Chapter One
Introduction
INTRODUCTION

Human-beings are basically psychosomatic entities. They join organizations, in their capacities to satisfy their economic, social and psychological needs. In any organization an employee has to adhere to the given quality of working life and play pre formatted prescribed roles. However, being humans, their nature changes from person to person, and it becomes impossible to satisfy oneself and at the same time others too, in all the walks of life. As a result, role stress arises and an employee becomes psychologically unwell. This in turn lowers down the organizational commitment of the employees which hampers the progress, productivity and profitability of the organization. All such problems and confusions may be unlocked by the master key of proper quality of working life.

Hence, by keeping in view the need of the hours, in the present investigation, we have incorporated the interactions of all these vital phenomenon of organizational behaviour, in the form of variables of study. The present research is framed as, “Impact of Quality of Working Life and Role Stress on Perceived Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being among Various Levels Bank Managers”. It includes four research variables, namely, Quality of Working Life (QWL), Role Stress (RS), Perceived Organizational Commitment (OC) and Psychological Well-Being (PWB). Former two variables are the independent variables, whereas the latter two variables are the dependent variables.

QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

Quality of Working Life (QWL) has emerged as a potent factor in recent past, throughout the developing economies in the entire world. In a noble and culture specific country like India, its scope seems to be much brighter than many labour legislations, enacted to protect the cause of workers.

Freedom to decide means freedom to think. This is the basic notion behind the humanitarian movement, and the same became the very concept of QWL movement (improvement). QWL is so vital that, it has emerged as an inevitable and crucial tool for both, the employers, as well as the employees. It is essential for employees as, a substantial part of their lives is spent on the job, making QWL to have a bearing upon the quality of their lives. Similarly, QWL is required for employers, as it is instrumental in achieving organizational goals.

The term QWL was introduced by Hoppock in 1935. Conceptually, it is an admixture of all efforts for enhancing motivation and satisfaction at work, with respect to its (work’s) humanitarian aspects. Motivation and satisfaction
are the keys to ensure good behaviour on the job. This can be internally done by improving QWL. Employees are the backbone of any organization. So, a good QWL is required for a healthy mind and sound body, fair working methods, high efficiency of employees on one hand, and production and profit on the other.

Before moving further and actually defining and learning the concept of QWL, let us go through its brief history. Thus, we will be able to examine it in a better and analytical manner. Initially, Taylorism, Hawthorne studies, Mayo's experiments sowed the seeds of QWL movement. QWL proved to be an eye-opener to the inhuman working environment of Pre-Industrial Revolution. Before the onset of the so called humanitarian movement, there were no policies; programmes; rules and regulations pertaining to working conditions. Awareness came after 1750, in England. QWL approach was a pioneer of potential quality of life improvement. It was more than a sheer work-organizations movement, which focuses on job-security and economic growth of employees.

Path breaker in the arena of QWL improvement was Taylor's book, "The Principles of Scientific Management", which was published in 1911. In this work of Taylor, he elaborated concepts of scientific management, which may be termed as, fore-runners of QWL concepts. They may be put into words as:

- Separation of planning from doing
- Functional foremanship of supervision, having eight different supervisors to give instructions in their respective fields
- Job-analysis based on time, motion and fatigue studies, to determine fair amount of work
- Standardization of tools, period of work, working conditions and cost of production
- Scientific selection and training of workmen
- Financial incentives to motivate workmen

Historically, the concept of QWL also included wages (Lawler 1968; Seashore and Barnowe, 1972; Pierce and Danham, 1976), working hours and working conditions (West, 1969; Ganguli and Joseph, 1969; Davis, 1971; Jhonsen, 1975). Thus, after examining the concept and history of QWL we can say that QWL is a relatively naive term for a bundle of old issues. It has long been of interest to philosophers, theologicians, social scientists, workers and employers. It's a broad term that can embrace every conceivable aspect of work ethics and working conditions, workers expression of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concerns about efficiency of outputs. QWL broadens consideration of social cohesion and stability. All thus can be made
clear by going through various definitions of QWL, stated by different experts and scholars of the field. They are as follows-

Benium (1974) has defined QWL in terms of quality of relationship between man and his task.

Ketzell and Yankelovich (1975) defined QWL as, “an individual’s evaluation of the outcomes of the work relationship. They observed and witnessed that a worker can enjoy a good QWL when- firstly, job incumbents have positive feelings towards his/her job and its future prospects. Secondly, is motivated to stay on the job and perform well. Thirdly, when he or she experiences and feels working life quite benefitting with his or her private life.

Spink (1975) defined QWL as the degree of excellence in work and working conditions, which contribute to overall satisfaction of individual and enhances the individual, as well as organizational effectiveness.

Trist (1975) stated that QWL is both means and end. It is an end in itself because it is a highly significant component in quality of life in general and it is a means by which the employee can acquire civic competencies and skills.

Walton (1975) stated that QWL is the degree to which members of work organization perceive that they are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in organization.

Hackman and Suttle (1977) made concerted efforts to define QWL in a broad sense, encompassing professional viewpoint. QWL refers to industrial democracy; high worker’s participation in corporate decision making or a culmination of the goals of human-relations. From management’s perspective QWL relates to a variety of efforts to improve productivity by improving human potentials and skills, rather than capital or technical inputs of production. From individual worker’s viewpoint, it refers to the degree to which he is able to satisfy important and personal needs through his experience in organization. From union’s perspective, it is high equitable sharing of income and resources of the work organization, and more humane to heal their working conditions. In philosophy, it means quality of content of relationship between man and his task in all its diversity. Relationships can be approached from the divergent viewpoint including man, organization and his society; embracing job-design; work organization; basic human needs and values and social concepts.

Lippit (1977) thought QWL as, “the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs to survive with some security, to interact with others, to have a sense of personal
usefulness, to be recognized for achievements and to have an opportunity to improve one’s skills and knowledge. Here Lippit covered the whole gamut of work life which may increase organizational effectiveness.

Cherns (1978) considered QWL as an area emphasizing to humanization of work place, work place democracy, work restructuring or job-design. His contention to view the concept of QWL seems to be an inspiration taken from movement started by Elton Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson in 1930’s, which is called ‘Human Relation Movement’, an employee oriented approach and humanization of the job.

Cohen and Rosenthal (1980) viewed QWL as an internationally designed effort to bring about increased labour management cooperation to jointly solve the problem of improving organizational performance and employee’s satisfaction.

Carlson (1980) stated that QWL is both a goal and an ongoing process for achieving goal. As a goal, QWL is commitment of any organization to work for improvement, the creation of high involvement, satisfaction and effective job and work environment for people at all levels of organization. As a process, QWL calls for efforts to realize goals through active involvement of people in achievement of organizational goals. Improvement in technology, information system, educational levels, affluence and independence lead to general life-satisfaction and some to lead to improve QWL.

Bhardwaj (1983) referred QWL as related to firstly, job satisfaction humanizing work or individualizing the organization and secondly, organizational development programmes.

Nurick (1985) views QWL as a set of firstly, philosophy with underlying values and assumptions; secondly, structure and method for organizational change; thirdly, human process as operating as operation of a planned change and fourthly, outcomes that can be monitored and assessed.

Dubey et al. (1988) were of the view that the term quality of life tends to cover a variety of areas such as physical, mental, psychological, social and spiritual well-being, personal functioning and general limitations. Quality of life means degree of excellence of one’s life that contributes to the person and benefits to society at large.

Davis (1995) opined that QWL is quality of relationship between employees and the total work environment.
Gani and Ahmad (1995) said that the term QWL may be conceptualized as a subset of quality of life which includes all life and living conditions.

Yousuf (1996) emphasized that QWL is a generic phase that covers a person’s feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards, benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and inter-personal relations and their intrinsic measuring.

With the growing importance and popularity of QWL, the American Society of Training and Development established a task force on QWL in 1979 and defined QWL as, “a process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping organizational environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting twin goals, that is, enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved QWL for employees”, (Skrovan, 1980). This clearly indicates the objectives of QWL programmes at work.

QWL is a highly complex and multi-faced concept implying a deeper concern for the members of an organization, irrespective of the level to which they belong. Nadler and Lawler (1983) after reviewing the literature in the field of QWL concluded that the definition of QWL underwent several changes and modifications with respect to its conceptual understanding. They categorized six significant definitions of the concept, which were modified through various stages depending upon the type of work environments. The stages are mentioned here under –

**First stage** (1959-1972): during this period QWL was conceived as a ‘variable’. Therefore, the emphasis was on individual worker’s reaction to personal consequences of work, experienced as job-satisfaction, job-motivation, mental health etc.

**Second stage** (1972-1979): here QWL was defined as an ‘approach’. It laid emphasis on individual worker and neglected the organizational outcomes. To this study, this definition seems to be incomplete as for overall organizational productive efficiency, both individual worker’s state of living as well as, organizational outcomes are equally important; hence, both should be equally taken care of.

**Third stage** (1979-1984): during this stage, a third view of QWL came out, according to which QWL was defined as ‘methods.’ This approach of QWL focused it as a set of methods, approaches or technologies for enhancing the work environment. All this is to make QWL as a highly productive and satisfying concept.
After examining these stages of QWL, it can be made clear that QWL engulfs the whole aspect of work environment. This work environment may affect quality of life of individual worker in jobs. Nadler and Lawler (1983) stated that QWL is a way of thinking about people, work and organizations. This makes clear the managerial functions of QWL. That is to say, QWL not only focuses on how people can do work better but also on how work may lead people to spend a better life.

In the context to types of definitions of QWL; here it is worth to mention the views of a renowned Indian scholar Reddy (1985). He very beautifully analyzed QWL concept across cultures and nations and presented a colourful opinion regarding QWL. The cross-cultural psychological attitude of Reddy is ‘hat, QWL is ‘work-redesigning’ in UK; ‘humanization of work programme’ in West Germany; and for the Japanese it is, ‘improving quality of products.’

During the last decade, there has been great progression in field of QWL. It started being associated with quality circle movements in large way. Japanese introduced the movement for the first time, in their industries. With the passage of time the Quality Circle Movement (QCM) started dominating European world too. Quality initially enhanced employee participation, which leads to valued outcomes (Mohram and Novelli, 1985; Balance, 1984). Quality circles, when extended at a greater parlance, it aims at humanization of work culture. This contributes towards improving quality of life of employees at work. So, we can conclude that QWL is studied in relation to job satisfaction across managerial levels, organizational climate, as well as cultural differences causing QWL. Likewise Hartenstein et al. (1984) emphasized that for QWL measures to be successful, management and labour must share their values. In absence of such values, often managers turn into authoritarian leaders. They deny their employees involvement, responsibility and autonomy. All such things lead to lack of competition and decrease in productivity.

We may infer from the aforementioned details that QWL touches many aspects of organizational behaviour. So, the researchers of this field identified its various dimensions. Some of them are summarized here under-

Walton (1975) identified eight dimensions of QWL. They are-

- Adequate and fair compensation
- Safe and healthy working conditions
- Development of human capacities
- Growth and security
- Social integration in work organization
Chapter 1 Introduction

- Constitutionalisation in work organization
- Work and total life space, and
- Social relevance of work life

Boiswert (1977) gave fifteen dimensions and Carlson (1978) stated sixteen dimension of QWL. With their seventeen dimensions Sinha and Sayeed (1980), developed a scale of QWL. Their dimensions are-

- Economic benefits
- Physical working conditions
- Career-orientation
- Advancement on merit
- Effect on personal life
- Mental state
- Union-management relations
- Self-respect
- Supervisory relationship
- Intra-group relationship
- Apathy
- Confidence in management
- Meaningful development
- Control influence and participation
- Employee commitment
- General life satisfaction and
- Organizational climate

Rosow (1981) gave eleven dimensions of QWL. They are-

- Pay
- Employee-benefit
- Job-security
- Alternative work schedule
- Job-stress
- Participation in decision-making
- Democracy in work-place
- Profit-sharing
- Pension right
- Company programmes designed to enhance worker welfare
- Four days work a week
Takezwa (1984) elaborately enlisted the dimensions of QWL as-

- Occupational safety and health
- Working hours
- Job-security
- Fair treatment at work
- Influence on decision-making
- Opportunity for advancement
- Worker's representation at company's board-meetings etc.

Recently, Heizel et al. (1993) proposed four dimensions of QWL as –

- Growth
- Mastery
- Involvement
- Self-control

It can be stated that QWL is an old wine in a new bottle. Improvement of QWL or the QWL-movement in itself is not a new approach. Many early concepts like job-enrichment, job-design, organizational structures, modes of communication, leadership behaviour were used to enhance the morale and motivation of human resources at work. They along with human needs gave rise to the very concept of QWL. It was very late, in 1972, Davis formally coined the term, "Quality of work life", in his paper presented at an international conference at Arden House, New York.

The decade of 1970s realized that, the whole structure of workplace based on socio-technical principles and the organization of work is necessary to meet the changing expectation of employees and to increase productivity. It was also to improve QWL (Walton, 1972; Thorsund, 1970; Anderson, 1975; Griffith, 1985). Last decade proved to be a revolutionary one for the growth and development of QWL. Many studies were conducted on it, and aspects related to it.

Need of the hour is to recognize the problems created by activities of QWL, for professional roles of middle managers. QWL may indicate the problems faced by middle management, for example, inadequate recognition at work, lack of influence, hectic workplace etc. (Schlesings and Oshry, 1984). Hence, it is beneficial to create a balance between organizational change adopted as a part of QWL and the existing and practical organizational structure and system, as things can not change overnight. It is the responsibility of the management to provide means to middle-management for discussion, concerns, and problem-sharing and also for problem-solving, developing
skills for organization and so on and so forth. Hence, QWL actions should be implemented by neutralizing its ill effects and after eradicating their drawbacks.

ROLE STRESS

Role stress is a highly charged concept of organizational psychology. Both positive as well as negative implications are attached to it. It may be positive, for example as an opportunity or negative, for example in context of new demands and commitments. It is an evil monster who has gripped fast developing nations. Its encroachment is so much, that it has proceeded to grow as water-hyacinth and suffocated those who are serving human organizations.

Present industrial world is full of materialistic race. To cope up with cut throat competition of globalization, Indian organizations have to upgrade themselves. Thus, it can be concluded that life in complex industrial organizations can be a great source of stress (Cooper and Marshall, 1978). Stress in work environment has gained impetus over the years.

One of the major sources of organizational stress is work role or the role assigned to an employee, in an organization. This is so, as the very nature of role has an inbuilt potential for stress. Work roles may create stress as they are in conflict with each other, or with the needs, values abilities and potentials of employees Role stress may also occur as, even though people occupy identical positions, they differ in their abilities, motives, need and above all their personality. Before literally understanding the real concept of role-stress, let us split it into two individual words, ‘role’ and ‘stress’, analyze their meaning and implications, and then enter into actual concept of role stress.

Since times immemorial, stress has become an unwanted pal of mankind. The substantial difference between past and present day stress, is the context in which stress is interpreted across cultures. During ancient and medieval times, stress was due to unpredictable natural phenomenon, so old age was regarded as, “Age of Uncertainty” (Galbraith, 1997). Whereas, in present era, stress is a result of overdemands, thus this is considered to be “Age of Anxiety” (Albrecht, 1979).

‘Stringere’ is a Latin word from which the word ‘stress’ has been originated. Stringere, in Latin means, ‘to draw tight’. However, the word partially derives its origin from French word ‘estresse’ meaning ‘narrowness’. In physical sciences, stress is an exerted pressure, strain or force exerted upon any object, wherein the object tends to resist the force or strain to maintain its original
state. According to physiology, stress is the changes in the physiological functions in response to evocative agents.

The credit of introducing “stress” in Life Sciences goes to a Canadian researcher, Seyle. He in 1936 made stress a biological concept and explained it in terms of ‘General Adaptation Syndrome’ or GAS. GAS states that, there are three phases in response to stress. They are-

- Alarm
- Continuous resistance, and
- It may terminate with Exhaustion

These three changes are incorporated in physical and chemical changes, which prepare an individual to fight or flee. Stress is a universal phenomenon, and is experienced by almost all people, in all spheres of life. Here, we are concerned with stress as a concept of psychology and then its role played in carrying on a role, that is to say role-stress. Till 1960s stress was studied in physiology and other physical sciences only. It was only in late sixties that stress grabbed the attention of psychologist and sociologists. Since then it is studied in both disciplines, extensively (Agrawala, Mahajan and Singh, 1979). Psychologically, stress is any external event or any internal drive which threatens to upset the organismic equilibrium (Seyle, 1956). Stress is a concept which is studied in all streams of the subjects, primarily being a part of physiological psychology. For them stress is that stimulus which imposes detectable strain that cannot be easily accommodated by body and so presents itself as impaired health and behaviour.

Discussing stress, that too in psychology is a real interesting subject matter. But here we will have to limit the widely studied concept to compartment of role-stress. Stress has far reaching effect on health, happiness and success as the working of any employee depends upon his adaptation to various stressful situations. In the parlance of management, stress may be defined as, any external, unexpected force or pressure that leads to increased role load and role conflict on the part of local person. Pestonjee (1992) has given three sectors of life, in which stress originates. They are-

- Job and organization sector: This sector covers all aspects of work environment.
- Social-sector: Social and cultural factors like, caste, food habit, language etc are included in it.
- Intra-psychic sector: Factors of intimate and personal importance fall here. It may take into concept like attitudes, interest, health, temperament etc.
Stress may emerge from any of these sectors and factors or from a combination of all of these factors and sectors.

Before heading further, it becomes necessary to discuss the very concept of 'role' as the concept of 'stress' has been described. Linguistically the word 'role' is enrooted in French word 'roule' meaning the role of paper on which an actor's part was written. In English too the word denotes more or less same meaning as a person's or things function in a particular situation. Organizations also follow the same meaning of the word role, with the change of its context. An employee of any organization may have to play varied roles. This may make him as a prey of stress, as role has an inbuilt potential for stress. Roles-stress can be experienced in any occupation. It is not the kind of occupation which gives birth to role-stress; rather, it's the transaction between job-environment and personal characteristics (Handy, 1988).

The role theory views person as an actor on social stage. It assumes behaviour to be shaped by logic of one's tasks and the social expectations as to what is the permissible range of proper behaviour. Thus, we can conclude that role theory gives primacy to technological and social factors in shaping of behaviour and also to internalized norms and values (Khandwalla, 1977). Role is the similarity in response of different individual to same situation (Pareek, 1981). It can also be defined as position of a person in a system (Pareek, 1976). Or to state more accurately role is the position one occupies in a social system, as defined by functions he/she performs in response to the expectations of the significant member of social system and his or her own expectations from that position or office (Pareek, 1983).

Kahn, Wolfe, Snookand and Rosenthal (1964) introduced the concept of role into organizational behaviour. It was formally done through publication of their work in form of a book entitled "Organizational Stress Studied in Role Conflict and Ambiguity" in the year 1964. They gave a role episode model in which a focal person and role senders (collectively termed as role set) interact cynically within a context influenced by organizational factors (for example infrastructure of an organization economic necessities etc) and personality factors (abilities, morals, motives, fears etc.) and interpersonal relations factors (influencing powers, dependence on others etc). The expectations of role senders regarding role performance take the form of 'role pressures'. These pressures are perceived and processed by focal person and act as role forces to influence focal person's behaviour in a manner according to or opposite to role sender's desires. They gave three separate dimensions of role related stress as-
• Role ambiguity
• Role conflict and
• Role overload

Both role conflict and role ambiguity were seen as having an objective or environmental component and a subjective or psychological component. Objective role construct refer to real evident situations in work environment and subjective role conflict and role ambiguity are internal states of focal person. This subjective parts of role conflict and role ambiguity may or may not correspond with their objective counterparts. All this depends upon the mediating influences of personality and inter-personal relations factors. Role overload is due to interaction of these two role overload: a set of obligations requiring the focal person to do more within a specified time limit, that is, role ambiguity, and role conflict.

Banton (1965) proposed three types of roles-

• Basic
• General and
• Independent

Mc Eachen (1958) defined and operationalized many role concepts. Pareek (1981) postulated a role-theory in which he projected role as a system; the system of various role an individual carries and performs; and system of various roles of which a person’s role is a part and in which the person’s role is defined by other significant roles. That is to say there are two aspects of role—the first is role set, and the second one is role space. Role set is the role system within the organization of which roles are and part and by which individual roles are defined. It is a pattern of inter-relationship between a role and other roles. So, role set leads to various expectations from an individual. When an individual is not able to come through according to expectations from him (or expectations from his role) here arise conflicts. These conflicts are of double nature. Firstly, they are between individual and his role-set expectations and secondly, they are between others and the individual (role-set). Collectively they are termed as “role-set conflicts”. Their various forms along with their descriptions are-

• Role ambiguity: experienced when there is lack of clarity about demands of the role.
• Role expectation: symbolizes conflicting demand made on the role by different persons (supervisors, subordinates and peers) in the organization.
• Role overload: is the feeling that too much is expected from the role than what the role player can cope with.
• Role erosion: arises when a role has become less important than it used to be. It means that challenge associated with the role has somehow lessened.
• Resource inadequacy: crops in when human or material resources allocated to role player are inadequate to meet demands of the role.
• Personal inadequacy: is demonstrated by the absence of adequacy skills, competence and training to meet demands of one's role.
• Role isolation: indicates absence of strong links of one's role with other roles in the organization.
• Role space is a dynamic relationship between, self and various roles. Self is the experience of identity arising from a person's interaction with the external reality things, person and systems various roles are played by a person which are centered on self and interactions with others. This forms role space. It is the dynamic relationship among various roles an individual occupies and his self. It has three main variables. They are: self, role under question, and other role focal person occupies or plays. Any conflict among these three variables of role space is referred to as role space conflict or "stress". They may be of various types, such as-
  • Inter-role distance: a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles e.g. role of a lecturer versus role of a daughter.
  • Self-role distance: arises due to a space or gap experienced between one's concept of self and demands of the role.
  • Role stagnation: refers to the feeling of being in the same role, which may lead to lessening of opportunities for growth and learning.

By far we have analyzed and described the concept of stress and role. Now it is high time to study about role-stress as a major organizational stressor of organizational settings.

An organization consists of four interacting subsystems namely, people, structure, technology and environment. All these systems work together to achieve desired common goals. An organization can also be viewed as a system of roles. Role is the channel through which an employee gets integrated into an organization. Among other organizational variables employee's job roles have been found to be major occupational stressor. In a formal organizational setting, a role can be defined in terms of job-description, job-specification and by organizational-structure (Francis and Milbourn, 1980). The success of any role play depends upon the extent to which the focal person's expectations and organizational expectations tally each other.

Fulfillment of needs depends on the success of complex roles played by people is society as well as work place. The interaction of one's personality, roles and society helps in to attain satisfaction. Satisfaction may be full;
partial or negative, that is, dissatisfaction. The needs, abilities, values of the role player may be in contrast to his or her role. This feeling gives rise to role stress. Non-work roles may also affect job stresses and its correlated domains like job-satisfaction (Cooper and Payne, 1990). The pressure from work or family may heighten conflict between work and family roles (Greenhaus and Beutall, 1982). They gave three ways which give rise to role pressure or role stress—

- Time spent in one role may give little time to denote to other roles,
- Strain within one role domain may "spill over" into another one,
- Behaviour appropriate to one role may be dysfunctional in another.

The enactment of an organizational role by an individual is an inter-action and partial overlap of two separate systems, the person system and organizational system overlap occurs in certain cycles of behaviour that are shared in time and space. They are identical for person and organization. These overlapping cycles contributes to organizational effectiveness. The effectiveness of work is affected by the assumption that how much role stress individuals perceive. There are many extrinsic and intrinsic factors, which gives rise to role stress. (Malik and Sabharwal, 1999).

Organizations are major sources of role stress. People from various walks of life, with different capacities join an organization and perform diverse tasks to achieve a common goal. All this hinders one’s freedom as employees have to follow rules and regulations within an organization. This leads him or her to stress. Since various stressors are found in organizations there have been efforts by researchers to identify and classify these stressors. One of such classification was proposed by Cooper and Marshall (1976, 1978) described seven categories of stressors which serve as a basis of occupational stress. They can be described as-

1. Intrinsic to job
   - Too much/too little work
   - Poor physical working conditions
   - Time pressure
   - Decision-making etc.
2. Role in Organization
   - Role conflict/ambiguity
   - Responsibility for people
   - No participation in decision-making etc.
3. Career Development
   - Under promotion/Over promotion
   - Lack of job security
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- Thwarted ambition etc.

4. Organizational Interface
- Company Vs. family demands
- Company Vs. own interests etc.

5. Organizational Structure and Climate
- Lack of effective consultation
- Restriction on behavior
- Office policies etc.

6. Relations within Organizations
- Poor relations with boss
- Poor relations with colleagues and subordinates
- Difficulty in delegating responsibility etc.

7. Individual Manager
- Personality
- Tolerance for ambiguity
- Ability to cope with change
- Motivation
- Behavioural pattern

Few and Bruning (1987) has identified six categories of stressors which serves as a basis of occupational stress. They may be described as-

- Task demands: they are related with different aspects of a person's job. e.g. autonomy, computerization, task variety, physical working conditions and interdependence of different tasks. High temperature, intense noise, over-crowding and frequent interruptions may arouse level of anxiety.
- Interpersonal demands: poor social support from peers, inadequate interpersonal relationships and undue pressure created by one employee or other.
- Role demands: forces exerted on a person by particular role the person performs in the organization. They are-
  - Role conflict: expectations from an employee, which he is unable to fulfill.
  - Role overload: is to perform more on the job, than specified permitted time.
- Role ambiguity: role of an employee, not clearly defined.
- Organization structure: job hierarchies, rules and regulations, company's policies and lack of industrial democracy in organization.
- Organizational leadership: factors emerging from functions of top officials. Their working style may lead to fear, depression or anxiety. It can
also impose unrealistic pressures on employee by exercising tight control and frequent punishments.

- Organization’s life stage: establishment, growth, maturity, declining stage poses many kinds of problems for employees. Out of them establishment and declining stage are highly stressful. Establishment leads to excitement; uncertainty and declining stage brings in downsizing, layoffs and varied uncertainties.

The research area of occupational stress has been widely studied. Schuler (1980) and Steers (1981) pointed out that stress causes absence from job and effects turnover. Role stress arises due to organizational climate and structure. It is a result of physical working conditions, while work stress is experienced during work performance of employees.

Other side of role stress can be it’s inter- organizational context. Role stress may occur not only during job but also outside the organization. It may arise in the interaction with family or other socio-cultural situations too (Vachom, 1987). Women experience more role-stress as compared to men (Sen, 1981). Stress at work may affect individual at home and in society too (Cooper, 1981).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Attraction, attachment, dedication, loyalty and support towards one’s organization are the simplest words to explain organizational commitment. Commitment represents everything beyond negative attraction and attachment; inverse dedication; passive loyalty and support. It is an active involvement with the organization where employees’ nurtures true relationships with the organization per se, and willingly give their best to organizations, in order to help their organization prosper and succeed, in each and every possible way.

Organizational Commitment is a recent addition to organizational behaviour’s literature. Becker’s (1960) “side-bet” concept was the first source of defining the term commitment, in organizational psychology. He analyzed that the concept enjoyed wide usage with little formal analysis or concrete theoretical reasoning. Becker (1960) defined commitment involving “consistent lines of actions” in behaviour that are produced by side-bets. Side-bets link extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity. These side-bets can be lost, if activity is discontinued. Whyte (1950) gave the concept of “The Organization Man”. This refers to one’s over commitment to the organization. For him, his ‘organization man’ is a person who works for the organization and posses a feeling of psycho-belongingness towards the same.
Hall et al. (1970) considered commitment as the process by which the goals of organization and of individual becomes increasingly integrated or congruent. However Sheldon (1971) stated that commitment is an attitude or an orientation towards the organization which links or attaches identity of a person to his organization Porter et al. (1976) opines that commitment is the strength of one's identification with job and involvement in particular organization, hence, characterized by one's willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of organization and a desire to maintain their membership in it. They perceived commitment as a highly active and positive orientation towards the organization.

Organizational commitment is a universal phenomenon. It is an affect of working condition and organizational climate, other than employee's work related attitude and behaviour per se. Modway et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment in terms of three factors. They were-

- A strong belief in acceptance of goals and values of organization.
- Readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of organization.
- A strong desire to remain member of organization.

These factors refer to behavioural dimension to evaluate employee's strength of attachment (Welsh and La Van, 1981; Morrow, 1983). More analytically, organizational commitment is a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization, its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Blau and Boal, 1987). Similarly, organizational commitment is an acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to retain membership in the organization (Balaji, 1992). It is also viewed as an employee's loyalty to the employer (Kin et al, 1996). Mottaz (1998) viewed commitment in terms of attitude. He called it an effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation, which links or attaches the individual to the organization. Venkatachalam (1998) talked about organizational commitment as taking on the organizational identity.

Organizational commitment is to identify with one's employing organization. So, it is the relative strength of an individual's identification with the involvement in a particular organization (Mishra and Srivastava, 2001). Whatever may be the words to describe organizational commitment, they measure a common concept. That is to say all of them indicate organizational commitment to be a bond on link of an individual to the organization. It's a process through which employees of any organization identifies and hence makes organizational goal as their personal goals. They are desirous of maintaining membership in the organization (Salanick, 1977).
March and Simon (1958) interpreted that real commitment creates an exchangeable relationship in which employees attach themselves to the organization in lieu of rewards or outcomes. The employees who are truly committed to the goals and values of an organization are more likely to participate on organizational activities.

After discussing a lot on organizational commitment, it becomes necessary to discuss about its types, at length. Etzioni (1961) was the first to develop a typology of organizational commitment. The basic notion behind evolving these types was that power or authority that organization's deliver over their employees is enrooted in the nature of employee's involvement in the organization. It can be put into words as-

- Moral involvement: it refers to positive and highly intense orientation towards organization, based on internalization of organizational goals and values or identification with authority.
- Calculative involvement: it is a less intense relationship with the organization and is largely based on rational exchange of benefits and rewards.
- Alienative involvement: here, least involvement with the organization is seen. Coercion plays a vital role in this type.

Here, Etzioni gave primary control mechanism. They are often used to have compliance with organizational directives.

Second typology was presented by Kanter (1968). He suggested his categories on the basis of social values. According to him, the three forms of commitment are-

- Continuance commitment: this refers to an employee's dedication to the survival of the organization.
- Cohesion commitment: it is the attachment of the social relationship in organizational context. This is brought by public renunciation, of previous social bonds or through employing in various social functions.
- Control commitment: in this type, the individual's attachment to his organizational norms can be viewed. This norm shape behaviour of individual in desired directions or may develop employee's pro-activity, conducive to organizational objectives.

Organizational commitment is a powerful tool, which can be used as an aid to achieve high level of performance. It can also be used to develop and maintain discipline in the organization (Sheldon, 1971). Most recently Meyer and Allen (1991) developed a framework of commitment based on three components. The components can be analyzed as-
• Affective commitment: employee’s emotional attachment to the identification with and involvement in the organization.
• Continuance commitment: an awareness of cost associated with leaving the organization, and
• Normative commitment: a feeling of obligation to continue with the associated organization.

Meyer et al. (1993) found out that job-status was positively related to affective and normative commitment, and negatively related to continuance occupational commitment.

Organizational commitment is concerned with psychological attachment to the organization that keeps the employees to have difficulty in isolating themselves from organization. The three parts of organizational commitment, which draw back an employee, to quit the organization are-

• Goals and values agreement.
• Behavioural investments in an organizational desire to retain organizational membership. There are many instances where organization requires individual employee, specialized in those critical position, to perform above and beyond the call of duty for the benefit of organization. Motivational basis for that ‘extra-role behaviour’ likely require more than simple compliance. The true antecedents of organizational commitment can be categorized into four categories, as, personal characteristics; role related variables; work experience and structural characteristics.

All of these categories have an impact on subjective utility of organizational membership, which directly have a bearing upon different levels of commitment (Modway et al., 1982). Stevens et al. (1978) gave different approaches to organizational commitment. He grouped various facets the concept and suggest its two types-

• Exchange approaches: over here, commitment is an outcome of inducement or contribution transaction between organization and the employee. This is with an explicit instrumentality of membership (in the organization) primary determinant of membership of members, irrespective of gain or loss in the process of exchange. The higher the favourability of exchange from member’s perspective, the higher will be his/her commitment to the organization.
• Psychological approach: this approach was the real idea of studies of Porter et al. (1976). According to psychological approach, organizational commitment is more active and positive orientation towards the organization. The employee wishfully keeps himself or herself committed
to organizational goals. Thus, as a consequence, it becomes more or less difficult for the employee to quit his/her organization.

Steers (1977) developed a framework giving antecedents and outcomes of commitment. He divided them into three groups, based on variables which influenced commitment. They are:

- Personal characteristics or attachments: age, education, need for achievement and work experience are few variables describing personal characteristics.
- Work experience: refers to varied socializing forces which have an impact on attachment with one's organization. It signifies experiences, attitudes of individuals as well as of groups towards their respective organizations.
- Job-characteristics: job challenges, opportunities for social interaction, feedback are the determinants, which explain this category.

Following the same line of explanation Becker (1992) suggested additional support and multiple constituency approach to describe organizational commitment. He demonstrated that employee's commitment to top management, supervisors and work itself contributed in an important manner, more than the organization itself for determining job-satisfaction and job-quitting. Also they predict the pro-social and organizational behaviour. Further Becker and Billings (1993) suggest four dominant profiles to identify commitment to various constituencies in the organization. They were:

- Locally committed: that is, attitude towards supervisor and work group.
- Globally committed: that is, attitude towards management and organization.
- Committed: that is, locally and globally committed and finally
- The uncommitted: neither locally nor globally committed.

Brown (1969) suggested three significant facets of commitment as:

- Notion of membership
- Current position of individual
- Predictive potential concerning certain aspects of performance, motivation to work, spontaneous contribution and other related outputs.

Interestingly, organizational commitment is also viewed as a process of identification with the goals of organization’s various departments. This also includes its human resources, their top management and also their customers, at large. Here goals and values are focal pivot of commitment. This description of organizational commitment realistically reflects the nature of employee’s attachment with the organization (Rechiers, 1985). An
employee’s psychological attitude toward his or her organization presents a variety of three major psychological foundations. They can be categorized as-

- Compliance: compliance arises when attitudes and behaviour are adopted for gaining rewards, not for sharing benefits.
- Identification: it occurs when an individual willingly get influenced by a relationship, in order to be proud of the accepted relation. This is like adoption of values of a group, without really adhering to them as their own.
- Internalization: here influence is adopted due to the induced attitude and behaviour, which are like one’s own values. The values of group and organization are one and the same (O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986).

Organizational commitment has always been the backbone of any organization. Its spirit is vital for the survival of any organizational set-up. Its importance has heightened due to present pace of development in the world. It has become a great concern for both, the employers as well as the employees. Organizational commitment has thus become most studied work related behavioural phenomenon, which directly or indirectly influences productivity and effectiveness, positively.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING**

Psychological well-being is not a new concept for human race. Psychological well-being fathers happiness for mankind. The concept of well-being is as old as human civilization, yet its relevance in present age is as novel as a nascent child. Psychological well-being or subjective well-being deals with people’s feelings in their day to day life (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, 1976; Warr, 1978). These feelings may vary from negative ones (like anxiety, depression, dissatisfaction etc.) to positive ones (like elation, satisfaction etc).

Well-being is the opposite pole of depression (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). In psychology, the concept of psychological well-being or subjective well-being have started gaining impetus, recently more, due to hectic work schedules and metro lifestyle. All the researches in this field have paid good interesting results (Argyl, 1987; Diener, 1984 and 2000; Eysenck, 1990; Strack et al., 1991).

Before moving further, let us take a quick glimpse of historical antecedents of the concept of psychological well-being. Since times immemorial, psychological well-being is a part and parcel of man’s lifestyle. Basically it was studied in philosophy, under the name of ‘Eudoemonics’. This can be clearly studied in Aristotle’s ‘Ethica Nicomachea’. Later, with the sheer development of human race, socially, the compartmentalization or more
precisely specialization began. This led the concept of psychological well-being to creep into the discipline of psychology too. Since then, it has become a topic of psychology as well as philosophy and theology.

Theology deals with study of religion. Analyzing theologically the concept of well-being, one can conclude that by the grace of people’s devote faith in the respective religion or religions, walking with love on the righteous path should lead to their true well-being or true worthiness of life (Nishizawa, 1998).

Buddhism preaches love and well-being for all that is not only for the believers of their faith, but also for the followers of other religions. Christianity’s mission is to bring about true well-being from mankind. Hinduism starts with “Sarve Bhavantu Sukhin” (let all enjoy well-being). Geeta claims well-being to be most important feature of life. This well-being can be attained by emancipation from anxiety producing fixations and attachments.

In Islam, the holy Quran states “Saber Tawakkul” that is to have patience and to have faith in God. It implies that having faith in God and observing patience leads to real well-being.

Well-being is an admixture of affective, cognitive and somatic state of affairs. It presents an overall view of subjective well-being (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). It also includes motivational experiences of life with subjective feeling of satisfaction. Terms like happiness, hope, positive mental health, quality of life, optimism or satisfaction are invariably used as synonyms of well-being. Happiness and satisfaction are the steps to the goal of well-being. They involve multiple life situations as belongingness, creativity, education, familial responsibilities, financial complexities, health (all mental, physical and social health), matrimony, opportunities self-esteem and trust in others. Satisfaction is an over whelming term which goes beyond the context of well-being. Restoration, homeostatic and drive reduction are its determinants. It is an experience unique to humans and is bombarded with values and morals.

Depression-Happiness is a measure of well-being. In over-viewing the concept, it was observed that well-being is the opposite pole of depression (Joseph and Lewis, 1998). Global measures of life situation can be influenced by mood at any given moment of time. This has an effect on well-being (Schwartz and Strack, 1999). However, situational factors fail, as compared to long term influences on well-being. Psychological well-being is also exhibited in socially desirable ways. On the other hand like its name, subjective well-being is a subjective experience (Eid and Diener, 1999). Well-being is also related to the constructs of hope, efficacy and optimism. Hope includes both
will and ways, optimism denotes general expectancy that one will experience good outcome in life. It does not imply the specification of agency through which good outcomes are realized (Magaletta and Oliver, 1999).

Subjective well-being or psychological well-being is also studied under the name of quality of life. Well-being is examined as a harmonious satisfaction of one’s desires and goals (Chekola, 1975). Quality of life is a total measure of physical, mental and social well-being. Also psychological well-being or subjective well-being is an important construct of quality of life (Campbell et al., 1970). Well-being can also be defined as a dynamic state of mind characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an individual abilities, needs and expectations and environmental demands and opportunities (Levi, 1987). Three features of subjective well-being have been identified as-

- It is based on subjective experiences, instead of objective conditions of life
- It has a positive, as well as a negative affect, and
- It is a global experience, as opposed to experience in particular domains such as work (Okun and Stock, 1987).

Oshi et al. (1999) proposed “value” as a moderator of well-being. The examination of individual developmental and cross-cultural variations in the process of well-being is a promising pathway to gain insight into the nature of subjective well-being. Subjective well-being centres on the person’s own judgments (Diener, 1984). Good life can be put into words in terms of “subjective well-being” (SWB) and in colloquial terms, it is labeled as “happiness”. Subjective well-being is not sufficient for good life, but it appears to be increasingly necessary for it (Diener; Sapyta and Suh, 1998). It refers to people’s evaluation of their life evaluations, which are both affective and cognitive. People experience abundant subjective well-being when they feel many pleasant and few unpleasant emotions, when they are engaged in interesting activities, when they experience many pleasures and few pains, and when they are satisfied with their lives (Diener, 2000).

There is a dubious relationship between well-being and quality of life. WHO defined quality of life as the condition of life resulting from combination of effect of a complete range of factors. For example those factors which determine health, happiness (including comfort in physical environment and satisfying occupation) education and social; intellectual attainments, freedom of action, justice and freedom of expression. Well-being is often regarded as a broader concept which includes standards of living, level of living and quality of life, that is, subjective well-being.
Standards of living is denoted by income, occupation, standard of housing, sanitation and nutrition, level of health provisions, educational, recreational and other services. Level of living is indicated through nine components. They are:

- Health
- Food consumption
- Education
- Occupation and working conditions
- Housing
- Social security
- Clothing
- Recreation and leisure and
- Human rights

These objective characteristics are assumed to influence human well-being. The World Health Organization Quality of Life group proposed a broader range of criteria for subjective quality of life comprising twenty-four facets. The subjective definition of quality of life considers that each individual has the right to decide whether his or her life is worthwhile.

The subjective feeling of contentment, happiness and satisfaction with life experience and of one’s role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry etc. is the way to describe general well-being (Verma and Verma, 1989). They laid special emphasis on the term “subjective well-being”, as they attribute that the aforementioned aspects cannot be evaluated objectively. General well-being is a part of the concept of positive mental health, which is not a mere absence of disease or infirmity (Verma, 1988). He further elaborated the absence of psychological ill-being. A person can have both conditions—poor or good with all its accompanying results. Psychological well-being is a person’s evaluative reaction to his or her life satisfaction, that is, “cognitive evaluations or effect”, “ongoing emotional reactions” (Diener and Diener, 1995).

Physical well-being is generally taken to be happiness, along with one’s cognitive appraisal of how satisfying his or her life has been, and it is also encompassing positive future prospects of life, that is, “hope”. It is also integrative character of mental healthiness which is, supposed to be composed of certain set of stable traits of personality, moral beliefs system, as well as stocks of psycho-behavioral resources connected with one’s major life domains such as home, school or workplace.