Chapter-2

Literature Review

Today, people are living in the 'Age of Stress' - Pestonjee, (1999).\(^{(1)}\)

2.0 Introduction (ORS and HRD-climate)

In this chapter the relevant research literature, theories and models pertaining specifically to organizational role stress and HRD climate are discussed and analyzed. This literature review will provide a theoretical assessment of the major concepts of organizational role stress and HRD climate to understand their relationship in the Public and private banking sector in NCR Delhi India.

Role Stress is a twentieth century syndrome. The literature indicates that dysfunctional individual and organizational consequences result from the existence of role conflicts in organizations. Organizational role stress (ORS) is also a manifestation of mad rat race, towards modern progress, which impacts employees to face stress complexities. ORS is inevitable in the wake of ever rising stiff competition, work pressures and ill structured organizational roles.

The anatomy of ORS in the banking service sector of India is being ascertained. The study investigates nature, antecedents, correlates, and consequences of role stress. A careful attempt is also made to understand the attributes of role stress, to extrapolate its dimensions, and to "locate research gap" in the literature review of "ORS and HRD climate", necessary for "hypothesis formulations' In this section, a careful, rich, and extensive combing for the relevant role stress literature is endeavoured.

Stress is experienced in organizational roles, as problems are encountered in role performance. This chapter organizes and reviews the literature on two vital constructs, that are involved in this research study on bank executives viz., (i) Organizational role-stress (ORS) / role-stressors, and (ii) HRD-climate. The constructs of role-stress and HRD climate are of recent active research interest.
In the international arena and domestic front there is a paucity of research work, focused on banks, to investigate the interactions/interplay of "organizational role stress" and "organizational HRD climate".

The basic, first or primary link of an employee with organization is through his/her role. So, if the organizational roles are found riddled with role-stress no organizational excellence, competitiveness or worthwhile productivity, can be envisaged. Even the best motivational intervention will yield no desired results till 'role' - the first and foremost linkage of employee with the organization - is devised and kept free from role-stress. Does HRD-Climate have some influence (interplay) on ORS? - is yet another very significant research question. These prominent concerns and curiosity lead to the present research work in this novel, dynamic, and need of the day field of study, to understand and empirically analyze the impacts of organizational role-stress, and its interactions with prevailing HRD-climate in the work setting of public and private banks.

This chapter provides a background review of the literature that is relevant to these issues, and to develop a strong information infrastructure to justify the study undertaken. In line with the research questions and objectives, it is realized that the topic under study covers a number of main and sub concepts and issues that need to be seen in the light of available research, and intricately delineated, clarified, understood and developed.

Relevant references from literature and research studies were collected from books, research articles and research papers from scientific journals. Libraries were visited in the course of collection of reviews and literature. Various internet websites were also used for retrieval of literature. In this endeavour a combination of seminal works and the most recent 21st century research, in the targeted research areas of role-stress and HRD-climate, are extensively reviewed and analyzed to trace the developments and linkages in the thought process. This chapter examines published evidence on the causes and effects of stress, and the implications it has on executives and organizations.
In sum, this literature review presents a theoretical assessment of these major and sub concepts to understand them and their inter-relationships. The literature and reports of researches relevant to the present investigation are presented in this chapter. A critical reading of relevant literature becomes indispensable not only in locating the research problem, but also in analyzing the procedures. The literature survey helps to:

1. sharpen the problem, reformulate it or even leads to defining other closely related problems,
2. get proper understanding of the problem chosen,
3. acquire proper theoretical and practical knowledge to investigate the problem.
4. show how the problem under study relates to the previous research studies, and
5. know whether the proposed problem had already been solved.

Through survey one can collect relevant information about the problem. Clarity of ideas can be acquired through study of literature.

**Section I: ORS - Review of Literature**

2.1 Organizational Role and Organizational Climate

“Role Theory defines a “role” as the boundaries and sets of expectations applied to role incumbents of a particular position, which are determined by the role incumbent and the role senders within and beyond the organization’s boundaries” claim: Banton, (1965), (92) Katz & Kahn, (1966). (11) The relevance of a role depends upon the importance placed on the product or outcome by the evaluator or observer, typically a person’s supervisor, state Dougherty and Pritchard (1985). (93) Organizational Climate has been shown to impact roles
and role perceptions - Kahn, et al. (1964), Oswald, Mossholder, and Harris, (1997).

Forte, Hoffman, Lamont and Brockmann (2000) claim that role-ambiguity may result from the changes in external environment and the subsequent reactions that impact organizational climate job stress and satisfaction are found inversely related. Srivastava and Pratap (1984) studied job satisfaction and organizational climate among executives and supervisors, reported a significant positive relationship between the overall climate and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was also found related to various individual dimensions of organizational climate such as leadership, communication, interaction, influence in decision making, goal-setting and control. Another study done by Gole & Sahu, (2008), Verma, (2008), says that Occupational stress was found to be significantly related to job satisfaction; the greater the stress the lower the satisfaction. Deepti Pathak (2012) claims that "The results show that Organizational Role Stress is negatively and significantly related with job satisfaction. Perceived Organizational Support was found to lessen the stress level of the employees, thereby indirectly affecting job satisfaction. In addition, the results of the hierarchical multiple regression analysis support the moderating effect of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) with regard to the relationship between organizational role stress & job satisfaction." Job satisfaction and perceived organizational support (POS) are the indicators of organizational HRD climate.

2.2 Role: Perceptions

Role is the interacting region between the organization and the individual. "Role is the place one occupies in a social system as defined by the functions one performs in response to the expectations of the 'significant' members of a social system and one's own expectations from that position or office." - Pareek, U. (1987).
Role stressors are highly inevitable in nature and have become major concern at workplace. Role is the interacting region between the organization and the individual. "An organization can be defined as a system of roles," - Katz and Kahn, (1966). However, if minutely evaluated role itself could be regarded as a system. From the point of view of an individual, there are two role systems: the system of various roles the individual carries and performs and the system of various roles of which his or her role is a part. The former is called 'Role Space' and the latter is known as 'Role Set', Pareek, U. (1976).

Pareek, U. (2010), has delineated role stress into two groups i.e., (a) role-space conflicts and (b) role-set conflicts, which together form 10-types of role stresses. He typifies:

(a) **Role Stress: Role-Space Conflicts:** Role space (the dynamic relationship among various roles the individual occupies and his or her self) has three main variables: the self, the role in question, and other roles the individual occupies. Any conflicts within this field are referred to as role-space conflicts or stress. Role-Space conflicts are: 1) Intra-role conflict, 2) Role-stagnation, 3) Inter-role distance.

(b) **Role Stress: Role-Set Conflicts:** A role set has been conceived of as a system of relationship between the role and other related roles in a social system. A role set consists of persons like boss, colleagues, subordinates, and clients who have different expectations from the role the individual occupies. the conflicts that arise as a result of incompatibility among these expectations of the significant other roles and the individual himself are referred to as role-set conflicts. Role-Set conflicts are: 1) Role-ambiguity, 2) Role-expectation conflict, 3) Role-overload, 4) Role-erosion, 5) Role-isolation. 6) Resource-inadequacy, 7) Personal inadequacy.

Prof. Omer Bin Sayeed (2000) found that, “The organizations which enhance employee commitment integrate organizational roles into the mainstream of their activities; while such organizations where only compliance
is expected make the employees too much adaptive or indifferent to organizational processes and outcomes”. Schub & Iwanicki, (1982). (103) claim that, "Several researchers in the field of role-stress and burnout have found role variables as important antecedent of burnout. Role-ambiguity was found to be a source of emotional exhaustion and low accomplishment."

Chermiss (1980), (104) identified role-ambiguity, role-conflict, and role-overload as strong contributors to the incidences of burnout among human service professionals.

2.2.1 Stress, Stressor and Strain: Conceptualization

There are numerous definitions, models and theories on how individuals are influenced by stress in the workplace. The growth of the study of psychology and stress in particular, has resulted in a wide range of definitions, not all of which assist in clarifying the meaning of the term - Jones & Bright, (2001), (105) Sharit and Salvend, (1982). (106)

After extensive literature reviews, Cox (1985), (107) defined stress as “a complex psychological state deriving from the person’s cognitive appraisal of the adaptation to the demands of the work environment.” He found that the process of appraisal took account of the following four factors:

- Demands on the person
- Individual characteristics, skill and ability to meet the demands, that is, personal resources
- Constraints individuals are under when coping
- Support received from others in coping

Cox (1985), (107) then on next page clarified: "The absolute level of demand would not appear to be the important factor in determining the experience of stress. More important is the discrepancy that exists between the level of demand and the person’s ability to cope (personal resources). Both overload (demands greater than abilities) and under load (demands less than abilities) in a work context can result in perceived stress because, it is only if an individual believes
there is a discrepancy between the demands and abilities, that a “stress state” has been reached - Cox, (1985). Work overload, also known as role overload, is considered to be a more important stressor for managers and “white-collar workers” than working conditions. It can be seen in terms of quantitative and qualitative overload. Quantitative overload refers to having too much to do, whereas qualitative overload refers to work that is too difficult for the incumbent to perform -French and Caplan, (1973).

Conceptualizations of stress usually emphasize the following elements: (i) a state of arousal resulting either from the presence of socio-environmental demands that tax the ordinary adaptive capacity of the individual, or (ii) from the absence of the means to attain the sought-after ends.- Lazarus (1966), Pearlin (1983).

External circumstances that challenge or obstruct are labelled stressors. Stress refers to internal arousal. Thus stress is not an inherent attribute of external conditions, but emanates from discrepancies between those conditions and characteristics of the individual -- his or her needs, values, perceptions, resources, and skills. Smith (1987), in an analogy to engineering physics, maintained that "stress should be assessed not merely as load, but as load relative to the supporting surface". Socio-environmental conditions differ in the capacity to evoke stress, however, some conditions threaten virtually everyone, whereas others are uniformly navigated with ease.

- **Stress & Strain defined:**

To introduce order in the terminology some writers have distinguished between ‘stress’, which they reserve mainly for inputs, and ‘strain’, which they apply to outcomes.

Cummings and Cooper (1979), defined stress as: “any force that puts a psychological or physical factor beyond its range of stability producing a strain within the individual. Knowledge that a stress is likely to occur constitutes a threat to the individual. A threat can cause a strain because of what it signifies to
the individual.” Beehr and O’Hara (1987), (113) suggest using ‘stressor’ rather than ‘stress’ to refer to causal factors because “few people misinterpret stressor to mean the person’s reaction.” They reserve the word ‘strain’ to mean specifically the “adverse reactions of the individuals to the … stressor.”

Fletcher (1988), (114) picks up this distinction and uses ‘strain’ to mean “the state of being stressed as evidenced by physiological, psychological or medical indices,” whilst Karasek and Theorell (1990), (115) define strain as “an overload condition experienced by an organism’s control system when it attempts to maintain integrated functioning in the face of too many environmental challenges.”

Cox’s (1993), (116) broader use of the term ‘stress’ might be replaced with the more precise term ‘strain’ in his summary: “Stress arises when individuals perceive that they cannot adequately cope with the demands being made on them or with threats to their well-being, assert- Lazarus, R.S, (1966), (117) Cox, (1990), (118) when coping is important to them - Cox, (1978), (119) and when they are anxious or depressed about it” - Cox and Ferguson, (1991). (120)

- Stressor defined:

Anisman and Merali (1999), (121) define the term "stressor" as a situation or event appraised as being aversive, in that it elicits a stress response. This then taxes a person’s Physiological or psychological resources, as well as potentially provoking a subjective state of mental or physical tension.

Stressors can be separated into two classifications psychogenic and or physical tension. Stressors of a purely psychological origin are called psychogenic stressors. Neurogenic stressors usually involve a physical stimulus. These authors next segregated environmental stressors as either systemic and possessive. Possessive stressors require appraisal of a situation involving high level cognitive processing of incoming sensory information. In contrast systemic stressors are of physiological origin. Simply defined, - Lazarus and Folkman
say a stressor is an event that causes stress to the individual when he or she appraises the demands as exceeding the resources. Herbert (1997), (123) utilizes the definition of stressor as an environmental event. Kahn and Byosiere, (1992), (124) say that "the cause or source of stress is known as "stressors" and stressors are conditions and events that evoke strain." Davison and Neale (2001), (125) concur with this definition and add that a stressor can be thought of as a stimulus, whether positive or negative in nature. A table of chronological definitions of job stressors is framed below:

Table 2.1: Definitions of Job Stressors - An Evolution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of Job Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Lazarus and Folkman</td>
<td>Simply defined, a stressor is an event that causes stress to them individual when he or she appraises the demands as exceeding the resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Anisman and Merali</td>
<td>Stressors can be separated into two classification psychogenic and or physical tension. Stressors of purely psychological origin are called psychogenic stressors. Neurogenic stressors usually involve physical stimulus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Davison and Neale</td>
<td>Concur with this definition and add that a stressor can be thought of as a stimulus, whether positive or negative in nature as coping process. The concept of coping as how to handle a problem or the emotion it process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Davison and Neale

2.3 Role Stress: Nature, Antecedents, Correlates, & Consequences

Role stress occurs when one perceives difficulty to integrate the different roles made upon him - Bentell and Greenhaus, (1983). (126) Role stress was found to be correlated with job related tension and alienation. An antecedent of stress means what leads to stress. Antecedents are the causative factors of stress. Antecedent variables include demographic and work characteristics. Stress, is a broader term and to define it is very difficult. Due to its complex nature most of the researchers cannot agree on a single definition. The cause or source of stress
is known as **stressors**. **Stressors** are conditions and events that evoke **strain**. The concept of stress was first proposed by **Selye, Hans** (1936). According to **Selye, H.** (1974), stress, is “the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it.”

- **Occupational Stress**

The word stress was derived from the Latin word *stringere*, meaning to draw tight and was used to describe hardships and affliction in the 17th century. Stress is recognized as an occupational disease resulting in significant human illness, both physical and psychological - **Quick, Nelson, and Quick, (2001).** The concept of stress has been defined as an outcome, a predictor or causal factor, as well as a “process” and has been investigated in medical, behavioral, and social science research - **Cooper, Dewe, and Driscoll, (2001).** Stress, in general, can be defined as the reaction of individuals to demands (stressors) imposed upon them. It refers to situations where the well-being of individuals is detrimentally affected by their failure to cope with the demands of their environment, - **Erkutlu and Chafra, (2006).**

**Pestonjee, (1999),** is of the view that in the past three decades, empirical researches on the theme of stress have increased many folds. Researchers have focused their attention on causal factors of stress, stress manifestations, moderators of stress-strain relationship, and types of stresses experienced by diverse work populations, and various coping strategies adopted by organizational entities to cope with stress. He also explained that, optimum level at which stress is functional is different for different persons and is dependent on variety of factors like the personality of an individual, self-esteem, his educational background, authority to make decisions, control over organizational and environmental variables and so on.

Stress is associated with impaired individual functioning in the workplace. A number of aspects of working life have been linked to stress. Aspects of work itself can be stressful, namely work overload - **Defrank and Ivancevich, (1998),** **Sparks and Cooper, (1999),** **Taylor et al., (2005),** and
role-based factors such as lack of power, role ambiguity, and role conflict - Burke, (1988), \textsuperscript{(135)} Nelson and Burke, (2000). \textsuperscript{(136)}

Pareek (1983), \textsuperscript{(37)} pioneered work on role stress by identifying as many as ten different types/categories of organizational role stresses (ORS) namely: SRD, IRD, RS, RI, RA, REC, RO, RE, RIn & PIn. The dimensions of ORS are:

1) Self-Role Distance (SRD): This represents the conflict of one’s values and self-concept with the role requirements within the organization.

2) Inter-Role Distance (IRD): It signifies the conflict that exists between organizational roles and others.

3) Role Stagnation (RS): This indicates the lack of opportunities for growth or progress.

4) Role Isolation (RI): Role Isolation is an indicator of the extent of alienation of one’s role from the other organizational roles.

5) Role Ambiguity (RA): It represents the paucity of clarity of what others expect from a role, for the lack of sufficient feedback on performance.

6) Role Expectation Conflict (REC): It signifies the conflicting demands on role-incumbent by others.

7) Role Overload (RO): It represents being ‘heaped-up’ with more than what one can actually accomplish.

8) Role Erosion (RE): It constitutes the feeling that the job is no longer challenging or that parts that should have remained within a particular role have been given to others.

9) Resource Inadequacy (RIn): It represents the stress emanating from not having enough resources (available knowledge, financial and personnel resources etc). to effectively perform in a role.

10) Personal Inadequacy (PIn): It represents the feeling of being ill-equipped for the demands of a particular role.

Ivanceivich and Matteson (1980), \textsuperscript{(136)} have identified three critical factors: (1) Role Ambiguity, (2) Role Conflict, and (3) The Degree of Responsibility for others - as major sources of stress in the Western society. Pestonjee, D. M.

\[84\]
(1997), espoused that "in India, three critical factors - (1) Role Erosion, (2) Inter-Role Distance, and (3) Role- Stagnation; are seen as the major sources of stress." Stress has become one of the most serious health issues of the twentieth century - a problem not just for individuals in terms of physical and mental morbidity, but for employers, governments and the society at large. Occupational stress has been of great concern to the management, employees, and other stakeholders of organizations. Occupational stress researchers agree that stress is a serious problem in many organizations - Cooper and Cartwright, (1994), Varca, (1999), Ornelas and Kleiner (2003).

Stress is ubiquitous in society it is an unavoidable consequence of modern living. Work-related stress: Spice of life or kiss of death? - is a million dollar question. Stress is a set of potentially pathogenic (disease-inducing) mechanisms. Its end results may include disease and death and loss in organizational output.

The pathogenic mechanisms can be categorised under the following four headings but are usually concurrent and tightly interwoven.

1. Emotional manifestations - it includes reactions of anxiety and depression, and feelings of hopelessness and helplessness.

2. Cognitive manifestations - under conditions of work-related stress, many workers find it difficult to concentrate, recollect, learn new things, be creative, and make decisions.

3. Behavioural manifestations - exposure to work-related and other stressors can trigger pathogenic health-related behaviours. Some workers use alcohol as a way to unwind, or they start (or increase) smoking (stress smoking). Others seek comfort in overeating (increasing the risk of obesity and subsequently of cardiovascular diseases and diabetes), in drugs, or take unnecessary risks at work or in traffic. Aggressive, violent or other types of antisocial behaviour may be another outlet chosen. Many of such reactions lead to accidents, disease and premature death.
(4) **Physiological manifestations** - the stress reactions include a preparation for "fight or flight". Take, for example, the employee who feels unjustly criticised by his or her supervisor. The employee's typical reactions may be increased blood pressure, accelerated blood clotting, increased or irregular heart rate, muscular tension (with subsequent pain in the neck, head and shoulder), or overproduction of acid gastric juice. Virtually every organ and organ system can be influenced.

- **Consequences of stress**

Stress produces a range of undesirable, expensive, and debilitating consequences which affect both individuals and organizations. In organizational setting, stress is nowadays becoming a major contributor to health and performance problems of individuals, and unwanted occurrences and costs for organizations. Consequences of occupational stress can be grouped into those (i) on individual and those (ii) on organizational level.

  1. **On the individual level**, there are three main subgroups of strains:
     a) **Unwanted feelings and behaviours** – such as job dissatisfaction, lower motivation, low employee morale, less organizational commitment, lowered overall quality of work life, absenteeism, turnover, intention to leave the job, lower productivity, decreased quantity and quality of work, inability to make sound decisions, more theft, sabotage and work stoppage, occupational burnout, alienation, and increased smoking and alcohol intake.
     b) **Physiological diseases (poor physical health)** – such as increased blood pressure and pulse rate, cardiovascular diseases, high cholesterol, high blood sugar, insomnia, headaches, infections, skin problems, suppressed immune system, injuries, and fatigue.
     c) **Psychological diseases (poor emotional (mental) health)** – psychological distress, depression, anxiousness, passiveness/aggressiveness, boredom, lose of self-confidence and self-esteem, lose of concentration, feelings of futility, impulsiveness and disregarding of
social norms and values dissatisfaction with job and live, losing of contact with reality, and emotional fatigue.

- **(2) The organizational level**, consequences of occupational stress can be grouped into two major subgroups:
  a) *Organizational symptoms* – such as discontent and poor morale among the workforce, performance/productivity losses, low quality products and services, poorer relationships with clients, suppliers, partners and regulatory authorities, losing customers, bad publicity, damage to the corporate image and reputation, missed opportunities, disruption to production, high accident and mistakes rates, high labour turnover, loss of valuable staff, increased sick-leave, permanent vacancies, premature retirement, diminished cooperation, poor internal communications, more internal conflicts, and dysfunctional workplace climate.
  b) *Organizational costs* – such as costs of reduced performance / productivity (lack of added value to product and/or service), high replacement costs in connection with labour turnover (increase in recruitment, training and retraining costs), increased sick pay, increased health-care costs and disability payments, higher grievance and litigation/compensation costs, and costs of equipment damage.

As evident from the above, consequences of occupational stress, both on individual and organizational level, is a real cost to the organizations. Because of its significant economic implications, stress is not only a huge burden - **Ben-Bakr et al., (1995)**, but is one of the fastest growing concern to the contemporary organizations, especially given the high levels of competition and environmental turbulence, which do not allow organizations to bear costs such as those caused by stress **(McHugh, 1993)**. However, costs which are a consequence of stress are hardly ever assessed or calculated either in human or financial terms. Despite the apparent need for measuring costs of stress, to date relatively limited number of organizations estimated those enormous indirect costs. At this juncture **Erkutlu and Chafra, (2006)** cautioned that, "Finally, it is important to stress that contrary to popular belief, stress can be associated
with both pleasant and unpleasant events, and only becomes problematic when it remains unresolved."

In other words, one could argue that not all stress is dysfunctional and that, in fact, stress is not inherently bad, while a limited amount of stress combined with appropriate responses actually can benefit both the individual and the organization - Chusmir and Franks, (1988).\(^{(146)}\) Namely, *as low and high stress predict poor performance, and moderate stress predicts maximum performance* - Yerkes & Dodson, (1908) in Sharples et al., (1996),\(^{(147)}\) the total elimination of stress should not be aimed at.

A report published by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH-1999),\(^{(7)}\) in the USA gave a summarized finding of various surveys conducted on organizational stress that between 26 and 40 percent of all surveyed workers experienced their work as very stressful. In this context Levi and Lunde Jensen, (1996),\(^{(148)}\) also found that in the European Union 28 percent workers reported that their work causes stress.

Harnois and Gabriel (2000),\(^{(149)}\) also found that in Japan, the percentage was even higher. The cost of occupational stress is very high in many organizations. For instance, the International Labor Organization (ILO) reports that inefficiencies arising from occupational stress may cost up to 10 percent of a country's GNP - Midgley, (1996).\(^{(150)}\)

In Indian context Bhatti *et al.* (2010),\(^{(151)}\) asserts that out of the intraorganizational and extraorganizational causes of stress, 67 percent of the overall stress experienced by the employees is due to factors within the organization wherein major cause of the stress is the workload. Workplace stress is found to have many variables.

Empirical research summarized above shows that organizational stress has detrimental effects on individual health and well-being. Moreover, stress interventions, particularly those aimed at individual stress management have been found to have beneficial effects. The complexity, turbulence and volatility
of "contemporary business environment" on interaction with "organizational life" cause occupational stress, which can be classified into two main groups:

(i) **job related stressors**, having three key subgroups: environment specific, organization specific, and job specific stressors, and

(ii) **individual-related stressors**, which can be either a consequence of individual characteristics or a consequence of individual life circumstances. These are exhibited in the following table.

**Table 2.2: Sources of Occupational Stress.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB RELATED STRESSORS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL - RELATED STRESSORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment specific</td>
<td>Individual Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic conditions,</td>
<td>Work/life conflict, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased levels of</td>
<td>problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition,</td>
<td>Demographic characteristics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market changes,</td>
<td>Coping skills, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development,</td>
<td>Work/life conflict, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in production</td>
<td>problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and products,</td>
<td>Personal problems, Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New forms of</td>
<td>problems, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization &amp; product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive for greater cost-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectiveness, Networks,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinationals,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public concern</td>
<td>Working conditions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the environment,</td>
<td>Physical danger,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>Over or under-promotion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient training, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization specific</td>
<td>Job specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes within</td>
<td>Poor fit between abilities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization,</td>
<td>skills needed to perform job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganizations,</td>
<td>effectively, Work overload,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayering,</td>
<td>Work -pace,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layoffs,</td>
<td>Pressure to work longer hours,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure,</td>
<td>Job characteristics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture /</td>
<td>Conflicting job demands,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate, Mergers,</td>
<td>Unclear job expectations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquisitions and</td>
<td>Pressures of responsibility,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar changes of</td>
<td>Time pressures, Lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company ownership,</td>
<td>resources to perform job,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce diversity,</td>
<td>Lack of information,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward systems,</td>
<td>Lack of collaboration,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion policies,</td>
<td>Relations with subordinates,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security,</td>
<td>Co-workers and superiors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership style,</td>
<td>Working conditions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training needed,</td>
<td>Physical danger,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>Over or under-promotion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient training, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**NOTE:** The table embodies the views expressed in the following publications:

Cooper and Marshall (1976); Burke (1988) in Lu et al. (2003); Chusmir and Franks (1988); Hurrell et al. (1988) in Murphy (1995); Jamal (1990) in Montgomery et al. (1996); McHugh (1993); Dua (1994); Fulcheri et al. (1995); Murphy (1995); Blake et al.(1996); Montgomery et al. (1996); Rees (1997); Schabracq and Cooper (2000); Antoniou et al.(2006).
Researchers on stress make it clear that to enter into the complex area of stress, especially in to the area of occupational stress, is very difficult. Role stress is found to be a multidimensional and complex phenomenon. Otherwise too stress is "a reality like love or electricity - unmistakable in experience but hard to define"- Teasdale and McKeown, (1994). This exhibits the importance for consistent exploration of its antecedents, determinants and consequences. These receive their reinforcement from the literature review. The role of organizational variables in organizational role stress and their resultant impact on the organizational relevant variables need to be explored, analyzed, evaluated and understood.

The term stress has been derived from the Latin word 'stringer' which means to draw tight. The term was used to refer the hardship, strain, adversity or affliction. Defining stress and isolating and discerning factors in the perception and experience of stress has been a very arduous and complex matter. It has been a subject of different analyses and continuous debate among experts. However, beyond this debate, a general consensus can be reached about a definition of stress, which is centered around the idea of a perceived imbalance in the interface between an individual, the environment and other individuals. When people are faced with demands from others or demands from the physical or psycho-social environment to which they feel unable to adequately respond, a reaction of the organism is activated to cope with the situation. The nature of this response depends upon a combination of different elements, including the extent of the demand, the personal characteristics and coping resources of the person, the constraints on the person in trying to cope and the support received from others. Stress is an integral part of natural fabric of life. "Stress is involved in an environmental situation that perceived as presenting demand which threatens to exceed the person’s capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he or she expects a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it"- McGrath, (1976). Stress is the term often used to describe distress, fatigue and feelings of not being able to cope. Stress is defined by Bruno, (1991), as the rate of wear
and tear on an organism. Mason, (2001), (155) defines stress as reactions of the body to negative influences. Mason further explains that his studies show "external stress may be positive or negative". French et al. (1971), (156) define stress as: “the consequence that an individual’s ability or skills fail to coordinate with the job or the job environment cannot satisfy the individual demand”.

"Stress refers both to the circumstances that place physical or psychological demands on an individual and to the emotional reactions experiences in these situations. Some degree of stress is a normal part of life and provides part of the stimulus to learn and grow, without having an adverse effect on health. When stress is intense, continuous or repeated - as is often the case with occupational stress - ill health can result - Hazards, (1994). (157) The experience of stress represents a psychological state. It can result from exposure, or threat of exposure, both to the more tangible workplace hazards and to the psycho-social hazards of work. The experience of stress is one important outcome of exposure to the hazards of work and to hazardous situations. Those hazards of work which are associated with the experience of stress are often termed stressors.

In the past two decades, interest in the concept of stress and research on stress has reached an all-time high - Goldberger and Brenitz (1993). (158) Stress is a condition of strain that has a direct bearing on emotions, thought process and physical conditions of a person. Selye, Hans. (1936), (127) first introduced the concept of stress into the life science in 1936. He defined stress as "The force, pressure, or strain exerted upon a material object or person which resist these forces and attempt to maintain its original state." Researchers on stress make it clear that, to enter in to the complex area of stress, especially in to the area of occupational stress, is very difficult. Stress is an unavoidable consequence of modern living. "Notwithstanding the apparent significance of stress in contemporary society, many regard it as one of the most imprecisely defined concepts in the scientific dictionary" - Ivancevich and Matteson, (1980). (138)

Stress has been on a rise in this era of high technology speed global competition and consumerism. Taking its toll on the physical and psychological health of the
employees, it is affecting the productivity and functioning of an organization. Researchers have demonstrated the direct and indirect costs of stress - Matteson and Ivancevich, (1987). Due to its cost, the critical importance of a stress-free work life for an organization for creating and sustaining competitive advantage cannot be underestimated and it comes with the realization that employees are susceptible to high levels of stress.

Steers, (1981), indicate that, "Occupational stress has become an important topic for study of organisational behaviour for several reasons." He further adds that, 1. Stress has harmful psychological and physiological effects on employees, 2. Stress is a major cause of employee turnover and absenteeism, 3. Stress experienced by one employee can affect the safety of other employees, 4. By controlling dysfunctional stress, individual and organisation can be managed more effectively.

MacLean (1985), argue “the word (stress) is sometimes used to denote stressful events, sometimes to denote the effect of these events on work performance, and sometimes to denote an individual’s reaction in terms of disordered health.” This confusion permeates much of the literature.

Not only is there “disagreement about the meaning of the term there is disagreement about how it should be measured.” These issues about the fundamental nature of stress preoccupied many researchers during the seventies and eighties as they tried to determine whether stress was a ”characteristic of the environment, an experience felt by the person, or a transactional phenomenon created by the process of the person interacting with the environment” - Schuler and Jackson, (1986).

Qualitative changes in the job create adjustment problem among employees. The interpersonal relationships within the department and between the departments create qualitative difficulties within the organisation to a great extent, Brook (1973). If executives cannot cope with the increased responsibilities it may lead to several physical and psychological disorders among them.
Miles & Perreault (1976), identified four different types of role conflicts viz., 1. Intra-sender role conflict, 2. Inter sender role conflict 3. Person-role conflict; 4. Role overload.

Katz and Kahn, (1978), and, Whetten, (1978), found," the use of role concepts suggests that occupational stress (job related stress) is associated with individual, interpersonal, and structural variables.

Brief and Aldag, (1976) and Greene (1978) revealed that: "There is evidence that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity also respond to their situation with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, a sense of futility or lower self-esteem, lower levels of job involvement and organisational commitment, and perceptions of lower performance on the part of the organisation, of supervisors, and of themselves."

Beehr & Newman (1978), define occupational stress as: "A condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterised by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning."

Workplace interpersonal conflicts and negative interpersonal relations are prevalent sources of stress - Dewe, (1993), Lang, (1984), Long et al., (1992), and are existed with negative mood depression, and symptoms of ill health Israel et al., (1989), Karasek, Gardell and Lindell, 1987). According to Caplan et al., "Lack of participation in the decision making process, lack of effective consultation and communication, unjustified restrictions on behaviour, office politics and no sense of belonging are identified as potential sources of stressors. Lack of participation in work activity is associated with negative psychological mood and behavioural responses, including escapist drinking and heavy smoking."

According to French and Caplan (1975), "Pressure of both qualitative and quantitative overload can result in the need to work excessive hours, which is an additional source of stress." Having to work under time pressure in order to meet deadlines is an independent source of stress. Studies show that stress levels increase as difficult deadlines draw near. More often, Stress is developed when
an individual employee is assigned a key responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power.

Stress is often developed when an individual is assigned a major responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power. Interpersonal factors such as group cohesiveness, functional dependence, communication frequency, relative authority and organisational distance between the role sender and the focal persons are important topics in organisational behaviour (Van Sell, Brief, and Schuler, 1981). (175)

Stress develops when an individual feels he is not competent to undertake the role assigned to him effectively. The individual feels that he lacks knowledge, skill and training on performing the role. "Occupational stress is an increasingly important occupational health problem and a significant cause of economic loss. Occupational stress may produce both overt-psychological and physiological disabilities. However it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect personal well-being and productivity" - Quick, Murphy, Hurrel and Orman, (1992). (176)

A job stressed individual is likely to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increased frequency of drinking and smoking, increase in negative psychological symptoms and reduced aspirations and self-esteem - Jick and Payne, (1980). (177)

Psychological stress, according to Lazarus (1999), (178) cannot be solely confined in the environment itself or just as the result of personality characteristics. He acknowledges that it is dependent on a particular kind of person-environment relationship and therefore the struggle to adapt to life may be termed stress. Other words that have been used in the past as a substitute for stress are: conflict, frustration, trauma, anomie, alienation, anxiety, depression, conditions in his/her management styles.

Cox and Griffiths (1995), (179) propose a “unifying concept of the stress process” which would allow these (stress) factors to be understood in their
context, both temporally and as they inter-relate systemically, “beginning with ... antecedent factors and ... the cognitive perceptual process which gives rise to the emotional experience of stress” and then considering “the correlates of that experience.”

The harmful and costly consequences of stress demonstrate the need for strategies to limit stressors within the organization as well as to deal with stress that already occurred, - Comish and Swindle, (1994). (180)

2.3.1 Sources and Dimensions of Organizational Role Stress

Cooper and Marshall, J. (1976), (181) explain that occupational stress means environmental factors or stressors such as work-overload, role-conflict, role-ambiguity, and poor working conditions associated with a particular job. So, role-stress is a psychological strain exerted on the focal person due to role-pressure.

Selye, Hans (1956), (44) defines stress in terms of the response, the body makes, to any demand on it. There is 'good stress' (eustress) - associated with feelings of joy, fulfillment, achievement - and 'bad stress' (distress), which is prolonged or too-frequent stress. It is not possible (without a frontal lobotomy) to live without stress. Originally the term came from physics: the application of sufficient force to an object to distort it. So stress comes from 'outside' the organism, causing the body to respond in either 'fight' (when angry) or 'flight' (fear). Stress is the transaction that takes place between a person and his environment. The outside event impinges on belief system, the brain interprets what's happening, and tells the body how to respond. Adrenalin is pumped into the bloodstream; blood is diverted from various organs to brain and muscles; pupils dilate (making vision more acute); hands and feet perspire; breathing and heart rate increase, etc. The body is on 'red alert', the alarm response. Mostly one is not subject to physical danger very often, but whenever one is 'driven' by a very tight program, or threatened by a demand or expectation a person doesn't think he can meet, the body reacts in the same way.
In fact, medical experts are now saying that "Type A" people in particular may be suffering a kind of 'adrenalin addiction'. McClelland, D.C. (1985), Professor of Psychology at Harvard, claimed stress addiction is similar to the state of "physiological arousal" (that) some people derive from a dependency on alcohol, caffeine and nicotine. "Some people get a little rush of adrenaline from such things, which is why they may be addicted," he said. "For some people this could be yet another form of self-destructiveness." In other words, stress, and, indeed, the addiction to stress, may offer some individuals a helpful, and not harmful, boost. But for others, stress, or the failure to properly resolve it, can be seriously harmful.

Soujanen and Bessinger (1983), in the book "Management and the Brain" suggest that some professionals are actually 'hooked' on stress. They get a 'high' out of controlling people and making complex decisions.

Dr. Paul J. Rosch, MD, FACP, (1983) President, The American Institute of Stress, Honorary Vice President, International Stress Management Association, Clinical Professor of Medicine and Psychiatry, New York Medical College, posited: "the Type A male (50% of all pastors are Type A, according to Dr. Arch Hart) who is living in the fast lane... has become addicted to his own adrenalin and unconsciously seeks ways to get those little surges. These days more of us will die from a stress-related illness than from infection or old age. The only advantage of living stressfully: you'll get to meet your Lord earlier!" - Rosch, P. J. (1983),

Rosch, Paul J (2008), with respect to job stress as a significant risk factor for heart disease, asks us to consider the following facts:

- Increased job stress as assessed by either the demand/control or effort/reward models is associated with higher rates of heart attacks.
- Stressful life change events, depression, anxiety, Type-A behaviour, and hostility have all been linked to an increased incidence of coronary events and 30% of all heart attacks can be attributed to psychosocial stress.
Dr. Arch Hart (1984), (186) says burnout symptoms may include demoralization (belief you are no longer effective); depersonalization (treating yourself and others in an impersonal way); detachment (withdrawing from responsibilities); distancing (avoidance of social and interpersonal contacts); and defeatism (a feeling of being 'beaten').

Christina Maslach, (1982), (187) who described burnout as 'a state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion marked by physical depletion and chronic fatigue, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, and by development of a negative self-concept and negative attitudes towards work, life and other people', offers the following signs: (1) decreased energy - 'keeping up the speed' becomes increasingly difficult; (2) feeling of failure in vocation; (3) reduced sense of reward in return for pouring so much of self into the job or project; (4) a sense of helplessness and inability to see a way out of problems; and (5) cynicism and negativism about self, others, work and the world generally.

2.3.2 Occupational Stress (Job stress/Work stress)

Stress is defined as an adaptive response, to an external situation that results in physical, psychological and behavioral deviations:

Occupational stress has been explained as the physiological and emotional responses that occur when workers perceive an imbalance between their work demands and their capability and/or resources to meet these demands. Worker's responses to stressors may be positive or negative depending on the type of demands placed on them, the amount of control they have over the situation, the amount of support they receive and the individual response of the person.

Occupational stress is a physical or psychological disorder associated with an occupational environment and manifested in symptoms such as extreme anxiety, tension, cramps, headaches, or digestion problems. It results in decreased performance, absenteeism, turnover and employee misalignment with the organization. Some pressure and challenge at work may be considered necessary
to keep a person motivated. But when pressures on the person are extreme and demands placed on him are beyond his ability to cope, stress is the result.

MIND (1992), (188) conducted a survey of 109 British companies in which 63% of the companies surveyed said they believed that problems at work caused equal or more stress than personal problems. This leads to a definition, of occupational stress. So, Weiman (1977), (189) espoused: “Occupational stress is the sum total of factors experienced in relation to work which affect the psychosocial and physiological homeostasis of the worker. The individual factor is termed a stressor and stress is the individual worker’s reaction to stressors.”

According to Carson and Kuipers (1998), (190) the process of stress can be divided into three levels. In the first level there are stressors that come from external sources, e.g. high job demands, a lack of resources and lack of support from supervisors and colleagues – these are specific occupational stressors. The second level can be seen as variables that act as a buffer against the negative effects of stress on individuals. The third level in the process consists of the outcomes of stress which can be positive or negative.

Colligan, Thomas W., Colligan MSW., and Higgins M. (2006). (28) “Often a stressor can lead the body to have a physiological reaction which can strain a person physically as well as mentally. A variety of factors contribute to workplace stress such as negative workload, isolation, extensive hours worked, toxic work environments, lack of autonomy, difficult relationships among co-workers and management, management bullying, harassment and lack of opportunities or motivation to advancement in one’s skill level”. These authors further add that: "There are a total of five categories associated with occupational stress:

- Factors unique to the job
- Role in the organization
- Career development
- Interpersonal work relationships
- Organizational Structure/climate."
These individual categories demonstrate that stress can occur specifically when a conflict arises from the job demands of the employee and the employee itself. If not handled properly, the stress can become distress. The first category concerns with the ability of the employee coping with the specific hours worked, the level of productive rate expected, the physical environment, as well as the expectancy of the work desired by management. The second category, role in the organization, is associated with the hierarchical ranking of that particular employee within the organization. Upper management is entitled to oversee the overall functioning of the organization. This causes potential distress as the employee must be able to perform simultaneous tasks. With the third category, career development, other factors come into play. Security of their occupation, promotion levels, etc. are all sources of stress, as this business market in terms of technology of economic dominance is ever-changing. The fourth category of workplace stress pertains to the interpersonal relationships within the workplace. The workplace is a communication and interaction based industry. These relationships (either developed or developing) can be problematic or positive. Common stressors include harassment, discrimination, biased opinions, hearsay, and other derogatory remarks. Finally, the last category of workplace stress is the organizational climate or structure. The overall communication, management style, and participation among groups of employees are variables to be considered. In essence, the resultant influence of the high participation rate, collaborative planning, and equally dispersed responsibilities provides a positive effect on stress reduction, improved work performance, job satisfaction, and decreased psychosomatic disorders.”

French, Caplan and Van Harrison (1982),(191) enhance this definition by pointing out that the term ‘occupation’ is “really a surrogate for a variety of characteristics of the job and of the person,” reinforcing the concept that stress is a multivariate phenomenon as well as being a term which is applied in a variety of different ways.
Luthans (1995), (192) Stress is not simply anxiety but usually accompanied by anxiety. Stress is not always harmful or dangerous. Sometimes, mild stress stimulates performance. Since there are individual difference in adaptation, mild stress to one, may be major stress to another major stress to other. As a result, “Stress” has individual, organizational, social and environmental dimensions.

Job or work, is an important part of life and also one of the major causes of stress. Various organizational related variables have been found to be the reason behind the workplace stress. Cooper and Marshall (1978), (193) suggested classification of stress in terms of six different stressors.

Caplan (1985), (194) reported the factors like supervisory climate, co-workers, and time pressures, pressures for conformity which affect the mental and physical health of employees. Low control over the work environment, decreased participation in decision making about conditions of work, unpredictability of events, both too little and too much complexity in work, role ambiguity, and excessive workload, responsibility for persons, role conflict, and lack of social support are found to affect the well-being of employees at the work place. With more exposure to these factors over a period of time, employees face more emotional and physiological trauma.

Abdel-Halim (1978), (195) examined the relative importance of role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload as source of stress and dissatisfaction among managerial level employees. The results showed that role ambiguity has the strongest relationship with role responses.

On the similar lines, Quah and Campbell (1994), (196) studied role conflict and role ambiguity as factors in work stress among managers in Singapore and indicated that role conflict and role ambiguity are positively and significantly related to work stress among managers and work stress is negatively and significantly related to job satisfaction.

Aziz (2003), (197) investigated the phenomenon of role stress and found resource inadequacy as the most compelling stressor among employees of information
technology industry. According to Ahmady et al. (2007), the most role-related stressors and forms of conflict among faculty members of Iranian medical schools include too many tasks and everyday work load; conflicting demands from colleagues and superiors; incompatible demands from their different.

Williams, (1994), commented "stress" as "one of the most inaccurate words in the scientific literature ...because it is used to describe both the sources and the effects of the stress process." MacLean, (1985), said that "disagreement about the meaning of the term" stress lies and naturally in this condition of vagueness there will arise "disagreement about how it should be measured."

Many researchers during the seventies and eighties tried to determine whether stress was a "characteristic of the environment, an experience felt by the person, or a transactional phenomenon created by the process of the person interacting with the environment," Schulter and Jackson, (1986).

(A) Stress initially was recognized a wide field for enquiry

Earlier literature shows that Lazarus (1971), had observed that stress referred to broad class of problems such as: “any demands which tax the system, whatever it is, a physiological system, a social system or a psychological system, and the response of that system.”

Stress clearly was then recognized as a wide field for enquiry, to the extent that many researchers in the field even “concluded that the concept of stress is no longer useful as a scientific construct” - Schulter and Jackson, (1986).

Kasl (1987), also supported the view point and observed: "It has been impossible to identify and agree upon a criterion, or more appropriately a set of criteria, for identifying the presence of a state of stress and then calibrating its intensity and duration.” If it was found difficult to determine stress, then in this scenario how can one attempt to measure it.

(B) Development of consensus on the meaning of stress
Around 1980 there started emerging polarization of views about the ambit of stress and development of a greater consensus on its meaning. Job stress is generally defined as the person-environment misfit. When there is misfit of an individual’s skills and abilities or needs in the environment, it threatens the individual’s "well-being". Strain and tension occur and stress is the natural result - *French, Rogers, and Cobb, (1974).*

*Cobb et al., (1975),* believed that, "The responsibility load creates severe stress among workers and managers. If an individual manager or employee cannot cope with the increased level of responsibilities, it may lead to them, several psychological and physical disorders."

*McGrath (1976),* suggested six sources of stress: (a) Task-based stress; (b) Role-based stress; (c) Stress intrinsic to the behavior setting; (d) Stress arising from the physical environment itself; (e) Stress arising from the social environment in the sense of interpersonal disagreement; and (f) Stress within the person-system which the focal person "brings with him" to the situation.

*Cooper and Marshall (1976),* proposed seven sources of managerial stress: (a) Intrinsic job; (b) Career development; (c) Role in the organization; (d) Organizational structure and climate; (e) Relationships within the organization; (f) Extra organizational sources: Company vs. family demand, company vs. own interest etc.; and (g) The individual himself. ...They also found that occupational stress is negative environmental factors associated with the job.

Research on job stress has long emphasized the importance of recognizing the performance implications of stress causative decision. The interpersonal relationships inside and among the departments, create qualitative difficulties inside the workplace to a large extent. *Miles and Perreault, (1976),* have identified four different types of role conflict:

1) Inter sender role conflict,
2) Intra-sender role conflict,
3) Role overload, and
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4) Person- role conflicts.

**Kahn et al. (1964),** (199) Role ambiguity exists when an individual has inadequate information about his work role, that is, where there is lack of clarity about the work objectives associated with the role, about work colleagues’ expectation of the work role and about the scope and responsibilities of the job.

**Ivancevich and Matteson (1980).** (138) signify that, “Lack of group cohesiveness may explain various behavioural and physiological outcomes in an employ desiring such sticks (bonding) together”. Negative interpersonal relations and workplace interpersonal conflicts are prevalent sources of stress and are existed with symptoms of ill health and negative mood depressions. Lack of effective consultation, lack of participation in the decision making process and communication, unjustified restrictions on behaviour, no sense of belonging and office politics are identified as potential sources of stressors. Lack of participation in work activity is associated with negative behavioural responses and psychological mood, including escapist drinking and heavy smoking.

A stress arises when an individual feels he is not competent enough to undertake the role assigned to him effectively and efficiently. The person feels that he lacks skill, knowledge and training on performing the role. A job stressed person is probably to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increase in negative psychological symptoms, increased frequency of drinking and smoking and reduced aspirations and self-esteem - Jick and Payne, (1980). (177)

Work related stress (produced by such factors as role ambiguity, role overload and career frustration) can produce such strain symptoms as irritability, fatigue, preoccupation, depression, and anxiety - Brief, Schuler & Van Sell, (1981). (203)

More often, Stress is developed when an individual employee is assigned a key responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power. Interpersonal factors such as group functional dependence, cohesiveness, communication frequency, relative authority and organisational distance between the focal
persons and the role sender are important topics in organisational behavior - *Vansell, Brief, and Schuler, (1981).* (204)

Negative interpersonal relations and workplace interpersonal conflicts are prevalent sources of stress *Dewe, (1993),* (168) and are existed with symptoms of ill health and negative mood depressions, - *Israel et al., (1989),* (171) *Karasek, Gardell and Lindell, (1987).* (172)

*Cox, T., and Cox, S. (1993),* (205) draw attention to the importance for general health which is a state of balance between needs and demands. For the concept of needs and demands he relied on the definition of WHO (1986) of "well-being" as: “a dynamic state of mind characterized by reasonable harmony between a person’s abilities, needs and expectations, and environmental demands and opportunities.”

To assess this concept of “dynamic state of mind” however, presents great methodological difficulties. *Levi (1992),* (206) accepted that “the individual’s subjective assessment is the only valid measure of well-being available.”

*Cox and Griffiths (1995),* (179) have subscribed to this belief and argued that: “the measurement of the stress state should be based primarily on self-report measures, which focus on the appraisal process and on the emotional experience of stress.”

Occupational stress is increasingly a significant source of economic loss and an important occupational health problem. Occupational stress may produce both physiologic and overt psychological disabilities. Nevertheless it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect productivity and personal well-being of an employee - *Quick, Murphy, Hurrel and Orman, (1992).* (172)

**(C) Role Stress: Sources**

Job stress (and more generally, employee health) has been a relatively neglected area of research among industrial/ organizational psychologists. The empirical research that has been done is reviewed within the context of six facets *(i.e.,*
environmental, personal, process, human consequences, organizational consequences, and time) of a seven facet conceptualization of the job stress - employee health research domain. (The seventh facet, adaptive responses, is reviewed in the forthcoming second article of this series.) A general and a sequential model are proposed for tying the facets together. It is concluded that some of the major problems of the research in this area are: confusion in the use of terminology regarding the elements of job stress, relatively weak methodology within specific studies, the lack of systematic approaches in the research, the lack of interdisciplinary approaches, and the lack of attention to many elements of the specific facets.

Ortqvist, Daniel and Wincent, Joakim (2006), conducted a meta study titled "Prominent consequences of role stress: A meta-analytic review". They conclude that: "Role stress has received a lot of research attention in psychological, sociological, and organizational studies over the last several decades. Based on a literature review of about 300 journal articles, this article examined prominent consequences of role stress. Specific focus is on researching differences in relationships between facets of role stress (i.e., role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload) and frequently cited consequences using techniques of meta-analysis. Findings indicate that each role stress facet has a different relationship with the eight consequences studied. Role stress research can benefit from looking at each facet individually in addition to role stress generally".

2.3.3 Models of occupational stress (job stress/ work stress)

(a) House 1974 Model:
Much of the stress literature leading up to the early 1970 was evaluated by House (1974), and he contended that it was," ... fragmentary, scattered, and theoretically unintegrated ... (due to the) nebulous status of stress as a concept or theoretical framework" With this in mind, House attempted to synthesise the work of leading stress researchers into a single integrated paradigm that could be
useful in stress research. Thus based on a review of previous literature, he identified five classes of variables necessary for a comprehensive model of stress: (1) objective social conditions conducive to stress (ie., stressors); (2) individual perceptions of stress; (3) individual responses (physiological, affective, and behavioural) to perceived stress; (4) more enduring outcomes of perceived stress and responses thereto; and (5) individual and situational conditioning variables that specify the relationships among the first four sets of factors. Personal characteristics, such as needs, abilities, and values, interact with an individual's perception of their objective environment, to elicit some form of subjective response.

According to the model, stress is most likely to occur in situation. Where the demands made exceed existing abilities or where clear obstacles exist to fulfilling strong needs or values The "coping", represents an attempt to eliminate or reduce stress by changing the objective environment in some .. way. "

House's model differed from previous stress models in two important ways. Firstly, House's model integrated physiological, social, and psychological aspects of the stress concept; and secondly, his model emphasised the importance of individual differences in the determination of stress responses, i.e., responses to stress result from an individual's subjective perception of objective environmental stressors.

(b) P-E fit Model

The 'person-environment fit' (P-E fit) formulation of stress used by Caplan et al. (1975), (209) Van Harrison (1978), (210) and others; has also proven to be a popular research model. This model posits that work-related stress results from a misfit between aspects of an individual's personality and aspects of his/ her working environment. For instance, a misfit between a person's skills and abilities, and the demands and requirements of a person's job could give rise to stress under the P-E fit model. Alternatively, the extent to which the job environment meets the needs of an individual may also determine whether a
stressful situation will eventuate. Although the model is widely used, there are some who suggest that it is a simple reformulation of House's (1974) model, and that it "... does not introduce a new and distinct conceptual entity" - McMichael, (1978).

(c) I & M's Model.
Ivancevich & Matteson (1980), (138) provide one of the more recent attempts at developing an integrative model for organisational stress research. The model in many respects is similar to the model developed earlier by House, 1974. The main difference appears to be the use of detailed classifications within each of the model's components. The researchers argue that these classifications represent "... intuitively and/or empirically attractive divisions" and will therefore facilitate organisational research. For example, physiological and behavioural stress outcomes are distinguished on the grounds that the linkage between physiological outcomes and stress-related disease is relatively well established in the literature, whereas the relationships between a) behavioural and physiological outcomes, and b) behavioural outcomes and various health criteria are less clear. Similarly, extra-organisational stressors are separated from intra-organisational stressors in order to emphasise that factors external to the organisation can have an impact on job-related stress. The non-exhaustive list of example variables provided within each classification is a further feature of I&M's model. For instance, the model indicates that work overload, role stress, career goal discrepancy, and responsibility for people are all examples of intra-organisational variables that have emerged from theoretical or empirical bases as stressors operating at the level of the individual.

(d) Osipow and Spokane (1984) Theoretical Model.
The theoretical model developed by Osipow and Spokane (1984), (212) has attempted to explain the relationship among occupational stress, personal strain, and coping resources. This model is built on the following basic assumptions that:
(a) in the workplace, individuals encounter a number of social role assignments which they are expected to perform upon request, and
(b) subjective perceptions of stress are of greater interest and relevance than objective measures (e.g., blood pressure or cortisol blood levels) of stress.

Osipow and Spokane, related the sources of work environment stress (stressors) to the resultant psychological strain (stress) and coping resources (how stress is managed). Given equal levels of perceived stress, the amount of strain individuals experience is moderated by their use of coping resources.

Although Osipow and Spokane (1984) did not develop an explicit definition for occupational stress, the concept is operationalized in terms of work roles. They proposed that occupational stress consists of six inter-related but distinct dimensions (i.e., work roles): (i) role overload, (ii) role insufficiency, (iii) role ambiguity, (iv) role boundary, (v) responsibility, and (vi) physical environment. The first five stressors stem from social roles while the last is a non-social stressor. Social roles refer to normative patterns of expectation about behaviour.


Role overload is experienced when the personal and workplace job demands exceed the individuals’ resources and capability for completing their work. Role Insufficiency is individuals’ lack of competency to complete job requirements. Role Ambiguity is the lack of clarity regarding priorities, expectations, and evaluation criteria. Lazarus and Folkman explained that role ambiguity is stressful because without clarity, individuals are unable to effectively plan or conduct themselves appropriately. Role Boundary is the presence of role conflict between job demands and devotion in the work setting. Responsibility is accountability for the performance and welfare of others on the job. Finally, Physical Environment refers to conditions that individuals are exposed to at work, such as loud noise or extreme temperatures. Each of these stressors can be discussed in terms of frequency, intensity, and duration, claim Osipow & Spokane. Personal strain, which Lazarus and Folkman (1984), refer to as
stress, is defined as “a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his/her resources and endangering his/her well-being” (p.19). Osipow and Spokane (1984), further, used this conceptual model to develop an instrument to specifically measure occupational stress, personal strain, and coping resources. The Occupational Stress Inventory (OSI) is a 140 item instrument consisting of three scales which measure occupational stress, personal strain, and coping resources in employed adults.

2.3.4 Burnout: A Research Review

Sharma, (2007), claimed "Burnout has been defined as a state of mental, physical and emotional exhaustion, usually resulting from chronic and persistent stress." Maslach, C(1979), argued: "Interestingly, the work on burnout did not begin as such. People were not talking about this issue in the early 1970s (at least not in print), and the term itself had not yet been used in this context. Rather, burnout was a phenomenon that was gradually discovered by people who were originally studying something else. In our case, the "something else" was emotion, growing out of an Interest In how people interpret and understand their own emotional states."

Maslach, C. and Jackson, S.E. (1984) observed that, "Within the last decade, there has been a tremendous surge of interest in the problem of burnout. Although it was virtually unheard of prior to the late 1970s, It suddenly became a very popular topic. Hundreds of articles were written about it, as were numerous books; professional conventions held special sessions on it; and the mass media gave it extensive coverage. The general theme of all these discussions was that: (1) burnout is a problem, and (2) we need to do something about it." These authors therein also "defined burnout as a syndrome of i) emotional exhaustion, ii) depersonalization, and iii) reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people In some capacity. Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and drained by one's contact with other people. Depersonalization
refers to an unfeeling and callous response toward these people, who are usually the recipients of one's service or care. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to a decline in one's feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people. This definition of burnout, which is now being used widely in ongoing research, was not based on a theoretical model but was derived empirically. Several years of earlier exploratory research provided the groundwork for the development of both our conceptual definition and our standardized measure."

The authors have also developed a standardized instrument, "The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)", to assess the different aspects of burnout - Maslach and Jackson (1981), (216) also Maslach C, Jackson S. (1986). (217)

Maslach and her colleague, Michael Leiter, defined the antithesis of burnout as engagement characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy, the opposites of exhaustion, cynicism and inefficacy. - Dokotri J. (2006). (218) Studies on burnout found that, it is related to exhaustion and work over-load factors in various organisations. - Green and Walkey, (1988), (219) also Chermiss, (1980). (104)

Herbert J. Freudenberger and G. Richelson (1980), (220) was one of the first to define and explain the dynamics of burnout among professional persons. He describes burnout as Ira state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, a way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward." They further claim that "whenever the expectation level is dramatically opposed to reality and the person persists in trying to reach that expectation, trouble is on the way."

Stress on the job is costly for employers, reflected in lower productivity, reduced motivation and job skills, and increased and accidents. Employees spend roughly one third of their lives working in an organisational, employee mental health is of particular importance.

Two people exposed to a threatening situation may differ substantially in magnitude and duration of stress responses and also in stress induced health
problems in physical and mental affects. Some of these variations relate to differences in temperament, social resources and the effectiveness of the coping responses that the individual brings to bear on the stressful transaction.

**Maslach & Jackson, (1982),** say that "recent studies suggest that increasing employees' participation in the decision-making process, and thus increasing the amount of control they have, may be an effective way to prevent burnout from occurring." The decision-making processes in organizations have important implications for the amount of role conflict and ambiguity experienced by employees - **Jackson, (1983),** which are, in turn, related to burnout. In particular, role ambiguity leads to emotional exhaustion and feelings of low accomplishment. Role conflict causes emotional exhaustion also, as well as the development of cynical attitudes towards clients - **Schwab and Iwanickl, (1982).**

**Jackson and Schuler (1983),** Based on their review of the literature on organizational behaviour, hypothesized four organizational conditions that are particularly likely to increase the risk of employee burnout: lack of rewards, especially absence of positive feedback; lack of control; lack of clarity; and lack of support.

**Hackman & Oldham (1980),** Jonge, Landeweerd, & Nijhuis (1993), are of the opinion that 'burnout' is simply the condition of a person who has become very physically and emotionally tired after doing a difficult job for a long time. The synonyms of burnout include fatigue, collapse, exhaustion, frazzle, lassitude, prostration, tiredness and weariness, while the antonyms include refreshment, rejuvenation, re-juvenescence and revitalisation. How stress is processed determines how much stress is felt and how close a person is to burnout. An individual can experience stressors but be unable to process the stress well and thus experience burnout. Another person can experience a significant number of stressors, but process each well, and avoid burnout. How close a person is to a state of burnout can be determined through various tests.
Janssen, et al. (1999), and Jonge, Landeweerd, and Nijhuis (1993), have analysed that, "Psychologists viewed stress in three ways: as a stimulus, as a response and as an ongoing interaction between the organism and its environment. We refer to stress as a stimulus when we make statements such as ‘I have a lot of stress in my life right now, I have three examinations next week’, or ‘my car broke down’. When stress is a response that has cognitive, physiological and behavioural components, the person might say ‘I am feeling all stressed out’, ‘I am tensed up’ or ‘I am having trouble concentrating on things’. A combination of stimulus and response conceptualises the person–situation interaction, which explains stress as an ongoing transaction between the organism and the environment."

From this perspective, stress can be defined as a pattern of cognitive appraisal, physiological responses and behavioural tendencies that occurs in response to a perceived imbalance between situational demands and the resources needed to cope with them. Excessive or unbearable stress leads to a situation of burnout.

- **Factors influencing stress and burnout:**

Researchers have identified various causes of stress and burnout which change from job to job and person to person. Griffith et al. (1999), Srivastav and Pareek (2008), identified various organizational role stress factors including inter-role distance, role expectation conflict, role erosion, role overload, role isolation, personal inadequacy, self role distance, role ambiguity and resource inadequacy. Cherniss (1980), identifies burnout as a socio-psychological phenomenon, a state of withdrawal from work or a state of decreased motivation due to excessive stress.

The term ‘burnout’ was first coined by Freudenberger (1994), who defined it as ‘the signs and symptoms characterised by loss of energy and feelings of life being broken into pieces’, presumably based on the 1960 novel "A Burnt-Out Case by Graham Greene", which describes a protagonist suffering.
Burnout has been described as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion marked by physical depletion and chronic fatigue, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, and by development of a negative self-concept and negative attitude toward work, life, and other people. Dr. Archibald Hart (1984) shares the following differences between burnout and stress:

**Table 2.3: Differences between Burnout & Stress - Dr. Arch Hart.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th>BURNOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress is characterized by over engagement.</td>
<td>Burnout is a defense characterized by disengagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Stress the emotions become over-reactive.</td>
<td>In Burnout the emotions become blunted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Stress the physical damage is primary.</td>
<td>In Burnout the emotional damage is primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exhaustion of Stress affects physical energy</td>
<td>The exhaustion of Burnout affects motivation and drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress produces disintegration.</td>
<td>Burnout produces demoralization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress can best be understood as a loss of fuel and energy.</td>
<td>Burnout can best be understood as a loss of ideals and hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The depression of Stress is produced by the body's need to protect itself and conserve energy.</td>
<td>The depression of Burnout is caused by the grief engendered by the loss of ideals and hope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress produces a sense of urgency and hyperactivity.</td>
<td>Burnout produces a sense of helplessness and hopelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress produces panic, phobic, and anxiety-type disorders</td>
<td>Burnout produces paranoia, depersonalization and detachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress may kill you prematurely, and you won't have enough time to finish what you started.</td>
<td>Burnout may never kill you but your long life may not seem worth living.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The American Institute of Stress (2012) propounded that "there are numerous emotional and physical disorders that have been linked to stress including depression, anxiety, heart attacks, stroke, hypertension, immune system disturbances that increase susceptibility to infections, a host of viral linked disorders ranging from the common cold and herpes to AIDS and certain cancers, as well as autoimmune diseases like rheumatoid arthritis and multiple
sclerosis. In addition stress can have direct effects on the skin (rashes, hives, atopic dermatitis, the gastrointestinal system (GERD, peptic ulcer, irritable bowel syndrome, ulcerative colitis) and can contribute to insomnia and degenerative neurological disorders like Parkinson’s disease. In fact, it’s hard to think of any disease in which stress cannot play an aggravating role or any part of the body that is not affected (see stress effects on the body stress diagram) or. This list will undoubtedly grow as the extensive ramifications of stress are increasingly being appreciated. The institute has isolated (following) fifty common signs and symptoms of stress:

Social withdrawal and isolation, 46. Constant tiredness, weakness, fatigue, 47. Frequent use of over-the-counter drugs, 48. Weight gain or loss without diet, 49. Increased smoking, alcohol or drug use, 50. Excessive gambling or impulse buying.

Steber, (1998), (232) argued that optimum stress is essential for performing well in one’s job. But once stress exceeds a certain limit it can cause burnout and detrimentally affect work performance. People can feel “crushed” by the need to make a life changing decision. They can feel “smashed” by a disaster, or “stretched” to the brink of "splitting."

Muthu and Prabhu (2007), (233) in their study: "Work Place Stress: Problems and Prospects" states that Equity theory addresses a worker's perception of fairness, including the sense that work is being assigned equally among all workers. Feeling of inequity lead to discontent that often causes stress. High stress coupled with a sense of job meaninglessness can lead to burn-out. Although burn-out is difficult to measure, it is usually accompanied by well-defined symptoms such as a high turnover rate which can be measured. Stress in the workplace need to be managed. Stress management programmes often include music, physical exercises, and various relaxation techniques. They can also include meditation and biofeedback techniques. In conclusion, building general awareness about occupational stress is the first step in prevention. Securing top management commitment and support for the program will only lend to more positive results. Reduction in occupational stress is a worthwhile time investment for managers and supervisors, as it will only stand to improve productivity, morale, and overall organizational climate.

- Conclusions:

  * Burnout is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job. It is defined by the three dimensions of i) exhaustion, ii) cynicism, and iii) inefficacy. The past 25 years of research has established the complexity of the construct, and places the individual stress experience within a larger organizational context of people's relation to their work. Recently, the
work on burnout has expanded internationally and has led to new conceptual models. The focus on engagement, the positive antithesis of burnout, promises to yield new perspectives on interventions to alleviate burnout. The social focus of burnout, and its specific ties to the work domain make a distinct and valuable contribution to people's health and well-being.

2.4 Organizational Role Stress (ORS) Dimensions: Uday Pareek

Role-stress is recently gaining rising research interest in the field of organizational dynamics. Researchers working on the increasing complexity of organizational roles recognized the potential of conflict and stress in these roles. Organizational roles, are found critical in integrating employees with their organizations. Organizational Role Stress (ORS) occurs when one perceives difficulty to integrate the different roles made upon the employee. An organization is a system of roles and its membership is a potential source of stress. There are ten stresses connected with a role (Pareek, 1983). (37); Pareek (1993). (41) These are: 1. Role Ambiguity (RA), 2. Role overload, 3. Role stagnation (RS), 4. Role expectations conflict (REC), 5.Role erosion (RE) 6. Role Isolation (RI), 7. Personal inadequacy (PI), 8. Inter-Role Distance (IRD), 9. Self-role Distance (SRD), 10. Resource inadequacy (RIn).

2.4.1 Role Ambiguity (RA)

It refers to the lack of clarity about the expectations of the role which may arise out of lack of information or understanding. It may exist in relation to activities, responsibilities, personal styles, and norms and may operate at three stages:

1) When the role sender holds his expectations about the role,
2) When he/she sends it, and
3) When the occupant receives those expectations

So, when there is a lack of clarity about the role and the expectations of others from the role, or inadequate feedback on how one’s performance is regarded by others, stress due to Role Ambiguity may happen. Behrman and Perreault
(1984) suggest that when management expectations are vague, when a person has insufficient information to carry out job duties or when uncertainty exists concerning job requirements, Role ambiguity can occur. Four types of roles, according to Kahn and Quinn (1970), are most likely to experience ambiguity (a) New Roles in the organization, (b) Roles in expanding or contracting organizations, (c) Roles in organizations subjected to repeated changes, (d) process related roles. In such situations, people may experience stress because they are uncertain about how their performance is being evaluated and whether they are doing the right things.

Kahn (1973) also differentiated between present role ambiguity and future-prospect ambiguity. Kahn et al. (1964) found, "people suffering from role ambiguity may also experience high job related tension, low job satisfaction, low self-confidence and a sense of futility." Dougherty and Pritchard (1985), define role-ambiguity as “uncertainty about the products to produce or their importance for the role and one’s evaluation.” Other role researchers have similar views of role ambiguity and have defined it as the lack of clear information about job responsibilities and expectations, which are required by the role incumbent for adequate performance of a role - Kahn, et al. (1964)


Kahn, et al. (1964) argue that role stressors emerge from the social environment created by organizations. They view organizations as networks of interrelated roles with role senders coming from various places within the organization. Top management, immediate supervisors, co-workers, and team members may all serve the role sending function for a given role incumbent (Kahn, et al., 1964). Peterson, et al. (1995) expand the definition of role ambiguity to include uncertainty about what actions to take to fulfill a role. The role ambiguity construct is relatively a much-studied component of role theory.

Ritzer (1996) maintains that society is continually moving toward greater proliferation of roles and the institutionalization of roles. Katz and Kahn
(1978), (164) describe the role as “the building block of social systems and the summation of the requirements with which such systems confront their members as individuals.” They further argue that a shift in role senders, which occurs when an organization changes strategy or structure, is equivalent to a change in role identity, which one may guess impacts perceptions of role ambiguity. Faced with changing roles, new and varied job responsibilities, and technological advances, a worker or role incumbent finds himself or herself in ambiguous situations. Poorly written or detailed job descriptions, unclear assignments, and mixed messages from superiors can all impact perceptions of role ambiguity - Huber, (1981). (241)

Bushe, Havlovic, and Coetzer. (1996), (242) advise: for ensuring that clear boundaries between people and roles exist. They state, “as organizations de-structure to allow for greater initiative and innovation by employees and less reliance on rules and procedures, boundaries become fuzzy, and uncertainty increases and so does free-floating anxiety (anxiety that cannot be easily attributable to any one cause).”

Hirschhorn and Gilmore (1992), (243) identified three key boundary areas necessary for people to be able to work together without being overwhelmed by ambiguity. The boundaries include:

1) Authority boundaries -- Who is in charge?
2) Task boundaries -- Who is supposed to do what?
3) Political boundaries -- Who wants what?

Newton and Keenan (1987), (244) share that “a research strategy which deliberately sets out to differentiate between varying forms of role stress may be of particular benefit to our understanding of the relationship between organizational, interpersonal, and personal factors, and stress and strain”

The multidimensional approaches (where the various attributes of the variable have been determined by factor analysis) to the study of role ambiguity began
with Bedeian and Armenakis (1981), (245) and have continued with Sawyer (1992), (246) and Singh., Verbeke., and Rhoads (1996). (247)

Based on their findings, and the foundation provided by the classic works [viz. Kahn, et al. (1964), (22) and Rizzo., House., and Lirtzman, (1970), (248)] there are four widely accepted dimensions to role ambiguity, which may be experienced by the role incumbents and are based on the role incumbents perception. The dimensions include --

1) **Expectation ambiguity** -- What is expected? What should I be doing?

2) **Process ambiguity** -- How do I get things done? How do I achieve organizational objectives?

3) **Priority ambiguity** -- When should things be done and in what order?

4) **Behavior ambiguity** -- How am I expected to act in various situations? What behaviors will lead to the needed or desired outcomes?

Sawyer (1992), (246) has even hypothesized that different types of role ambiguity may have different causes. Singh et.al. (1996), (247) believe that role ambiguity is more amenable to managerial "intervention" and structural accommodation than many other organizational issues. Perrewe and Ganster (1989), (249) claim: In spite of the past research on role stress (including role ambiguity, role conflict, and role overload), our understanding of the relationships among and between role stressors, reactions to role stressors and the possible outcomes remain limited.

### 2.4.1.1 Consequences of Role Ambiguity

Bedeian and Armenakis (1981), (250) have established a causal relationship between role ambiguity and increased tension, frustration, anxiety, and propensity to leave. Lower job satisfaction has also been linked to role ambiguity by Pearson (1991), (251) who found a causal link with a longitudinal study of railroad workers in Australia. Jackson and Schuler (1985), (252) suggested, “There is a need to examine the antecedents & consequences of role ambiguity and role conflict in organizations using causal designs.” (p. 45).
Although most studies have found a relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction, there are a few notable exceptions in the literature, specifically - 


These mixed findings leave some unanswered questions about the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction. Part of this problem may relate to the experimental designs used. It is disappointing to note that with the exceptions highlighted above,

Miles (1975), {257} asserts that co-relational designs are typically employed by researchers making the issue and direction of causality difficult to determine.

Miles and Perreault (1976), {163} identify four different types of role conflict: 1. Intra-sender role conflict 2. Inter sender role conflict. 3. Person- role conflict; 4. Role overload.


“Organizational commitment is an important variable that impacts performance and it has also been shown to be a moderator between role ambiguity and performance”- Jamal (1985). {23} Individuals who are committed to the organization demonstrate a willingness to provide significant efforts on behalf of the organization and accept and support the values and goals of the organization, claim Mowday, Steers, and Porter, (1979). {261}

Schuler (1980), {262} points out many factors including abilities, experience, training, and values may impact a role incumbent’s perceptions of and responses to role stress. The study of roles and role ambiguity are critical for organizations,
especially in light of issues such as diversity, globalization, competitive pressures, and the fragmentation of consumer markets.

Hofstede (1980),\(^{(263)}\) for instance, echoes these same concerns regarding uncertainty in global organizations by describing the rationale for his uncertainty avoidance construct, which he described as "(in)tolerance for ambiguity".

According to Hofstede (1980),\(^{(263)}\) "The concept of uncertainty is often linked to the concept of environment; the "environment" which usually is taken to include everything not under direct control of the organization is a source of uncertainty for which the organization tries to compensate."

### 2.4.1.2 Role Clarity leads Job Satisfaction

When role ambiguity is low, role clarity is high. Managers and workers need role clarity to ensure that they are working on the things that will ultimately make the firm successful. Role incumbents who are experiencing role ambiguity may be working on the wrong things (based on the organization’s mission and objectives) and are probably unaware that they are doing so (Van Sell, et al., (1981).\(^{(260)}\)

Singh and Bhandarker (1983),\(^{(264)}\) take this a step further by stating that “Managerial role clarity is viewed as one of the basic requirements for organizational effectiveness.” They further state “Managers suffering from role ambiguity are invariably observed to be preoccupied with trivial organizational chores.”

Thus, based on the concepts underlying role theory, high levels of ambiguity will likely reduce the satisfaction levels that a role incumbent has with his role, and will increase anxiety, distort reality, and the role incumbent will likely perform less effectively - Rizzo, et al., (1970).\(^{(248)}\)
Role clarity is defined as the subjective feeling of having as much role relevant information as a person would like to have - Lyons, (1971). Clarity of goals and paths has been associated with greater satisfaction with tasks in business and health care settings - House, (1981), Lyons, (1971).

Smith and Brannick, (1990) assert that, "Moving from a state of role ambiguity to a state of role clarity has been described as role clarification." The authors next claim that they, "Even found that participative decision making processes facilitate role clarification through the role incumbent’s ability to communicate about and negotiate the role expectations to be fulfilled.”

Gladstein (1984) indicates that “Rewards, in the form of pay and recognition, had their largest influence on how the group leader behaved and how the group set itself up to work.” (p.514). She even observed that rewards were positively related to goal clarity, role clarity, and performance.

Similar to Lyons ideas, Parasuraman (1981) defines role clarity as the extent to which individuals receive and understand information needed to do their jobs. He explored relationships between specific organizational characteristics and the degree of role clarity present. He found that formal policies were not clearly understood, but that the purchasing employees surveyed had subjectively established their own informal role definitions, which they were much clearer about. He suggests “the actions of purchasing professionals may be guided to a greater extent by their own informal role definitions than by formal policies” (p.4). He further suggests that the firm clearly communicate formal policies in an attempt to ensure that the informal role perceptions are not in conflict with the formal policies. Parasuraman further emphasized that “given the importance of achieving high role clarity….firms should take concrete steps to clarify their roles” (p.6) and that “Role clarity has a strong positive association with job satisfaction” (p.7).

Dougherty & Pritchard (1985) also support the use of specific training programs for role clarity. They maintain, “Subordinates and superiors discuss their perceptions of the relevance of status reports, oral and written
communications, etc., for the performance of the subordinates job.” They further conclude that an examination of disagreements on these items would be useful in reducing ambiguity levels by resolving the disagreements through face-to-face discussions between the supervisor and subordinates or through group discussions for teams.

2.4.2 Role overload

Role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload frequently have been studied as antecedents of occupational stress - Brief and Aldag, (1976), (166) Ivanceyich, Matteson, and Preston, (1982). (269)

Role stressors comprise role overload, role conflict and role ambiguity. Role overload occurs when individuals have to do too much or too complicated work, role conflict refers to situations with conflicting role expectations, and role ambiguity refers to situations with unclear role expectation. There are ample of studies on this successful model.

Jackson and Schuler (1985), (252) and Tubbs and Collins (2000), (270) meta-analyzed findings from these studies and showed clear relationships between role stressors and impaired well-being.

When people face multiple obligations, role demands, or duties requiring them to do more than possible in the time available (Tyagi, 1985), (271) they are likely to feel stress due to Role overload.

Marshall and Cooper (1979), (272) also differentiate between quantitative overload which is about too much to do and qualitative overload which is about difficulty of the tasks and the accountability of the role.

Kahn and Quinn (1970), (273) suggested that role overload may happen in conditions when there is 1) absence of role integration 2) when large variations exist in the expected output 3) absence of role power and 4) when duties cannot be delegated.
2.4.3 Role stagnation (RS)

Due to limited or no career growth prospects, stress due to Role stagnation sets in. It may happen at any point of time in life. Generally when people feel that they are not doing anything new or different, such stress may occur. Many middle aged, middle management executives suffer from fear and disappointment of becoming obsolete. - Constandse (1972), (274)

Vijayashree and Mund (2011), (275) suggest that with age, job opportunities become fewer in number and new jobs require new skills. This may create a sense of helplessness of being stuck at a role because of lack of options.

2.4.4 Role expectations conflict (REC)

Conflicting expectations or demands by the different role senders can create Role Expectations Conflict stress. For every role, there are significant others who have expectations from the role. These expectations from multiple role partners at the same time can be incompatible and the person can experience Role Expectation conflict.

All individuals according to Netemeyer, Johnston and Burton (1990), (276) confront conflict or ambiguity with respect to his/her job which is compounded by the different expectations.

2.4.5 Role erosion (RE)

When people feel that some of the important functions that should be part of their role are being done by others, they may feel stressed due to Role Erosion. Such a situation may also be threatening to the role holder who thinks that he should be doing this work to justify his position or authority. Role erosion generally happens when there is restructuring happening in an organization and new roles being created. This can also lead to the feeling of being underutilized for some people. Beukel and Molleman (2002), (277) suggest that people do not enjoy feeling underutilized.

2.4.6 Role Isolation (RI)
Role isolation has been defined as the stress resulting from the situation when the role occupant feels physically or psychologically isolated due to lack of communication with others in the organization, due to location, hierarchy, process, organizational climate etc. S/he feels a lack of support from the others performing roles vitally linked with his/her role.

Vijayashree and Mund (2011), (275) state that the key measure of perceived role distance is ease and frequency of interaction. Role distance is considered to be low when relationships are strong, and vice versa. French and Caplan (1972), (278) and Kahn et al. (1964), (19) also suggested that mistrust of co-workers is positively related to low job satisfaction and high role ambiguity.

2.4.7 Personal inadequacy (PI)

The person (role occupant) experiencing stress due to Personal Inadequacy feels deficient in the required skills, knowledge or preparation to perform his role (work) effectively. It may arise due to change in technology, products, markets or even new positions and roles. McMurray (1973), (279) discusses that a manager who has received too many quick promotions may also overwork to keep the job and hide the feeling of personal inadequacy.

2.4.8 Inter-Role Distance (IRD)

It is experienced when there is a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles. For example, the role of an executive versus the role of a husband/wife.

2.4.9 Self-role Distance (SRD)

When the role a person occupies goes against his/her self-concept, then he/she feels self-role distance type of stress. This is essentially a conflict arising out of mismatch between the person and his/her job. When a role occupant does not identify with the occupied role or feels underutilized or ill-utilized, s/he suffers from Self Role Distance.

Self Role Distance according to Sharma (2007), (213) is stress when a person’s
self-concept and his/her role do not match. In her study on the determinants of burnout among Indian executives, she suggests that executives suffering from burnout have strong feeling of inadequacy. The study concludes that there are five predictors of ‘inadequacy’ viz., role expectation conflict, stress personality inter-role distance, self-role distance and role stagnation. When a person does not want to be involved in a certain job but has to, either due to the norm or because of the role or demand of the situation, or even because of no choice, s/he may experience stress due to an inner conflict between the given role as perceived by the role occupant and self.

2.4.10 Resource inadequacy (RIn)

When a role occupant feels that he is not having adequate necessary resources to fulfill his job demands, he may feel stress due to resource inadequacy. The inadequacy may relate to shortage of supplies, manpower, information, infrastructures or even money.

2.5 Role Stress & Performance linkage: A research perspective

Do the various role-stressors impact performance? If yes, how and in what way? These are some of the dominant research questions in the role-stress research. The failure to link "role stressors with performance" in the literature is highlighted by Motowidlo, et al. (1986), (280) who state: “We know relatively little, however, about the relation of stress to job performance.” It would be beneficial, then, to evaluate the impacts of role stressors on work group performance. Role ambiguity may well be an organizational phenomenon that lends itself to managerial intervention - Singh and Rhoads, (1991). (281) These interventions may lead to enhance individual and organizational performance at little or no cost to the firm.

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983), (282) reported positive correlations between job satisfaction and pro-social organizational behaviours such as helping,
volunteering, cooperating, listening, and showing consideration for the needs and feelings of others.

“If organizational growth and development are desired, the influence of role-stress producing conditions are to be minimized in much the same way as a plant is expected to grow and flourish by the weeding out of what is not required around. Due to several constraints in an organization, total elimination of unwanted condition is not possible. Nevertheless, in the process of redesigning the roles and networking conditions and linkages, creative growth of the roles and role occupants can be explored.” Sayeed, O.B. and Pareek, U. (2000),\(^{(102)}\)

Work attitude in general can be construed as perception of employees towards work as well as the organization itself that can be greatly influenced by Organizational Commitment (OC), Emotional Intelligence, and Interpersonal trust in the work environment - Cook and Wall, (1980).\(^{(283)}\) While, Organizational Commitment (OC) is the positive side of the work attitude, negative work place attitude may result in stress. Thus, stress in performance of organizational roles, Organizational Role Stress (ORS), can be directly interrelated with employee commitment and job satisfaction - Erdogan and Bauer, (2010).\(^{(284)}\)

### 2.6. Key National and International Studies on Role Stresses: An Exploration

This section analyses an important bunch of 60 case studies to showcase the nature, dimensions and impacts of organizational role stress (ORS), and to find its impact variations on public/private, business organizations. Public sector organizations are those which are government owned and operated. Such organizations focus primarily on the administration of essential services and the control and maintenance of a country’s social and economic conditions. In contrast, private sector organizations are considered either profit-making enterprises or community service groups that operate independently of the
government - **Macklin, Smith, and Dollard, (2006).**

Research on role stress/job stress has long emphasized the importance of recognizing the performance implications of decision under stress. Job stress has fuelled a significant, multifaceted literature.

- **KEY NATIONAL STUDIES.**

Recent and prominent studies reported on Organizational Role Stress and its management in Indian context/banking sector include:

1. **Bano and Jha (2012),** reported that employees irrespective of belonging to public or private sector experience moderate level of stress with role erosion being a major influencing factor while resource inadequacy contributes the least.

2. **Rajib Lochan and Manju Bhagat (2008),** surveyed the causes of occupational stress amongst the software professionals. They studied the ways adopted by them to cope up with the occupational stress, and their "intention to leave the employment". The sample comprised of 26 software professionals working in three different software companies and having their office in Pune (India). The sample included full time working professionals, with varying demographic details. Company A, B, and C had a strength of around 100, 500, and 1000 employees respectively. In all the three organisations, informants were dispersed throughout the organisational hierarchy and were selected via randomised quota sampling. Qualitative methods were used to collect the data which included four focused group discussions and 26 in-depth interviews. The study tried to draw attention of the sample group to work related issues of the software professionals and its impact on them. Burnout amongst the professionals was noted to be the real issue and was found common amongst all the professionals. This was the major cause that often made them think to change their careers completely and get away from it. The intention to leave the organisation came into their mind in search of the solution i.e. to look elsewhere for a new job.

[128]
3. Kumar (2006), (288) while making an attempt to investigate and compare the level of stress experienced by the employees of nationalised and non-nationalised banks reported existence of significant differences between them.

4. Lehal and Singh (2005), (289) A comparative study by Lehal and Singh (2005) between the ORS experienced by teaching faculty belonging to Public and Private institutions of higher learning India observes decreased level of stress in public sector.

5. Leemamol Mathew (2005) (290), of the University of Calicut found in – An Exploratory Study on - Occupational Stress and Coping Strategies of Special Educatorsl (those who teach the disabled) in South India as the sources of stress as (i) school structure and climate, (ii) home work interface, (iii) relationship with other people, (iv) intrinsic job factors. The common effect of stress on special educators was found to be health related problems – both physical and mental – and job dissatisfaction. There was no organized method to redress the problem rising from occupational stress. As a result, the most commonly used coping strategies were social support, task strategies, and home/school relationship. The sources of stress as repeatedly reported were that of a low salary – due to the subcontracting by the Government to NGO’s, job insecurity, work overload, and high teacher – student ratio.

6. Abdulla (2004), (291) found that organizational role stress and organizational climate have shown, the effect of personal and organizational factors on stress and its impact on efficacy at work. He further observed more satisfied are the bank employees in the organisation more active approach they use towards problem resolution.

7. Mohsin Aziz, (2004), (292) Organizational stress originates in organizational demands that are experienced by the individual. Stress is built up in the concept of role which is conceived as the position a person occupies in a system. This paper investigates the intensity of organizational role stress among women informational technology professionals in the Indian private sector.
Organizational role stress scale is used on a sample of 264 to explore the level of role stress. Resource inadequacy has emerged as the most potent role stressor, followed by role overload and personal inadequacy. The research finds differences in the level of stress between married and unmarried employees on several role stressors. However, level of education does not emerge as a significant differentiator of stressors.

8. Kaur (2003),[^293] identified role erosion, role overload, role isolation and personal inadequacy responsible for occupational role stress in her study of managers working in different branches of Punjab State Cooperative Bank Ltd.

9. Mahajan Sadhana (2002),[^294] in her study - Organizational Stress on the Employees in clerical cadre at the offices of life insurance corporation of India situated in Shimla division of HP, while measuring the Organizational Role Stress concludes that the age, gender and the different types of role has a significant effect on the stress levels of the employees or The results show higher role stress in male employees than female employees.

10. Nirmala (2002),[^295] attempted to identify main sources of occupational stress and the relationship between various sources of occupational stress and job performance. The respondents were 175 cashiers-cum-clerks of nationalized banks of Haryana. The findings show significant negative co relation between the major sources of occupational stress and job performance. The relationship of other occupational variables was also in expected directions, though not significant.

11. Dr. Shayam L. Kaushal (2001),[^296] in his study on the topic of "Organizational Role stress on some officio-Demographic issues in Banks" described that job stress perceived by employees are not so much. However female employees found highly stressed for their dual responsibility at workplace as well as at home. Higher qualified employees felt more stress in comparison to graduate ones, for their increased expectations. Younger employees opine more stress in view of their under utilization of energy, fresh

[^293]: Kaur (2003)
[^294]: Mahajan Sadhana (2002)
[^295]: Nirmala (2002)
[^296]: Dr. Shayam L. Kaushal (2001)
view points, lack of proper inputs and pending promotions and urban background employees perceive strain caused by dual career constraints and nuclear family problems. It is heartening to mention that job stress in the bank is average. However the major stressor identified is role stagnation, role erosion; inter role distances which all are inter-related with each other, one giving way to another. Therefore a need has been felt to examine job stress in general and these stressors in particular. Frequent stress audit will help to identify the stressors and consequently their resolution.

12. Gananraj (2001), (297) in a study of branch Executives of commercial banks observed that environmental factors and individual characteristics i.e. how bank employees/ Executives perceive the stressful situation or stress plays a key role for generation of stress. Moreover, the study depicts that there is inverse relationship between stress and job performance.

13. Pestonjee and Azeem (2001), (298) the present study investigates the relationships between organizational role stress and job burnout among university teachers. The sample consisted of (N=300) university teachers, which has been classified into three groups of 100 each. The results of the study indicate that organizational role stress is highly correlated with job burnout among all the three groups of teachers (Lecturers, Readers and Professors). Lecturers have higher level of role stress as compared to other two counterparts and are found to be significantly different from Readers and professors on demographic variables and their level of role stress and emotional exhaustion. Readers are found to be significantly different on Role Erosion, Role Overload, Self-Role Distance, Resource Inadequacy and Total ORS from the Professors but not found to be significantly different on the level of job burnout. Professors are found to have least amount of the level of stress and burnout as compared to Readers and Lecturers. Stepwise multiple regression analysis suggested that Total ORS, Role Erosion, Role Overload, Resource Inadequacy, Role Isolation, and Role Ambiguity are common significant predictors of job burnout among all these three groups.
14. Pandey (1997), (299) conducted a study to determine the relationship between personal demographics and organisational role stress. The study was conducted on 61 personnel of Indian Railways (aged 28-58 years). Role stresses were measured by administering the Organisational Role Stress Scale (Pareek, 1983). The analysis revealed a positive but non-significant relationship of age with all the dimensions of role-stress except role-ambiguity. Similarly, education showed positive but non-significant correlation with all the 10-positive dimensions of role-stress. Experience was reported to be positive and significantly associated with inter-role distance, role-expectation conflict, role ambiguity, personal inadequacy, role stagnation, role erosion, and role self-distance.

15. Chand and Sethi (1997), (300) conducted a study to examine the organizational factors as predictors of job related strain among 150 junior officers working in various banking institutions in the state of Himachal Pradesh. Role conflict, strenuous working conditions and role overload were found to be the dearest and most significant predictors of job related strain.

16. Dwivedi (1997), (301) in his research “assesses the magnitude of trust, distrust, and ORS to determine the extent of this relationship among public and private sector organization”. Surveying 55 executives from the public sector and 62 from the private sector, the author finds that stress levels are low in high-performance organizations and high in low-performance organizations.

17. Pattanayak and Mishra (1997), (302) carried out a comparative assessment between old and new public sector organizations in respect to ORS and quality of work life (QWL) as an index of organizational effectiveness. The study addressed ORS scale (Pareek, 1983,c) and quality of work-life scale (Jain, 1991) on 800 respondents including executives and non-executives both. both from old and new public sector organizations. The sample included executives and non-executives both from service and manufacturing units. Significant differences were observed between old and new public sector firms on all the ten dimensions of organizational role stress and total role stress. Similarly significant differences
were found between executives and nonexecutives on all ORS dimensions and total role stress.

18. Satyanarayana (1995),\(^{303}\) dominated contributors to role stress were investigated among 75 Executives and 75 Supervisors of BHEL. The analysis of the data revealed that role erosion (RE), personal inadequacy (Pln), resource inadequacy (RI) and role stagnation (RS) were experienced as dominate contributors of role stress in executives and supervisors. The two groups differed significantly in respect of inter-role distance (IRD), role overload (RO), and personal inadequacy (Pln) and role ambiguity (RA) dimensions.

19. Raju and Madhu (1994),\(^{304}\) examined the influence of organizational level on role stress of 154 lower level, 202 middle level and 101 higher level employees. The higher level employees experienced lesser role conflict and role ambiguity than their middle and lower level counterparts who obtained comparable scores.

20. Ahmad and Khanna (1992),\(^{305}\) investigated the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and job involvement among 50 middle level Hotel managers aged 22-36 years. The analysis of data revealed a significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction irrespective of the subjects sex, marital status, education and experience. Occupational stress was reported to be negatively correlated with job involvement. The high job involvement group was more satisfied with their job than the low job involvement group.

21. Rageshwari (1992),\(^{306}\) argued that strenuous working conditions have been the cause for stress in bank officers. More feasible are the working conditions in banks, least stress is experienced and faced by employees.

22. Mittal, Uma (1992),\(^{307}\) conducted a Ph.D. research study in University of Rajasthan, Jaipur titled: "Coping styles as related to role stress, locus of control and personality type." The sample comprised of 147 doctors, both from private and government hospital settings. The study found: that the major stress
experienced by doctors is role erosion, followed by inter-role-distance. Private doctors experienced more role overload and self-role-distance in comparison to govt. doctors. Male doctors experienced more role erosion and self-role-distance than female doctors. Male private doctors experienced more self-role distance and role ambiguity in comparison to male government doctors. Female private doctors experienced more role-overload. Personality type 'A' was found significantly positively related to total role stress.

23. **Srivastava (1991)**, (308) surveys 300 employees of the Life Insurance Corporation and reports that there is a significant positive correlation between various dimensions of role stress and symptoms of mental ill health. Stress arising from role ambiguity and role stagnation is the most intensively correlated with anxiety.

24. **Chaudhary (1990)**, (309) probes the relationship between role stress and job satisfaction among bank officers. The author's results indicate that role-erosion and resource-inadequacy act as dominant stressors while role-ambiguity and role- expectation conflict are remote contributors to role-stress in the sample population.

25. **Achmamba and Gopikumar (1990)** (310), while studying male and female employees of a bank observed a relationship between stress and job satisfaction. They found that higher the stress experienced by the employees lesser is the job satisfaction among the employees and vice versa.

26. **Jha and Bhardwaj's (1989)**, (311) empirical study of job stress and motivation among 120 frontline managers from both the public and private sector finds that the latter score more than the former in factors such as the need for achievement and total motivation.

27. **Kumar, S. (1989)**, (312) the sample comprised of 252- lower and middle management executives from different functional areas in an oil company. The variables were measured using: ORS Scale by Pareek1983; MAO-R Pareek; and REC, Pareek. Study found that unmarried executives experienced significantly higher total stress as compared to married executives. Executives married to to
working women were observed to experience significantly high total stress in comparison to executives having housewives. They also scored higher on role expectation conflict and role overload. Role stagnation, personal inadequacy and self-role distance were found to be significantly higher among lower level executives.

28. Kedar Nath (1988), (313) while studying climate in banks found that role ambiguity was potent source of stress among Executives. If Executives are not clear about their roles in the organisation or are not provided with required information relevant to them, they feel stressed on the factor.

29. Sharma (1987), (314) focused on the managers and supervisors of public and private pharmaceutical organizations to ascertain the role of a motivated climate on four psychological variables: (i) job satisfaction, (ii) participation, (iii) alienation, and (iv) role stress. The study sample comprises of 150 respondents, including 75 managers, and 75 supervisors. The findings of the study indicated that employees of public sector organizations scored lower than and differed significantly from those of private sector organizations. However, public sector employees scored significantly higher in terms of role stagnation.

30. Gupta, N. K. and Pratap S. (1987), (315) conducted a study to determine the role of service length on organizational role stress amongst 200 executives of BHEL i.e. Bharat Heavy electrical LTD, a public sector undertaking. The sample was divided into three categories on the basis of their length of service: those with less than 5 years of service, with 5 to 10 years of service and with more than 10 years of service. The findings were as follows

- a linear increase was observed in the extent of organisational role stress as a function of service length.
- executives with longer service length (5 to 10 years and 10 or more years) obtained higher stress scores than the group with service length up to five years.
- a linear increase was also observed in role overload as a function of service length.
31. **Bhatnagar and Bose (1985)**, (316) made an attempt to identify age and leadership styles as correlates of 10 types of role stresses. For this purpose, Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972) and ORS Scale (Parrek, 1983) were administered. Means, SD and Person's product moment coefficients of correlation were used to analyse the data. The findings of the study revealed that branch managers scored lower on role ambiguity (RA), self-role distance (SRD), and role stagnation (RS) indicating that respondents do not really experience major stresses in these areas. The study points out, that role overload is one of the potent factors for stress among bank staff. The study showed the effect of educational qualification of employees with their coping disposition with respect to hierarchical position. They came to conclusion that it had no effect on their coping disposition. While on the other hand it was found that income played a significant role in bank employees coping style and approach towards problem resolution, i.e. higher the income, more they use problem focussed coping to deal with stress.

32. **Khanna, B. B. (1985)**, (317) assessed relationship between Organizational climate and organizational Role Stress and their impact upon organizational effectiveness. The sample of the case study comprised of 392 executives at three managerial level from five functional areas: 138 executives (manufacturing division), 106 (administration), 82 (technical services), 42 (marketing), and 24 (R&D). Of these 24 were senior executives, 76 middle executives and 292 junior executives. ORS Scale, Pareek, 1983; MAO-C, Pareek, 1989: Organizational effectiveness Questionnaire, Daftur, 1984 were used to measure the variables. The study concludes: Role stress of the organization was fairly low whereas motivational climates were average and organizational effectiveness was high. Role erosion was found to be major contributor of role stress. Age was found to be negatively associated with role stress but was positively related to organizational effectiveness. Self-role distance, personal inadequacy, achievement, role ambiguity and role erosion were important predictors of organizational effectiveness. Executives with lower degree of role ambiguity
reported higher job satisfaction. It was also found that lower the degree of role stress, higher was the score on organizational effectiveness and vice versa.

33. Ahmad, Bharadwaj, and Narula (1985), \(^{(318)}\) assess stress levels among 30 executives from both the public and private sector, using an ORS scale to measure ten dimensions of role stress. Their study reveals significant differences between public and private sector employees in three dimensions of role stress: role isolation, role ambiguity, and self-role distance. The authors also establish the insignificant effect of several background factors, such as age, level of education, income, marital status, and work experience.

34. Sen. (1981), \(^{(319)}\) while comparing various hierarchical levels including clerical staff in a banking sector, observed that clerical staff was more prone to stress than managerial cadre. Moreover, clerical staff scored high on role stagnation irrespective of their working in different banks, while as they scored least on inter-role distance than Executives of various hierarchical levels. This suggests that clerks have least feeling of competition among themselves. Further, noticed that lower level Executives used more of impunitive style for coping with stress which is an avoidance strategy as compared to higher level Executives in coping with stress.

35. Chand and Sethi (1979) \(^{(320)}\) argued: there is a significant relationship between job stress and role overload, higher is the work load more the bank employees get exposed to stress.

- **KEY INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

36. Malik (2011), \(^{(321)}\) collects data on 200 bank employees in Quetta, Pakistan, of which 100 work in public sector banks and the remaining 100 in private sector banks. The author finds that there is a significant difference in the level of stress to which both groups are subject, and that public sector bank employees face a high level of occupational stress.

37. D’Aleo, Stebbins, Lowe, Lees, and Ham (2007), \(^{(322)}\) in their research title "A comparative study of role and stress of public and private sector employees”
examine a sample of 559 public and 105 private sector employees to assess their respective risk profiles. They find that public sector employees face more stress than private sector employees.

38. Macklin et al. (2006), (323) survey 84 public and 143 private sector employees to assess any significant difference in their stress levels. They conclude that there is no significant difference between employees on the basis of sector, but that there is a significant difference between genders, i.e., female employees are subject to greater stress than males.

39. Health and Safety Executive (HSE, 2004), (324) Report published in May 2004 named “Employment Relations and Union Services: Health and Safety-Workplace Stress” discuss factors which causes stress at work place in which poor relationship with the managers and unsympathetic management. Report on occupational stress policy by Health and Safety Executive (HSE) 2004 has identified six key areas that can be causes of work related stress.

40. Sabir et al., (2003), (34) Time pressures, excessive demands, role conflicts, ergonomic deficiencies, job security and relationship with customers are particularly common stressors amongst employees in the financial services sector. Furthermore, new stressors such as computer break downs, computer slowdowns and electronic performance monitoring, have developed as a result of increased human interaction with computers (Violence and stress at work in financial services).

41. David (2000), (325) in his research title ”Managing Employee Stress and Safety: A guide to minimizing stress-related cost while maximizing employee - Managing Employee Stress and Safety” A 2½ year study involving almost 28,000 employees in 215 organizations showed that poor teamwork and ineffective supervision were the two most important factors leading to employee stress, with role conflict and lack of equality issues having the strongest influence on job burnout, health problems, and performance problems.
42. Lewig and Dollard (2001), (326) find that public sector employees are subject to greater work-related stress than private sector employees.

43. Dollard and Walsh (1999), (327) however, report that private sector workers in Queensland, Australia, had made twice as many stress claims as public sector workers.

44. Janice T.S. Ho (1995), (328) "The Singapore executive: stress, personality and well-being", examines the Singapore executive in the service sector: insurance, financial and banking; in terms of the level of stress experienced, coping styles, and personality (Type-A/Type-B). The study tests the relationship between personality type, perceptions of stress and psychological wellbeing. The study also examines the level of stress and psychological wellbeing across the three industries. Although Type-A executives reported a significantly higher level of stress than Type-B executives, they were not psychologically less healthy than their Type-B counterparts. Executives across the three industries did not differ in terms of reported stress. Executives in the finance sector tended to be more worn out and uptight than executives in the banking and insurance sectors. Work overload, role ambiguity and relationships with colleagues were cited to be the major stressors. While switch-off, exercise and quiet control were the most common coping techniques. Study discusses interventions aimed at changing work and task variables and changing characteristics of executives.

45. Cluskey (1994), (329) carried out a survey on management accountants, stress, and job strains. He found the main causes of stress to be (1) Reporting to more than one boss, (2) Heavy workload under time constraints, (3) Work relations in the organization, and (4) A perceived lack of career progress. They were suffering with additional source of stress: a mismatch between their personality and the task demands of their job.

46. Dewe (1993), (168) "Examining the nature of work stress: Individual evaluations of stressful experiences and coping." Negative interpersonal relations and workplace interpersonal conflicts are prevalent sources of stress and are existed with symptoms of ill health and negative mood depressions.
47. Quick et al., (1992), (176) Occupational stress is increasingly a significant source of economic loss and an important occupational health problem. Occupational stress may produce both physiologic and overt psychological disabilities. Nevertheless it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect productivity and personal well-being of an employee.

48. Kahn et al., (1992), (124) Occupational stress is an increasingly important occupational health problem and a significant cause of economic loss. Occupational stress may produce both overt psychological and physiologic disabilities. However, it may also cause subtle manifestation of morbidity that can affect personal well-being and productivity.

49. Motowidlo et al., (1986), (280) conducted a study published in the journal of applied psychology. These researchers asked a large number of nurses to describe their own levels of work related stress. Result indicated, the higher the nurses feelings of stress, the lower their job performance. Thus these findings and several other findings indicate that in real life settings performance may be reduced even by low or moderate level of stress.

50. Shaw and Riskind (1983), (330) study published in the journal of applied psychology. In this study he has shown that why certain jobs are quite high in stress as compare to others. Results indicated that the greater the extent to which a job requires making decisions, repeated exchange of information with others, performing unstructured rather than structured tasks, unpleasant physical conditions, the more stressful the job tends to be.

51. Vansell et al., (1981), (175) Stress is often developed when an individual is assigned a major responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power. Interpersonal factors such as group cohesiveness, functional dependence, communication frequency, relative authority and organizational distance between the role sender and the focal persons are important topics in organizational behaviour.
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52. Ivancevich et al., (1980). In their research titled “Stress and work: A Managerial Perspective.” Signify that, “Lack of group cohesiveness may explain various behavioural and physiological outcomes in an employ desiring such sticks together”.

53. Jick and Payne (1980), a stress arises when an individual feels he is not competent enough to undertake the role assigned to him effectively and efficiently. The person feels that he lacks skill, knowledge and training on performing the role (stress, conflict management and counselling, p.283). A job stressed person is probably to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increase in negative psychological symptoms, increased frequency of drinking and smoking and reduced aspirations and self-esteem.

54. Schuler, R.S. (1980), stated that stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint or demand related to what he or she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be uncertain and important.

55. Beehr and Newman (1978), in his research title “Job Stress, employ Health and organizational Effectiveness Analysis model & literature Reviews” defined occupational stress as "A condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs/work and characterised by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning.

56. Katz and Kahn (1978), the job related concepts suggests that use of role-stress is associated with interpersonal, individual, and structural variables.

57. Miles and Perreault (1976), identify four different types of role conflict: Intra-sender role conflict, Inter sender role conflict, Person- role conflict; role over load.

58. Greene, (1972), there is evidence that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity also respond to their situation with depression, anxiety, physical symptoms, a sense of futility or lower self esteem, lower levels of job
involvement and organisational commitment, and perceptions of lower performance on part of the organisation, of supervisors and of themselves.

59. Cobb (1975),\(^{333}\) was with belief that, "The responsibility load creates severe stress among workers and managers". If the individual manager/employee cannot cope with the increased level of responsibilities it may lead to several psychological and physical disorders among them.

60. French and Caplan (1975),\(^{174}\) found that, "Pressure of both quantitative and qualitative overload can result in the need to work excessive hours, which is an additional source of job stress". Having to perform under time pressure in order to meet deadlines/targets is an independent source of stress. Studies revealed that levels of stress increase as difficult deadlines draw near. More often, Stress is developed when an individual employee is assigned a key responsibility without proper authority and delegation of power.

CONCLUSION:

It is clear that different studies have generated different results on the basis of their particular contexts. Some studies argue that public sector employees are subject to greater stress while others argue the opposite. The literature review shows that work-related stress is almost equal in both the public and private sector, and that research on this topic remains a popular field of enquiry.

Section-II : Review of Literature on Organizational HRD Climate, Content Analysis & interplay with Role Stress

2.7 Rationale for Studying Organisational Climate

The term “organizational climate” as a technical term, is “a set of measurable properties of the work environment, based on the collective perception of the people who live and work in the environment and demonstrated to influence their motivation and behaviour.” As an everyday term, it describes the overall “tone” or “work atmosphere” of an organization. Simply stated, climate is
people’s perceptions of the environment in which they work. Research and experience have shown that organizational climate has a long-term impact on an organization’s productivity and performance. It provides managers with insights into the “people side” of the business. It is determined primarily by the organizational culture, polices, and practices of its leaders. Organizational Climate, then, can become an active and useful tool for managing the people side of the business.

Organizational culture and climate are widely used terms that have received considerable attention in both the trade and academic press. The concepts have been studied for decades in business and industrial organizations and their importance to understanding organizational functioning is generally accepted. Organizational climate as a concept, its role and value in organizations and its impact on various organizational outcomes have been studied for over 50 years. Organisational climate is found to directly account for the variance in key business performance measures. "High performing organisations have climates with particular measurable characteristics. Climate does make a difference to an organisation’s performance because it indicates how energising the work environment is for employees”.

Watkin and Hubbard (2003). (334)

Organizational climate is important to organizational performance. Several authors claim a significant relationship between organizational climate and performance - Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Marrow, Bowers, and Seashore (1967), Frederickson (1966). Organizational climate is a strong predictor of employee job satisfaction. It is of research interest to explore if it also moderates organizational role-stress.

2.8 Organizational Climate: An Evolution

The growing significance placed on understanding employees and their behaviour within the organization has produced a great deal of interest in investigating employee perceptions of climate within the organization. This
section traces the history of the concept and construct of organizational climate and attempts to explicate the various concepts and dimensions related to climate. Climate has a long history in the fields of industrial and organizational psychology and organizational behavior.

Organizational climate theory has been described by Hellriegel and Slocum, (1974),\(^{338}\) as “one of the most important, but least understood concepts” In the 1930’s, it was recommended that in order to better understand behaviour, one must look at it as it was related to the environment in which the behaviour took place. This suggestion seemed very logical to researchers and thus began the investigation into environmental research. The idea of organizational climate integrates at least three types of concepts. They include i) environmental concepts, such as size and arrangement of the firm, which are peripheral to the person, ii) individual concepts, such as attitudes the worker brings with him to the firm, and iii) outcome concepts including such things as satisfaction, performance, and commitment to the firm, which are determined by the interaction between the environmental and individual concepts. The importance of investigating the interaction of organizational and individual variables is that it provides much needed direction for identifying and conceptualizing environmental variables relevant to the climate.

The notion of organizational climate has commonly been attributed to Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939).\(^{62}\) In their study of aggressive behaviour in juvenile males, they coined the term “social climate” to connote the environment that was created in diverse treatment groups in their study. In this study, the researchers were largely interested in investigating leader behaviours across the experimental groups and identifying the influence that those leader behaviours had on the relational exchanges within that group, specifically focusing on the aggressive behaviour of boys. In this study, they found three methods of leader behaviour: i) authoritarian, ii) democratic, and iii) laissez-faire.

According to Schneider, (1990),\(^{339}\) the earliest explicit reference to the concept of climate occurred in Lewin, et al. (1939) article on experimentally created
“social climate” in boy’s group. These authors offered neither definition nor a measure of climate. The article mainly emphasized on the relationship between leadership styles and so-called "social climate". Fleishman (1953), (340) also discussed leadership climate but left the concept of climate undefined.

Since 1966, there have been intensive and diverse efforts to conceptualize climate measures and to form "organizational climate"- construct. A need to analyse the state of knowledge with respect to this construct exists currently because of the synthesis of contradictions in the construct conceptualizations as emerging from diverse research findings. Now days, climate has become an important aspect for describing the "social system" prevailing in an organization.

McGregor (1960), (341) conceptualized managerial climate as “the day to day behavior of the immediate supervisor and other significant people in the managerial organization”. McGregor designed no quantitative measures of of his climate conceptualization.

Forehand and Glimer (1964) (342) have defined organizational climate as a “set of characteristics that describe and organization from and that, (a) distinguish one organization from another, (b) are relationship over a period of time, and (c) Influence the behavior of people in organization”.

Litwin and Stringer (1968), (63) first comprehensively conceptualized and operationalized climate as it is studied now. They presented a paper at a climate conference. Their paper presented a set of six climate dimensions including structure, reward and warm or support as reported by organization member’s perceptions.

Two years later, Tagiuri, Litwin, and Barnes (1968), (343) published a book of collected papers. This book explored nature of the climate construct, its definition and empirical findings. Thus, even though the word climate appeared in 1939, the concept of climate as we know now, was not fully explicated until 1968 by Tagiuri, Litwin and Stringer.
Organizational climate variables such as supportiveness, participation, feelings of trust, and performance can provide useful insight for refining work environments - *James and James, (1989)*. (344)

**Suresh Kumar, (2011),** says, "Organization is the structure or network of relationship among individuals and positioned in a work setting and the process by which the structure is created, maintained and used. Climate refers to the entire internal environment of the Organization in which people of the Organization work for the achievement of goals. Organization climate acts as a bridge which links two type of phenomenon; on the one side the objective i.e., the tangible aspects of the organization e.g. structure, rules, procedures and leadership style and on the other, the moral and behaviour of employees. It is defined as a molar concept that reflects the general atmosphere of a work place, and is assumed to influence the motivation, satisfaction and behaviour of the individual in the organization. Organizational Climate is the summary perception which people have about an organization. It is a global expression of what the organization is. Organizational climate is the manifestation of the attitudes of organizational members toward the organization itself. An organization tends to attract and keep people who fit in its climate, so that its patterns are perpetuated at least to some extent. Human religionists introduced the concept of organizational climate in the late 1940s.”

Climate for an organization is somewhat like personality for a person. "Just as every individual has a personality that makes each person unique, each organization has an organizational climate that clearly distinguishes its personality from other organizations." - *James and Milbouem, (1980).* (346)

### 2.9 Organizational Culture: Nature and Significance

**(A) Nature of Organizational Culture**

Organizational or corporate culture is the pattern of values, norms, beliefs, attitudes and assumptions that may not have been articulated but shape the ways
in which people behave and things get done. Values refer to what is believed to be important about how people and the organizations behave. Norms are the unwritten rules of behavior.

**Meyerson and Martin (1987),** (66) have expounded that, "Organizational culture is concerned with abstractions such as values and norms which pervade the whole or part of an organization. They may not be defined, discussed or even noticed. Put another way, culture can be regarded as a ‘code word for the subjective side of organizational life’.''

Each individual has his/her beliefs that translate into personal values which, expressed collectively, shape an organisation’s culture - **Haines, (2000).** (347) Culture plays an important role in every individual firm as, self-evidently, each firm has its own culture - **Mohe, (2008).** (348)

**Cameron and Quinn, (1999),** (349) observed, "A high degree of organisation performance is related to a strong culture, that is, a culture with well integrated and effective set of values, beliefs and behaviours."

**Agrawal and Tyagi (2010),** (350) observed, "Managers and leaders must understand organisational culture because it influences the way their organisations react to the changing demands of the business environment"

**Purcell et al (2003),** (351) observed, "Culture is a system of shared values and beliefs about what is important, what behaviours are important and about feelings and relationships internally and externally."

**Eldridge and Crombie (1974),** (352) claim that, "The culture of an organization refers to the unique configuration of norms, values, beliefs and ways of behaving that characterize the manner in which groups and individuals combine to get things done."

**Deal and Kennedy (1982),** (80) has given a summary definition that, "Culture is a system of informal rules that spells out how people are to behave most of the time."
Furnham and Gunter (1993), (81) espouse that "culture is the commonly held beliefs, attitudes and values that exist in an organization. Put more simply, culture is ‘the way we do things around here’. They next sum-up the various definitions of culture and list amongst others, the following areas of agreement on the concept of culture:

- It is difficult to define (often a pointless exercise).
- It is multi-dimensional, with many different components at different levels.
- It is not particularly dynamic, and ever changing (being relatively stable over short periods of time).
- It takes time to establish and therefore time to change a corporate culture.

(B) Problems with the concept

These authors next, refer to a number of problems with the concept, including:

- How to categorize culture (what terminology to use);
- When and why corporate culture should be changed and how this takes place;
- What is the healthiest, most optimal or desirable culture.

They also point out that it is dangerous to treat culture as an objective entity ‘as if everyone in the world would be able to observe the same phenomenon, whereas this is patently not the case’

(C) The Significance of Culture

These authors summarise that: Culture represents the ‘social glue’ and generates a ‘we-feeling’, thus counteracting processes of differentiations which are an unavoidable part of organizational life. Organizational culture offers a shared system of meanings which is the basis for communications and mutual understanding. If these functions are not fulfilled in a satisfactory way, culture may significantly reduce the efficiency of an organization.

The authors say that they found that in some organizations there was a certain something – christened the ‘big idea’ – that seemed to give them a competitive
edge. The big idea consisted of a few words or statements that very clearly summed up the organization, what it was about and what it was like to work there. In turn this enabled the organization to manage its corporate culture and establish a set of shared values, which recognized and reinforced the sort of organization it wanted to be. Thus it was able to establish a strong shared culture within which particular practices that encouraged better performance would be embedded and flourish.

2.10 Culture and Climate: A Content Analysis

A recent, extensive content analysis by Verbeke, Volgering, and Hessels (1998), \(^\text{(353)}\) of the published organizational literature on culture and climate identified 32-different definitions of organizational climate, and 54 - definitions of organizational culture. The number and nature of the definitions uncovered by the content analysis revealed confusion about the distinction between culture and climate and the broad range of organizational phenomena included under those labels. However, the content analysis also disclosed two core concepts in the literature that highlight the distinctiveness between culture and climate. The empirically derived core concepts from the literature described 'climate' as the way people perceive their work environment and 'culture' as the way things are done in an organizational unit. Although these core concepts are not fully developed definitions, they make an important distinction.

By describing climate as the way people perceive their work environment and culture as the way things are done in an organizational unit, climate is defined as a property of the individual and culture is defined as a property of the organization. This difference has been suggested for at least the last decade and characterizes the definitions of the two constructs as presented below - James, James, and Ashe, (1990). \(^\text{(354)}\)

Wiley and Brooks, (2000), \(^\text{(355)}\) examined “the relationship between how employees describe their work environments and the relative performance success of those work environments.” This research found that employees were more “energised and productive” in work environments in which particular
organisational and leadership practices were present. The research claim of these authors is: more the employees are "energised and productive" the greater customer satisfaction will result along with a stronger long-term business performance of the organisation. Brown and Leigh, (1996), (356) are of the view that "Organisations that are able to create environments that employees perceive to be benign and in which they are able to achieve their full potential are regarded as a key source of competitive advantage" Organisational climate can therefore be considered a key variable in successful organisations. As it energises employees and enhances production

2.10.1 Organizational Climate - Meaning and definition

"Organizational culture and climate focus on how organizational participants observe, experience, and make sense of their work environment" - Schneider, Ehrhart and Macey, (2011). (357) Historically, the construct of climate preceded the construct of culture. Climate was formally introduced in the 1960s by Lewin, Kurt (1951). (358) The organizational climate is a multi-faceted, organizational construct. The term organizational climate, was first introduced in 1939 following a study of children’s school clubs by Lewin Kurt and his colleagues Lewin and his associates characterized leadership within the clubs as corresponding to one of three styles (autocratic, democratic, or laissez faire). These styles determined the social climate within the clubs, which led in turn to particular behaviour repertoires displayed by the boys. They also made an important argument that behaviour is a function of the person and the environment (B = f [P, E]; Lewin, Lippitt and White, (1939). (62)

Climate research has endeavoured to explain the environmental variable. Many definitions of organizational climate exist in the literature. Organizational climate is defined as “ A set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in this environment and assume to influence their motivation and behavior” argued Litwin and Stringer, (1966, p.1). (359)
Schneider (1975),\(^{(360)}\) suggests that organizational climate comprises perceptions that are psychologically meaningful environmental descriptions which people agree characterize a system’s practices and procedures.

According to Campbell \textit{et al.}, (1970),\(^{(340)}\) Organisational climate can be defined as a "set of attributes specific to a particular organisation that may be induced from the way that organisation deals with its members and its environment. For the individual members within the organisation, climate takes the form of a set of attitudes and experiences which describe the organisation in term of both static characteristics (such as degree of autonomy) and behaviour outcome and outcome-outcome contingencies." They conclude that "climate has four fundamental dimensions, including individual autonomy, degree of structure, reward orientation, and a combination of consideration, warmth and support."

These researchers and others have approached organizational climate as a multi-faceted, organizational construct (e.g., Schneider, (1975),\(^{(360)}\) Ott, (1989),\(^{(361)}\) Moran and Volkwein, (1992),\(^{(362)}\)

\textbf{Forehand and Gilmer (1964),} \(^{(341)}\) state that organizational "climate consists of (i) a set of characteristics that describe an organization. (ii) Distinguish it from other organizations , (iii) are relatively enduring over time and (iv) influence the behaviour of the people in it.

\textbf{Tagiuri, Renato (1968),} \(^{(64)}\) defines organizational climate as a relatively ending quality of the internal environment that is experienced by the members, which influences their behaviour and can describe in terms of values of a particular set of characteristics of the organization.

\textbf{Schneider Benjamin (1975),} \(^{(360)}\) defined organizational climate as a mutually agreed internal (or molar) environmental description of an organization’s practices and procedures. The dynamics (study of forces producing motion) of organizational climate depends upon employee’s perceptions. Thus, organisational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment that is experienced by its members, influences their behaviour and
can be described in terms of the value of a particular set of characteristics of the organization. It may be possible to have as many climates as there are people in the organisation when considered collectively, the actions of the individuals become more meaningful for viewing the total impact upon the climate and determining the stability of the work environment. The climate should be viewed from a total system perspective, While there may be differences in climates within departments these will be integrated to a certain extent to denote overall organisational climate.


One of the earliest definitions of organizational climate was proposed by Forehand and Von Gilmer (1964). (342) They viewed organizational climate to be comprised of qualities that discriminate one firm from another, that endure over time, and help to control actions of employees within the organization.

Subsequent research from Tagiuri, Litwin, and Barnes (1968), (343) build upon Forehand and Von Gilmer by adding the notion that “climate should be described as the set of qualities that encompass the organization of inquiry”.

Beyond this, several researchers have proposed other definitions that place more weight on the environment, including things such as guidelines, actions, and the atmospherics Argyris, (1958), (369) Schein, (1992), (370) while another group insists that leader and manager behaviour are most important Fleishman, (1953), (340) McGregor, (1960), (341) and Meyer, (1968). (371). Moreover, another group of researchers focus on measurable outcomes (Forehand, 1968) (372).
Davis, Keith (1978),\(^{(373)}\) says "Organizational climate means the favourableness or unfavourableness of the environment for people in the organisation."

Schneider, B (1987),\(^{(374)}\) offers the most “cut and dry” explanation: "Obviously climate and culture are complimentary topics. Climate focuses on how the organization functions (what it rewards, supports, and expects), while culture addresses the assumptions and values attributed to why particular activities and behaviours are rewarded, supported and expected. Culture, then, focuses on why things happen as they do, on the meaning or reasons for what happens."

Cooke and Rousseau (1988),\(^{(375)}\) propose that: "Climate, rather than culture, reflects perceptions of organizational structures and how it feels to be a member of the organization. In contrast, beliefs regarding how to behave are aspects of culture."

Moran and Volkwein (1992),\(^{(362)}\) incorporating definitions in the literature provide the following definition of organisational climate: "Organisational climate is the relatively enduring characteristic of an organisation which distinguishes it from other organisations: and

1. embodies member’s collective perceptions about their organisations with respect to such dimensions as autonomy, trust, cohesiveness, support, recognition, innovation and fairness;
2. is produced by member interaction; (c) serves as a basis for interpreting the situation;
3. reflects the prevalent norms, values and attitudes of the organisation’s culture; and
4. acts as a source of influence for shaping behaviour."

Even though there appears to be a lack of consensus among researchers on the definition of climate, and there are also conflicting or confusing definitions and inconsistencies in the operationalization of the construct; but most definitions include some of the following common characteristics of the organisational

- Organisational climate is generally considered to be a molar concept.
- Organisational climate, although ever changing, exhibits some form of continuity over time.
- Organisational climate is phenomenologically external to the individual, but cognitively, climate is internal to the individual because it is affected by individual perceptions.
- Organisational climate is based on reality and can be shared by the participants in the sense that there is consensus on the climate of the organisation, resulting in a “commonality of perceptions”.
- Organisational climate has the potential to influence the behaviour of individuals in the organisation.

Grant, (2002),\(^{(377)}\) prepared a brief list of the differing definitions of "organizational climate" as given below:

1) Organizational climate is made up of perceived organizational properties intervening between organizational characteristics and behaviour, claim- Friedlander and Margulies, (1969).\(^{(365)}\)

2) Organizational climate is a set of attitudes and expectations describing the organization’s static characteristics and behaviour outcome and outcome-outcome contingencies - Campbell, et al., (1970).\(^{(363)}\)

3) Individual perceptions of their organization are affected by characteristics of the organization and the individual - Schneider and Hall, (1972).\(^{(378)}\)

4) Psychologically meaningful cognitive representations of the situation perceptions - James and Jones, (1974).\(^{(364)}\)

5) Perceptions or interpretations of meaning which help individuals make sense of the world and know how to behave - Schneider and Snyder, 1975.\(^{(379)}\)

6) Individuals’ cognitive representations of proximal environments... expressed in terms of psychological meaning and significance to the
individual, an attribute of the individual, which is learned, historical and resistant to change - *James and Sells, (1981).*\(^{(380)}\)

7) An assessed molar perception or an inference researchers make based on more particular perceptions - *Schneider and Reichers, (1983).*\(^{(381)}\)

8) ‘Organizational Climate’- a generic term from a broad class of organizational, rather than psychological, variables that describe the context for individual’s actions - *Glick, W. (1985).*\(^{(382)}\)

9) Organizational Climate is a concept reflecting the content and strength of the prevalent values, norms, attitudes, behaviours and feelings of the people in an organization - *McNabb and Sepic, (1995).*\(^{(383)}\)

CONCLUSION:

It is evident from above discussions, that the researchers have attempted to permit the definition of organizational climate be taken out of the context of inquiry. However, although it is complicated to propose an all purpose definition, it is still possible to draw the boundaries of the concept by ascribing to it certain characteristics.

However, the above should not be a be taken as a real concern. In this context *Tagiuri, et al. (1968),*\(^{(64)}\) have identified several aspects of climate as listed below, that as per him help to clarify the domain of the concept.

1) Climate is a molar, synthetic concept (like personality).
2) Climate is a particular configuration of situational variables.
3) Its component elements may vary, however, while the climate may remain the same.
4) It is the meaning of an enduring situational configuration.
5) Climate has continuity, but not as lasting as culture.
6) Climate is determined importantly by characteristics, conduct, attitudes, expectations of other persons, and by sociological and cultural realities.
7) Climate is phenomenologically external to the actor who may, however, feel that he contributes to its nature.
8) Climate is phenomenologically distinct from the task for both observer and actor.
9) It is in the actor’s or observer’s head, though not necessarily in a conscious form, but it is based on characteristics of external reality.
10) It is capable of being shared (as consensus) by several people in the situation, and it is interpreted in terms of shared meanings (with some individual variation around a consensus).
11) It cannot be a common delusion since it must be periodically based on external reality.
12) It may or may not be capable of description in words, although it may be capable of specification in terms of response.
13) It has potential behavioural consequences.

Tagiuri, et al., (1968),(64) further state that organisational climate "is an indirect determinant of behaviour in that it acts upon attitudes, expectations, and states of arousal, which are direct determinants of behaviour.”

2.10.2 Organizational Culture Vs. Organizational Climate
Since its inception, the concept of organizational climate has often been confused with organizational culture. As per Stringer (2002),(384) "organizational culture and organizational climate are two very different constructs.

Similar to climate, the concept of culture has no consensus on its definition. One can define culture as “shared basic assumptions” - Schein, (1992),(385) or "prevailing ideals that carry on over time despite fluctuations in organization personnel.

" Deal and Kennedy, (1982),(80) Meyerson (1991), (386) suggested that one reason culture is so difficult to define is because it is, in essence, the code word for the contextual side of organizational existence.

Denison (1996 p.644),(69) went further to describe the similarities and differences between organizational climate and culture. His distinction between
these two concepts claims that: "Climate refers to a situation and its link to thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of organizational members. Thus, it is temporal, subjective, and often subject to direct manipulation by people with power and influence. Culture, in contrast, refers to an evolved context (within which a situation may be imbedded). Thus, it is rooted in history, collectively held, and sufficiently complex to resist attempts at direct manipulation"

Table 2.4: Summary of the differences between organisational climate and organisational culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE</th>
<th>ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has its roots in social psychology discipline</td>
<td>Originates in the anthropology domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on the individual's perceptions and cognitions which are used to comprehend and discriminate attributes of the organisation’s internal environment</td>
<td>Focus is on analysing the underlying structure of symbols, myths and rituals which lead to shared values, norms and meanings in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively enduring characteristic of the organization</td>
<td>Highly enduring characteristic of the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More shallow with regard to penetrating individuals’ consciousness and organisational realities.</td>
<td>Highly enduring characteristic of the organisation, Occurs at the level of attitudes and values but also at a deeper level of assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is more visible and operates at the level of attitudes and values</td>
<td>Is relatively invisible and is preconscious in individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolves more quickly and changes rapidly</td>
<td>Evolves slowly and is not easy to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique characteristics of individuals are evident</td>
<td>Collective characteristics are exhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methodology is used</td>
<td>Qualitative methodology is used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The above table, shows that organisational climate forms part of organisational culture. It illustrates how the individual perceives organisational conditions. This impacts on organisational climate. Organisational climate, in turn, is influenced by the culture in the organisation. Hence, while climate has an influence on the
interaction in an organisation, the interaction shapes the organisation’s climate and can influence its culture - Moran, and Volkwein, (1992). They have made perhaps a most comprehensive definition of climate Distinction between culture and climate is also visible in their theoretical directions.

A. Climate is rooted in the "person-environment fit" theories from Lewin (1951), wherein behaviour is considered a product of both the person and the environment (e.g., the person is external to the environment); while

B. Culture (a social construction of events) assumes that the employee cannot be divided from the environment. Some researchers have even gone further to claim that "climate is a sub-component of organizational culture" - Schein, (1992), and Stringer, (2002).

2.10.3 Healthy Organizational Climate: Characteristics

Employees anthropomorphise their organizations according to how their organizations treat them - Rhoades and Eisenberger, (2002). After assigning human like characteristics (e.g. Caring nature, considerate nature) to their organizations, employees develop a set of beliefs on the extent to which their organizations value their contributions and care about their wellbeing. These beliefs have been labelled Perceived Organizational Support, which comprises three forms of favourable treatment: (1) organizational rewards & job conditions; (2) fairness; and (3) supervisor support (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Mullins, (2005) stated that organizational climate is characterized, therefore by the nature of the people-organization relationship and the superior-subordinate relationship. These relationships are determined by interactions among goal and interactive, formal structure, the process of management, styles of leadership and the behaviour of people. Although similar types of
organizations will share certain common feature norms, each organization will have its own different and distinctive features.

In general terms, however, a healthy organization climate might be expected to exhibit such characteristic feature as explored by Mullins:

1) The integration of organizational goal and personal goals;
2) The most appropriate organization structure based on the demands of the socio technical system;
3) Democratic functioning of the organization with full opportunities for participation;
4) Justice in treatment with equitable HRM (human resource management) and employment relations policies and practices;
5) Mutual trust, consideration and support among different levels of the organization;
6) The open discussion of conflict with an attempt to avoid confrontation managerial behaviour and styles of leadership appropriate to the particular work situation;
7) Acceptance of the physiological contract between the individual and organization;
8) Recognition of peoples need’s and acceptance at work and individual differences and attributes;
9) Equitable systems of rewards based on positive recognition;
10) Concern for the quality of working life and job design;
11) Opportunities for personal development and career progression;
12) A sense of identity with, and loyalty to the organization and a feeling of being a valued and important member.

Mullins, (2005), concluded, "if organizational climate is to be improved, then attention should be given to the above features. A healthy climate will not by itself guarantee improved organizational effectiveness. However, an organization is most unlikely to attain optimum operational performance unless the climate evokes a spirit of support and
co-operation throughout the organization, and is conducive to motivating members to work willingly and effectively."

2.11 Conceptualizations on Organizational Climate (OC).
Description of the concept, constructs, determinants and correlates of organizational climate emerges from various definitions propounded on organizational climate, as discussed below.

1). James L.A. & James, (1989), (344) Organizational climate is an inherently multilevel construct involving distinct perceptions and beliefs about an organization’s physical and social environment. At the individual level, psychological climate refers to individuals’ perceptions of and the meanings they assign to their environment. As a higher level construct, organizational climate reflects beliefs about the organization’s environment that are shared among members and to which members attach psychological meaning to help them make sense of their environment.

2). Schein, E.H., (1990, 1992), (390) Conceptualized organizational culture as the process of socialization that takes place to integrate individuals into an organization, and allow organizations to adapt to external demands. The essence of organizational culture is the underlying values and beliefs that work to shape behavioural norms in organizations. Most definitions are derived from Schein (1992) who describes culture as "a pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel as related to those problems" (Page 13). Culture has three distinct layers ranging from the observable rituals, symbols and behavioural norms at the artifactual level, to the less obvious espoused values and beliefs at the intermediate level, and finally underlying assumptions at the deepest, most subjective level of analysis.
The literature suggests that organizational culture and organizational climate are separate but related constructs. Organizational climate is accepted to be a temporary condition comprised of objective or perceived environmental issues that can be measured quantitatively, manipulated and changed relatively easily; whereas, organizational culture is thought to be the set of values, beliefs and assumptions held in common by members of the organization and necessary for internal integration and adaptation to external forces. Compared to climate, culture is more complex, difficult to assess and resistant to change. Organizations who want to assess their culture must start by conducting a comprehensive morale of teachers. The study revealed that in the elementary schools teachers, morale was high in open climate and there exist significant relationship qualitative analysis through ethnographic and clinical descriptive methods, to develop a conceptual model for their organization. When sufficient data are collected and a conceptual model is developed, quantitative analysis.

3). Asforth, (1994),\(^{(391)}\) argued that climate is a joint property of both the organization and the individual. This means that climate is the result of interaction between organizational characteristics and the members’ behavior.

4). Fink et al. (1995),\(^{(392)}\) defined organizational climate as a set of attitudes and beliefs relating to the organization that is shared and collectively held by organizational members as a whole.

5). William, et al. (1986),\(^{(393)}\) defined organizational climate as “the favorableness or unfavorableness of the environment for people in the organization.”

6). James et al. (1990),\(^{(354)}\) defined climate for individuals in the organization as the extent to which the organization provides for well being of its members.

7). Taguiri (1968), cited in Fink et al. (1995),\(^{(392)}\) Most researchers adopted the classic and more widely referenced definition of organizational climate provided by Taguiri. His definition of organizational climate posits that: “Climate is the relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a)
is experienced by its members; (b) influences their behavior; and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization.

8). **Natraj (2001)**, concluded a study on organizational climate and teacher morale. The aim of the study was to find out the relationship between the school organizational climate and between organizational climate and teacher’s moral.

9). **Aggarwal and Bose (2004)**, examined the relationship between certain aspects of the organizational climate that may be created with the perception of procedural justice in public and private sector Indian organization and role efficacy. Findings indicated that irrespective of the form of the organization, managements attempt to develop the role efficacy of members. It required the creation of positive work environment which enables members to perceive fair procedures used for implementing human resource decisions.

10). **Doe and Gazit (2008)**, presented a model that combine transformational and social interaction as antecedents of climate strength, (i.e. the degree of within-unit agreement about climate perceptions). Dispute over their longstanding status as primary variables, both antecedents have received limited empirical research. Results indicated a partially mediated model between transformational leadership and climate strength, with density of group communication network as the mediating variable.

**2.12 Dimensions of Organizational Climate (OC): A review of multi-faceted researches**

**Albrecht, (1979)**, claimed that, "Organizational climate is a multidimensional system of the properties of the internal environment of an organization. The dimensions generally relates to two categories of perceptions: (1) behaviours in the organization and (2) feelings of members toward the organization, for example the amount of perceived warmth."
Pritchard & Karasick, (1973), Lawler, Hall, and Oldham, (1974), these researchers have identified numerous dimensions of climate, which they have used as operational referents for the construct. Organizational role stress has a negative correlation with employee satisfaction (which is in direct relation, and an indicative factor of positive organizational climate). Organizational Climate was found related to performance and individual job satisfaction and retention, as well as organizational effectiveness and success.

Pareek, U. (1975), developed a scale to measure organizational climate which is best suited to Indian conditions. It is known as 'motivational analysis of organizational climate questionnaire Mao (c) and patterned after Litwin and Stringer (1968), climate questionnaire. However, it differs from Litwin & Stringer (1968) questionnaire in that (a) it is comparatively more exhaustive, and (b) it uses ranking method rather than the rainy method used in Litwin and Stringer's questionnaire. Pareek assessed Climate in terms of (1) achievement, (2) expert power, (3) extensions, (4) affiliations, (5) dependency, and (6) control in twelve areas, namely, i) orientation, ii) inter-personal relationship, iii) supervision, iv) managing problems, v) managing mistakes, vi) managing conflicts, vii) communication, viii) decision making, ix) trust, x) managing reward, xi) risk taking, xii) innovation and change.

Locke (1976), suggested that climate dimensions are likely correlate of job-satisfaction. Organizational climate as per Denison, (1996), is “the way in which organizational members perceive and characterize their environment in an attitudinal and value-based manner”

Kandan (1985), the study aimed to investigate, “Perception of Organizational Climate and Need Satisfacation among Bank Employees”. It was observed that in all the needed area there was a perceived deficiency in fulfillment of social and security needs. These needs were comparatively more fulfilled than the higher order needs like self-actualization and self-esteem.

Volkwein, Malik, and Napierski-Prancl, (1998), clarify that, several work-related variables exert positive and significant influences on employee
satisfaction: a supportive organizational culture, teamwork, relationships with colleagues and superiors, worker autonomy, and self-fulfillment.

**Johnsrud (1999),** (404) conducted two studies and examined the morale of mid-level administrators in a university setting. Defining morale as “a state of mind regarding one's job, including satisfaction, commitment, loyalty, and sense of common purpose with respect to one's work” (1999; p. 124), he found that organizational climate related dimensions, such as trust, communication, guidance, feedback and recognition of competence from supervisors as significant contributors to overall morale of employees.

**Gani and Faruq (2001),** (405) aimed a study to investigated correlates of organizational climate in banking industry. During the last three decades, no trend has been more dynamic in the industrial psychology then the growth of interaction in the Organizational Climate. The present study conducted in the banking industry of Kashmir, provides an adequate description of the concept, constructs, determinants and correlates of organizational climate.

**Johnsrud, (2002),** (406) claim that, as a result of its subjective nature and vulnerability to control and manipulate by individuals, within an organization’s decision-making mechanism, the organizational climate is greatly influenced by organizational leadership.

**Allen’s (2003),** (407) in his study examined the organizational climate and its relationship to job insecurity in three different universities. Utilizing approximately 60 administrative staff interviews, qualitative examination identified the following organizational climate-related items as contributing factors to high levels of insecurity: lack of respect and trust, poor interpersonal relationships, and not seeing oneself as a part of the campus community.

The above patterns of similarity regarding the relationship between organizational climate related variables and administrative staff satisfaction provide strong evidence of the importance and influence of such factors in the workplace. For example, issues regarding self-fulfillment, recognition, morale,
respect, and the quality of peer relationships and interactions between organizational members (and leaders) are conducive and vital in producing a positive or balanced organizational climate that facilitates loyalty, commitment, and trust. Thus, the significance of a balanced organizational climate cannot be overstated in terms of the benefits yielded as a result of the harmony between an organization and its members.

Bolman & Deal (1991, 1997, 2003), (408) support the above evidence and assert that, "a multi-frame orientation promotes organizational success, which is a by-product of the perceived organizational climate and satisfaction of organizational members. Their Leadership Orientations instrument is keyed to four different conceptions (frames) of organizations and of the task of organizational leadership. If organizational satisfaction and success are associated with leadership four-frame-related factors such as: i) teamwork (human resource), ii) guidance (structural), iii) trust (symbolic), and iv) autonomy (political), one would expect that an organizational climate encompassing the four frames in a multi-frame or balanced view would yield such results." These expectations were further confirmed in the findings of Mosser and Walls (2002). (409)

CONCLUSIONS:
The analysis of foregoing multi faced research evidences that some of the elements or dimensions of organizational climate are reckoned as: leadership, teamwork, relationships with colleagues and superiors, worker autonomy, self-fulfillment, trust, communication, guidance, feedback and recognition of competence from supervisors, morale, respect, and the quality of peer relationships and interactions between organizational members (and leaders) All these elements are encapsulated into four-frame-related factors such as (i) teamwork (human resource), (ii) guidance (structural), (iii) trust (symbolic), and (iv) autonomy (political).

Organizational climate is a concept in organizational behavior that has generated much interest as well as controversy among researchers. Despite the controversy, there is a widespread agreement that organizations should strive
hard to establish the right climate to achieve organizational effectiveness. Toward that end, organizations must first determine what are the variables that constitute the climate construct. The term organizational climate has been defined in many ways.

**Organizational role stress has a negative correlation with employee satisfaction which has positive correlation with organizational climate.** Thus, organizational role-stress (ORS) has a negative correlation with organizational climate. Denison, (1996),\(^69\) defined Organizational climate as “the way in which organizational members perceive and characterize their environment in an attitudinal and value-based manner.” Organizational climate has been asserted as an important and influential aspect of satisfaction and retention, as well as organizational effectiveness and success.

### 2.13 Organizational Climate Dimensions: Divergence in researches

"Organizational Climate" reflects a person’s perception of the organization to which s/he belongs. It is a set of characteristics and factors that are perceived by the employees about their organization, which serve as a major face in influencing their behaviour. These factors may include job descriptions, organizational structural format, performance and evaluation standards, leadership style, challenges and innovations, organizational values and culture and so on. Since organizational climate deals with inter-perceptions of employees toward their own organization, different organizations with different practices and procedures will therefore have different climate construct. This has lent complexity to the organizational climate construct. In a synthesis of various definitions, there is a divergence of views among researchers on what actually constitutes the climate construct.

1. **Forehand & Gilmer (1964),\(^{342}\)** refer climate as a set of characteristics that:
   1. describe and distinguish an organization from other organizations,
   2. are relatively enduring over time, and
   3. influence the behavior of people in the organization.
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2. Litwin, G.H. and Stringer, R. (1966), \(^{(410)}\) have included six factors, which affect organisational climate. These are:
   1. Organisational structure: perception of the extent of organisational constraints, rules, regulations, red tape
   2. Individual responsibility: feelings of autonomy of being's one's own boss
   3. Rewards: feeling related to being confident of adequate and appropriate rewards
   4. Risk and Risk taking: perception of the degree of challenge and risk in the work situation
   5. Warmth and support: feeling of general good fellowship and helpfulness prevailing in the work settings; and
   6. Tolerance and Conflict: Degree of confidence that the climate can tolerate, differing opinions.

3. Taguiri, R. (1968), \(^{(411)}\) has identified five factors in organisational climate on the basis of information provided by managers. These are:
   1. Practices relating to providing a sense of direction or purpose to their jobs-setting of objectives, planning and feedback
   2. Opportunities for exercising individual initiative
   3. Work with a superior who is highly competitive and competent
   4. Working with co-operative and pleasant people and
   5. Being with a profit oriented and sales oriented company.

4. Schneider & Bartlett (1968), \(^{(412)}\) give a broader and systematic study of climate dimensions. They propose six factors that should be included in determining Organisational Climate. These are:
   1. Managerial support,
   2. Managerial structure,
   3. Concern for new employees,
   4. Inter-agency conflict,
   5. Agent dependence; and
5. **Litwin and Stringer (1968)**, (63) on contrary, view climate as a set of measurable properties of the work environment perceived by the people in it, and is therefore assumed to influence behavior. They identified nine priori climate dimensions, viz.:


6. **Pritchard and Karasick (1973)**, (398) In a synthesis of various definitions, define climate as:

   1. a relatively enduring quality of an organization's internal environment which distinguishes it from other organizations,
   2. which results from the behavior and policies of members of the organization,
   3. is perceived by members of the organization, and
   4. acts as a source of pressure for directing activity.

7. **Steers (1977)**, (413) in a study on organizational effectiveness, refers organizational climate as the perceived properties or characteristics found in the work environment that result largely from actions taken consciously or unconsciously by an organization and that presumably affect subsequent behavior.

8. **LaFollete and Sims (1975)**, (414) using the climate questionnaire developed by Litwin and Stringer based on the nine a priori scales; identified six factors or dimensions that constitute climate namely:

   1. Affective tone toward people,
   2. Affective tone toward management,
   3. Policy & promotion clarity,
   4. Job pressure and standards,
   5. Openness of upward communication, and
   6. Risk in decision making.

[168]
9. **Muchinsky (1976),** (415) who used a similar climate questionnaire also identified six factors, which he called:

   1. Interpersonal Milieu,
   2. Standards,
   3. General Effective Tone Toward Management,
   4. Organizational Structure and Procedure,
   5. Responsibility, and
   6. Organizational Identification.

10. **Payne and Pheysey (1971),** (416) **Pritchard and Karasick (1973),** (398) **and Joyce and Slocum (1984),** (366) attempted to generate climate constructs. They yielded two, eleven and six climate factors respectively. There was also a diversity in the number of climate dimensions.

11. **Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970),** (363) identified four factors that appeared to be common to most climate studies. The factors were

   1. Individual Autonomy,
   2. Degree of Structure imposed upon the position,
   3. Reward Orientation and Consideration,

While some factors seem to be common across those climate studies, some factors appear to be specific to certain studies only, and others tend to have fuzzy inter-study relationships (**Muchinsky 1976**). (415)


   1. Conformity,
   2. Responsibility,
   3. Standards,
   4. Rewards,
   5. Organization Clarity,
6. Warmth and Support, and
7. Leadership.

13. **Lawrence James and Allan Jones (1974)**\(^{(364)}\) have classified the following factors that influence organisational climate:

1. Organisational Context: mission, goals and objectives, function etc.
2. Organisational Structure: size, degree of centralisation and operating procedures.
3. Leadership Process: leadership styles, communication, decision making and related processes.
4. Physical Environment: employee, safety, environmental stresses and physical space characteristics.
5. Organisational Values and Norms: conformity, loyalty, impersonality and reciprocity.

14. **Goran Ekvall, (1983)**\(^{(60)}\) spent many years looking at the organisational climatic dimensions that affect organisational creativity (Innovation). He identified following ten organisational climate dimensions.

1. Challenge
2. Freedom
3. Idea time
4. Dynamism
5. Idea support
6. Trust and openness
7. Playfulness and humor
8. Conflicts
9. Debates
10. Risk-taking

According to the Swedish researcher Prof. Goran Ekvall, an innovative culture/climate is characterized by the following:
- **Challenge and involvement.** How much employees are involved in, motivated by, and committed to the long-term goals and success of the organization.
- **Freedom.** The degree to which employees can independently define their work, exercise discretion, and take initiative in their day-to-day activities.
- **Trust and openness.** The degree to which employees are supportive of and respectful to each other.
- **Idea time.** The amounts of time individuals have to elaborate on new ideas before taking action.
- **Playfulness/humour.** How much spontaneity, fun, and ease there is in the workplace.
- **Conflict resolution.** The degree to which individuals make decisions and resolve issues based on the good of the organization vs. personal interest.
- **Debates.** How much employees are allowed to express their opinions and put forth their ideas for consideration and review.
- **Risk-taking.** How much managers tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity, and whether employees are rewarded for taking risks.

He grouped above dimensions into following three areas:

**Resources:** Idea Time; Idea Support; Challenge and Involvement

**Personal Motivation:** Trust and Openness; Playfulness and Humor; Absence of Interpersonal Conflicts

**Exploration:** Risk-taking; Debates about the Issues; Freedom

15. **Richard M. Hodgetts (1991),** has classified organisational climate into two major categories. He has given its 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 the water and cannot be seen.

1. The factors in the visible part that can be observed and measured are called as OVERT factors, and

2. The factors that are not visible and quantifiable are called COVERT factors.

[171]
Table 2.5: *Overt and Covert factors of Organisational Climate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt Factors</th>
<th>Covert Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hierarchy</td>
<td>1. Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial resources</td>
<td>2. Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals of organisation</td>
<td>3. Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technological state</td>
<td>5. Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Efficiency measurement</td>
<td>7. Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Richard M. Hodgetts (1991)

2.13.1 FINDINGS

The above studies show that it is very difficult to generalise the basic contents (elements, factors or dimensions) of organisational climate construct. Based on these studies, some broad generalisations can be drawn and it can be concluded that four basic factors are somewhat common to the findings of most studies. These factors are: (i) Individual autonomy, (ii) The degree of structure imposed upon the position, (iii) Reward orientation, and (iv) Consideration, warmth and support. Another common factor can be in respect of "conflict" and "co-operation". But this factor is used in different perspectives by different people.

2.13.2 CONCLUSIONS

- Organizational climate is an inherently multilevel construct involving distinct perceptions and beliefs about an organization’s physical and social environment. At the individual level, *psychological climate* refers to individuals’ perceptions of and the meanings they assign to their environment. As a higher level construct, *organizational climate* reflects beliefs about the organization’s environment that are shared among members and to which members attach psychological meaning to help
them make sense of their environment. - [James, L. A. and James, L. R. (1989); (344) James, L. R. and Jones, A. P (1974). (364)]

- Climate is an embodiment of apparent personality traits, emerging from firm and deep cultural grounding. Climate is an indicator of culture. Climate and culture have close bonding or linkage. If upper current of water in river is regarded as climate than the underneath water stream is culture.

- *When the organisational climate is favourable, job satisfaction is high.*

In sum, Organisational climate can be defined as organisational employee' perception of human, social and other organisational characteristics of work environment.

- "... while (organisational) culture is concerned with the nature of beliefs and expectations about organizational life, climate is an indicator of whether those beliefs and expectations are being fulfilled." - Buono *et al* (1985), (419) observe.

- *Apparently, there is a very thin line between organisational culture and organisational climate. Obviously climate, favourable or unfavourable, has its origin in the organisation's culture itself.*

### 2.14 HRD-Climate: A review of researches

**Battu (2007),** (420) in his book studied HRD Climate in Agrigold Pvt. Ltd. He compared the perception of managers, supervisors and workers on different level of general climate, OCTAPAC culture and HRD mechanisms. He indicated the overall climate in the organization to be good but just below the desired level.

**Srimannarayana (2009),** (421) studied HRD Climate in 18 manufacturing organization, where response was collected from 726 employees. The overall mean score of HRD climate was found to be 3.49 (62.32%). From the fact he concluded that the suitability of developmental climate prevailing in manufacturing sector in India was of moderate level only.
Saxena & Tiwari (2009), (422) did an empirical study of HRD-Climate (HRDC) in selected public sector banks. Their study showed that the HRDC in the public sector bank is average. They also found no difference in the perception of the employees on the basis of gender, qualification, designation but the perception of the employees differs on the basis of change.

Saraswathi (2010), (423) presented a comparative analysis of HRD climate based on employees working in "software" and "manufacturing" organizations. The overall mean of HRD climate was found to be 3.77 and 3.46 in software and manufacturing organization respectively indicating the fact that the developmental climate (the general climate, HRD Mechanisms and OCTAPAC culture) were found to be better in software organizations compared to that of manufacturing organization.

Solkhe and Chaudhary (2011), (424) conducted an empirical investigation examining the three components of HRDC. The result from their study shows a reasonable level of development orientation, trust and freedom of expression, healthy interpersonal relationship and openness. However, employees are not satisfied with promotions decisions within the company.

Mane (2012), (425) in his article judged HRD practices in private sector milk processing organizations in Pune region to be moderate, due to poor HRD practices and further suggested scientific way to enhance the HRD climate.

Gupta and Malhotra (2012), (426) carried out HRD climate survey in 13 - selected different information technology organizations and found most of the employees are highly satisfied with the prevailing human resource development practices, policies and climate in the different organizations.

Kilam and Kumari (2012), (427) in their article studied the HRD climate in Banks and experience of a target group of executives in various public sector banks in India with respect to their career in the bank. They found “Career Planning & Development” to be one of the most important HRD Sub Systems and not the most important HRD Sub-System.
Khan, Tarab (2012), analyzed the HRD Climate in Private Sector Telecommunication Industry of India. They studied the relationship between Employee Development and HRD Climate in Reliance Communications Ltd. They developed a positive relationship between the climate of the organization and the development of the employees. The overall employee development average score was found to be 3.59 indicating the fact that the overall score was found to be average and there is still scope for further development.

Benjamin (2012), in his paper examined the relationships among human resource development climate (HRDC), organizational Citizenship behaviour (OCB) and voluntary turnover intentions (VTI) in Nigerian banks. He found Nigerian banks management can reduce turnover and foster citizenship behaviour by ensuring that a favourable developmental climate exists within their organizations.

Mohanty, Parija and Sahu (2012) in their article studied the level of HRD climate among employees and analyzed the impact of HRD climate on job performance in selected private Insurance companies. They concluded that average HRD climate was prevailing in the private insurance sector in Odisha.

Srinibash Dash and J. Mohapatra (2012) Found that an optimal level of HRD Climate was essential for facilitating HRD at major manufacturing units of the organization like Rourkela Steel Plant. The study aimed to assess the extent of developmental climate prevailing, through identifying and measuring the perceived organizational culture and its various dimensions. 644 responses were tested on the five-point scale 38-item questionnaire developed by T.V. Rao and E. Abraham. The findings indicated that there was a gap between top mgmt. belief and action towards development of its human resources. The study revealed that some of the HRD mechanisms were working better than others.

Suchitra, P. (2013) Found a lack of research endeavor in comparing the HRD practices in banking sector. The study assessed the extent of HRD climate prevailing and influencing the level of employee satisfaction and performance.
HRD-Climate was a contributing/influencing factor to satisfy different needs of the individuals in both the public sector and private sector banks.

**Kanamarlapudi, Anil; and Vangapandu Ramadevi (2013).** Studied the different dimensions of HRD climate in Commercial Bank of Ethiopia (CBE). The results indicated that collaboration among the employees of CBE was high followed by trust and openness and autonomy was considered to be the least. The study revealed that there was significant difference in HRD dimensions - authenticity, autonomy, collaboration, confrontation and trust dimensions between the branches of CBE while F-value was insignificant for openness and pro-action dimensions indicating that openness and pro-action dimensions of HRD climate did not significantly differ between the branches of CBE.

**Jain, V.K. (2013).** He studied the nature of HRD climate of the company and the variables contributing to the HRD climate. Significant HRD Climate Factors were extracted based on the inter correlations of the HRD Climate Variables. The impact of HRD variables was also tested.

**Pirzada Sami Ullah Sabri (2014).** Examined the mediating role of perceived organizational support (POS) between human resource development climate (HRDC) and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) in manufacturing sector. The study adapts the questionnaire from Rao and Abraham (1986), Eisbenberger et al. (1986) and Podsakoff et al. (1990). Sample size was 500. He found that the perceived organizational support (POS) positively and significantly play as mediator between HRDC and OCB.

So, human resource development climate is an integral part of organizational climate. It can be defined as perceptions the employee can have on the developmental environment of an organization. It can be further grouped into three-broad Categories:

1. -- OCTAPACE - Culture,
2. -- General Climate,
3. **Human Resource Development Mechanisms.**

The OCTAPACE items deal with the extent to which Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Autonomy, Pro-activity, Authenticity Collaboration and experimentation are valued and promoted in the organization. General climate items focus on the importance given to human resources development by the top management. The items dealing with human resource development mechanisms measure the extent to which human resource development mechanisms are implemented seriously.

2.15 **Organizational "HRD - Climate"**

Rao, T.V. and Abraham, E. (1986),\(^{(436)}\) claim that, "An optimal level of development climate is essential for facilitating HRD activities." It is important to note that one of the key roles of an HRD manager is that he is a change agent. Emphasizing this need, Desimone, et al., (2002),\(^{(437)}\) assert that, "The pace and volume of modern change is focusing attention on ways human resource development (HRD) activities can be used to ensure organizational members have what it takes to successfully meet their challenges." Athreya, (1988),\(^{(438)}\) asserted that, "The positive HRD climate makes existing systems more effective and makes the organization more receptive to the introduction of relevant additional system." Measuring role perception and role related processes has gained significance in management research in general - Mintzberg (1973).\(^{(39)}\)

As a final outcome of the aforesaid review of literature spanning from the year 1939-2013 on climate dimensions/factors, this study concludes to use the most exhaustive and highly validated research instrument: OCTAPAC-profile, for its study of **HRD-Climate.** Organizational HRD-climate is dependent on the perception of its organizational members on the level of existence of OCTAPAC profile; and the level of Role Stress in the organization negatively impacts/influences this perception.

"HRD climate" is the perception the employees have on the development environment of an organization. The elements of HRD climate as per T. V. Rao
(1990).\(^{439}\) can be grouped into three broad categories: i) General climate, ii) OCTAPAC culture, and iii) HRD mechanisms.

- *The general climate* items deal with the importance given to human resources development in general by the top management and the line manager.
- *The OCTAPAC culture* items deal with the extent to which Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Autonomy, Proactively, Authenticity and Collaboration are valued and promoted in the organization.
- The items dealing with *HRD mechanisms* measure the extent to which HRD mechanisms are implemented seriously.

**HRM/D Practices and Organizational Climate**

HRD specialists/Managers face a major challenge to ensure the development and management of an appropriate HRD Climate, as the HRD culture facilitates effective implementation of HR systems. Thus a general supportive climate is important for HRD function if its programs have to be implemented effectively. HRD climate, reveals the perception of the employees in the development environment of an organization. The concept of climate with special reference to HRD Climate, i.e., "HRD climate" has been developed by Rao and Abraham (1986).\(^{431}\)

**HRD and HRD Climate:**

Loard Nadler (1969),\(^{440}\) first introduced the concept of "Human Resource Development (HRD)." Since then HRD is growing as an influential discipline or professional field of practice. HRD has become increasingly critical to the survival and success of all organizations (Wilson, 2005).\(^{441}\) Various management scholars defined HRD, but Rao (1991),\(^{442}\) provided a clear and comprehensive definition based on organizational and national contexts. In organizational context as a process by which the employees of an organization are continuously helped in a planned way to:

- acquire or sharpen capabilities required to perform various functions associated with their present or expected future roles;
develop their general capabilities as individual and discover and exploit their own inner potentials for their own and/or organizational development purposes; and,

- develop an organizational culture in which supervisor–subordinate relationships, team work, and collaboration among subunits are strong and contribute to the professional wellbeing, motivation and pride of employees.

**HRD-Climate:** The basic reason is that HRD culture facilitates effective implementation of HR systems. So, a general supportive climate is a must for HRD function so that its programs may be implemented effectively. Thus the HRD climate forms and reveals the general perception of the employees about the development environment of an organization.

Reichers and Schneider (1990), (443) define organizational climate as the “shared perceptions of organizational policies, practices, and procedures, both formal and informal.”

Abraham (1989), (444) found HRD culture to be an important intervening variable in translating HRD practices into profit. In essence, HRD tantamount to building competence, commitment and culture (Rao, 1990). (445)

The concept of climate with special reference to HRD Climate, has been developed by T.V. Rao and E. Abraham (1986). (446) The study shows that a good "HRD Climate" rather than HRD Practices are responsible for organizational performance. HR practices create the atmosphere for the employees that facilitate their development.

For a positive HRD climate to prevail within an organization, it must be built on the important culture characteristics identified by Rao & Abraham (1990). (447) These characteristics are: Openness, Confrontation, Trust, Autonomy, Proaction, Authenticity and Collaboration (OCTAPAC). However, organizations differ in the extent to which they are able to align with these characteristics.
"HRD climate" is the perception of the employees about the prevailing HRD Culture in the organization which is mostly brought out through surveys covering the entire sample of employees. Mapping such HRD climate helps the organisation to know the existing climate and to take necessary steps to modify or change certain practices if they feel there remains a gap between what they want and what is prevalent.

"Map your HRD Practices-profile" is an instrument, developed by Rao T.V (1991). It contains 95 activities clubbed under 9 different dimensions:

1) HRD philosophy and liaison with top management,
2) creating development motivation in line managers,
3) strengthening HRD climate through HRD systems,
4) directing HRD efforts to goal and strategies of the organizations,
5) monitoring HRD implementation,
6) human process search,
7) influencing HR polices,
8) creating business linkages and
9) net working and benchmarking.

The studies show that HRD practices and climate have a high positive correlation among them.

In order to measure HRD, is structured questionnaire was developed by the centre for HRD at XLRI. It had 38 items grouped under three categories, *general climate, *OCTAPACE culture and *HRD mechanisms to assess the level of HRD climate. General climate provides the views on the top management support for HRD; OCTAPACE culture depicts about the degree of 1. openness, 2. confrontation, 3. trust, 4. autonomy, 5. pro-activity, 6. authority and 7. collaboration exist in the organization; and HRD-Mechanisms take into account (i). potential appraisal, (ii). performance appraisal, (iii). training and development, (iv). career planning and development and related activities.