CHAPTER -I

INTRODUCTION

The present era is the age of science and technology. The advancement in socio-economic and technological field apart from bringing progress has also created complexities, stress and anxiety in the daily life of people. No longer are the civilized men the victims of famines and epidemics – but the black plague has been replaced by a host of subtler, psychological plagues – worry, insecurity, disillusionment and doubts which have made it difficult for the modern man to lead a happy life.

The basic requisite for leading a happy life is the provision of appropriate environment and the adequate means for living – first survival and then a full term, long, healthy life full of happiness. Modern man’s path to happiness is not an easy one. It is beset with seemingly endless personal and social problems. Excessive competition, conflicting pressure groups, rapid social change and threat of global wars has aggravated man’s insecurities and emotional scars, drained human energy and happiness in a way that can be seen in the millions of victims of depression. Depression triggered by stress has led to dissatisfaction. The growth of prosperity and march of consumerism has failed to generate the hope for satisfaction in life. What was once a luxury has now become a common expectation. This makes its absence a source of dissatisfaction. The craving for more has become the way of life. Some want more money while others crave for good job and so on and so forth.

Life is mostly seen from quantitative rather than qualitative point of view. The materialistic attitude is prevalent globally and in all spheres. Man has become a victim of passion, jealousy and arrogance. He is dissatisfied, unhappy and discontented due to unaccomplished tasks and desires. There is no harmony between his inner and outer self. The feeling of emptiness, tension and meaninglessness prevails everywhere and in all walks of life.

Life is not always smooth sailing, but a haphazard process. It is a mixture of necessity and freedom, chance and choice. We cannot change the events but we have to change our approach to them. Life is full of struggle. Troubles are natural. They do not
spare the strong and the weak; the rich and the poor; the saint and the sinner. Each individual has to encounter them. One wins or loses in life according to one’s capacity and preparation for trials.

According to Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of English Language, ‘Life is the sum of distinguished phenomena of plans and adoption of environment’.

Sri Aurobindo holds that life is not an inexplicable dream nor is it incorrigible evil but a mighty pulsation of divine existence.

John Gray defines life as an object to which the effort or ambition is directed.

Every individual has different desires, wishes, ambitions and aims in life that are to be satisfied. Some want to gain recognition, appreciation while others crave for long life and security not only from physical dangers but also from socio-psychological ones.

Maslow strongly believes that human being is a wanting animal and he never reaches a state of satisfaction. According to him, when certain needs and desires are satisfied, at once, other and higher needs emerge and when these in turn are satisfied, again new and still higher needs emerge and so on and so forth.’ Man experiences obstacles and interference in his attempt to achieve them. This creates problems and serious and deliberate efforts have to be made to overcome these impediments. The obstruction, internal or external barrier, restriction or interference in accomplishment leads to dissatisfaction and discontentment thus leading to disharmony between inner and outer self. All this creates confusion, chaos and turmoil in life whereas the successful accomplishment always leads to happiness and contentment. This is termed as satisfaction. The extent to which an individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from his total life situation is referred to as life satisfaction (Guion 1958).

In general, the word satisfaction is defined as fulfilment or gratification of desires, feelings or expression of pleasure, contentment and optimism. Satisfaction is a Latin word that means to make or do enough. Satisfaction is not about what happens to us, it is how we perceive what happens to us. It is not wishing for what we do not have, but enjoying what we have. It is the knack of finding a positive for every negative.

According to the Psychological Dictionary, ‘Satisfaction is the simple feeling or state accompanying the attainment by an impulse of its objectives.’
According to International Webster’s Dictionary (1999), ‘Satisfaction means fulfilment of need or desire, some pleasantness or contentment.’

Porter and Hawler (1986) opine ‘Satisfaction is the extent to which rewards actually received meet or exceed the perceived equitable level of rewards. The greater the failure of actual rewards to meet or exceed perceived equitable rewards, the more dissatisfied a person is considered to be in a given situation’.

In the words of James (1972), ‘Satisfaction is the degree to which the members of a social system have a positive affective orientation towards membership in the system. Members who have a positive affective orientation are satisfied whereas members who have a negative affective orientation are dissatisfied’.

Satisfaction mainly depends upon the individual’s environment, calibre, behaviour and proper understanding of man and nature. It is mainly concerned with mind than with material things. It is measured by the spirit in which a man meets the problems of life. Satisfaction in life can be attained by overcoming blocks, reaching goals, satisfying motives, relieving frustration and maintaining equilibrium between his needs and his capacity of realizing these needs.

A person who is satisfied is happy and leads a comfortable life and is not jealous of others and has peace of mind. He can realize his aims and ideals in life. Where there is dissatisfaction no improvement or betterment is possible. A highly satisfied person has high morale and has favourable life attitudes. Only a satisfied man can lead a fuller and prosperous life and can make maximum contribution to the welfare of the nation.

The future of a country depends on its educated human resources. Education is an instrument as well as catalyst for the attainment of a better and higher quality of life. The teacher being the kingpin of the entire education system, all developmental activities related to social, cultural, intellectual, aesthetic and emotional aspects revolve around him. The report of Kothari Commission (1966) rightly says that of all the different factors that influence the quality of education and its contribution to national development, the quality, competence and character of teachers is undoubtedly the most significant. The Program of Action and National Policy on Education (1988) states that the status of teachers reflects the socio-cultural ethos of a society, no people can rise above the level of its teachers. The teacher is the principal means for implementing
educational programmes and for the organization of education. Teachers are a crucial link in providing valuable information to the youth. Enlightened, emancipated and empowered teachers lead communities and nations in their march towards better and higher quality of life.

All the above is more true for the elementary school teachers because the foundation of child’s personality, attitude, habits, learning skills and communicating capabilities is laid down at the primary stage. It is the stage when basic language skills of reading, writing and arithmetic are acquired, values are internalized and environmental consciousness is sharpened. The Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen has rightly put it, ‘as you reap what you sow’ and you don’t reap what you don’t sow’, which makes the role of elementary school teachers all the more crucial as it is they who sow the seeds of future generation. If they are conscientious, dedicated to their profession and satisfied in their personal and professional life the future of the nation can be said to be in safe hands. Dissatisfaction in the life of a teacher can result in personal disadvantage as well as disadvantage to the entire society. The consequences of dissatisfaction are severe particularly in the human service profession like teaching, perhaps it is responsible for a significant number of indifferent, uncommitted teachers who have brought such a disgrace to the otherwise noble profession of teaching. The overt manifestations of dissatisfied teachers are generally intense reactions of anger, anxiety, restlessness, depression, boredom, psychosomatic symptoms and in extreme cases nervous breakdown. Dissatisfaction in the life of teachers can lead to exaggerated rigidity and inflexibility. The dissatisfied teachers display low tolerance, feel emotionally and physically exhausted and display low commitment to teaching ((Maslach, 1976, Chemiss, 1980, Basi, 1990).

Satisfaction results from fruitful synthesis of thought and action. Job satisfaction is the most crucial factor for life satisfaction (Yelamachili, 2006) since work is overwhelmingly an important part of our lives. Stress in the work place means raising tempers, lowering productivity and having an insidious impact on the morale. This causes emotional disturbance and leads to dissatisfaction. Excessive stress or dissatisfaction may result to burnout – psychological withdrawal from work (Ponnusammy, 2006).
Decrease in job satisfaction and subsequent poor job performance results in Job Stress and burnout. (Cunningham, 1983; Savery and Detiuk 1986; O'Connor and Clarke 1990)

What really satisfies a worker and acts as a motivation to work is the nature of the job he does and its content in relation to social environment he works in. Although wages, working conditions and welfare are important, the extent to which the job gives him satisfaction motivates him to work.

Stress at work resulting from increased complexity of work and its divergent demands has become a prominent feature of modern organizations extending impairing effects on employees physical as well as mental ill health (Kyriacou, 1987; Rastogi and Kashyap 2001) Stress at work has been reported to significantly impair the relationship of teacher with his students and the quality of teaching and commitment that he is able to display (Davis, 1981; Srivastava 1983; Shann, 1998). Though a moderate degree of stress has been noted creating as well as promoting employees inclination towards the job, however, excessive and consistent job stress results in job dissatisfaction, tension, anxiety, depression and in some cases even serious, mental and physical disabilities ranging all the way to diseases.

The role of teachers in today's climate is complex and demanding. Teachers face competing expectations from government and school system. Unions, parents and the media have frequently been found to display symptoms of job stress among teachers. The daily interactions with students and co-workers and the incessant and fragmented demands of teaching often lead to overwhelming pressures and challenges which may lead to stress.

But, the present scenario is quite discouraging. In the last two decades, probably no professional group has been criticized as frequently and as intensely as teachers. Society perceives the present generation of teachers as unprofessional and irresponsible, lacking in dedication and commitment which teachers of past were reputed to possess. On one extreme the teacher is made accountable for national development to the extent of nation building and on the other extreme the society often overlooks him as a human being and expects him to live by the forced choice norms set up by the society. A teacher who begins his professional life with such a strong commitment and sense of responsibility has to face many challenges. Pressure due to school reform efforts,
inadequate administrative support, poor working conditions, lack of participation in
school decision making, the burden of paperwork and lack of resources have all been
identified as factors that can cause stress among school staff. (Hammond and Onikama,
1997). Where work stress is unrelenting, some negative psychological, physiological and
behavioral consequences may result. (De Robbio and Iwanicki, 1996)

Job stress has its roots in work environment but it adversely affects attitude,
behaviour and health of the individual. Mental health is an absolute necessity if one has
to face all personal and professional problems adequately. The emotional difficulties of
the teachers are often revealed in their treatment of students. When teachers lose control
or resort to sadistic forms of punishment there is little doubt that their behaviour springs
from some emotional instability. The highest degree of mental health permits an
individual to realize the greatest success with his capabilities and derive maximum
satisfaction in life.

A satisfied teacher will have positive attitude towards his profession and will be
in a position to acquire modern sophisticated and scientific technology to teaching. On
the other hand a dissatisfied teacher can do incalculable harm to the nation as he won't be
able to do justice to his duties.

A large number of studies have investigated causes /factors affecting life
Sharma (1980), Shahpur, Nagappa, Doraswami and Venkataiah (1996), Saxena and Rani
(1996), Pinquart and Sorenson (2000) focusing on personality factors (age, sex,
temperament, leadership behaviour, coping strategies) work related factors (inadequate
salary, low status, organizational climate, insensitive administration, low status; general
factors (teacher effectiveness, frustration, self acceptance, modernization, socio economic
status intelligence).

Since education is the key to unlock the door to the growth and development of a
country. It is responsible for improving the quality of life which reflects the pace of
growth and the advancement of the nation .The greatest challenge is to prepare the
students, the future of the country , for the change that is inevitable .No country can
progress if it is proactive in its action which can come only through learning and
education .With the proliferation of institutions of education maintenance of quality of
education is required. This demands competent teachers to cope up with the new changes in the horizon of knowledge, methods and techniques of teaching and proper use of technology in teaching learning process. The success as a teacher certainly depends on satisfaction in job (Naik, 1999) and in life. In the studies, the teacher is perceived as a person exposed to pressures from variety of sources. Out of the various possible predictors of life satisfaction among teachers as evident from earlier researches job stress, locus of control and mental health have been selected for the present study since not much work has been done on these variables. Hence the present study.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

LIFE SATISFACTION IN RELATION TO JOB STRESS MENTAL HEALTH AND LOCUS OF CONTROL OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

1.3. DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS

The general meaning and operational definitions of relevant concepts in the present investigation are as follows

1.3.1. LIFE SATISFACTION

Life satisfaction is a complex concept relating to psychological and environmental life conditions. It denotes an overall evaluation of life. Life satisfaction may be defined as the extent to which a person is pleased or satisfied by the environment or is displeased or frustrated by the inadequate life conditions and environmental situations. Life satisfaction is often considered a desirable goal, in and of itself, stemming from the Aristotelian ethical model, eudaimonism, (from eudaimonia, the Greek word for happiness) where correct actions lead to individual well-being, with happiness representing the supreme good (Myers, 1992). The concept of life satisfaction is part of a broader field of enquiry, commonly referred to as ‘Quality of Life’. The term ‘Quality of Life’ includes affective feelings of happiness, misery and strain and cognitive impression
of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. It indicates the amount of satisfaction one is deriving from one's life as a whole. In other words, it relates to life as a whole and to the specific domains of life (Dasgupta and Ray, 2000).

Ideologically, the line of research is rooted in 18th-century enlightenment thinking. From this perspective, the purpose of existence is life itself rather than the service of king or God. Self-actualization and happiness became central values. Society itself was seen as a means for providing citizens with the necessities for a good life. In the 19th century, this conviction manifested itself in the utilitarian creed that 'the best society is one which provides the greatest happiness for the greatest number. In the 20th century, it inspired large-scale attempts bringing series of reforms and influenced the development of the welfare state. Efforts towards the creation of a better society manifested themselves in attacks on the evils of ignorance, illness, and poverty. Advances in the combat of these social ills were followed by efforts to create welfare states that ensure a good life for everybody, in particular a good standard of living. By the year 1960, when most Western Nations had extensive welfare states, the new theme of 'limits to economic growth' appeared on the political agenda and values came to shift to 'post materialism'. This called for a broader conceptualization of good life and its measurement. As a result, the term 'quality of life' was introduced. The initial use of the concept was polemical stressing more on human existence than material welfare.

The first survey studies which used measures of life satisfaction were performed in U.S.A. in 1960's. The term 'Quality of life' denotes two meanings (1) the presence of conditions deemed necessary for a good life and (2) the practice of good living as such. When used at the societal level, only the former meaning applies. To say that the quality of life of the people in a country is poor, means that the essential conditions such as sufficient food, housing and health care are lacking. In other words, it means that the country is not 'livable' for its inhabitants. However, at the individual level, the term quality of life can take on both meanings. When we say that somebody does not have a good life, we may mean that he/she lacks things deemed indispensable and/or that this person does not thrive. These conditions may coincide, but this is not necessarily the case. A person may be rich, powerful and popular but still be troubled. On the other hand, some one who is poor, powerless and isolated may, nevertheless be thriving both
physically and mentally. These variants are referred as ‘presumed quality of life’ and ‘apparent quality of life’ respectively.

Life satisfaction is one of the indicators of apparent quality of life. Together with indicators of mental and physical health, it indicates how well people thrive. In essence, life satisfaction is a subjective assessment of the quality of one’s life. Satisfaction with one’s life implies a contentment with or acceptance of one’s life circumstances or the fulfilment of one’s wants and needs for one’s life as a whole. Satisfaction is a state of mind which can be evanescent as well as stable through time. It is an evaluative appraisal of something. The term refers to both contentment and enjoyment. As such it covers both cognitive as well as affective appraisals. Life satisfaction is the degree to which a person positively evaluates the overall quality of his / her life as a whole i.e. how much the person likes the life he / she leads. Most people are fully capable of rating the level of their own life satisfaction. The conceptualization of life satisfaction as proposed by theorists in the area suggests how exactly the people make judgment of level of life satisfaction. Angus Campbell (1976) conceptualized life satisfaction as the difference between what one wants and what one has – essentially, a comparison between ideal and reality.

Alex Michalos’s Multiple Discrepancy Theory (1986) also specifies that satisfaction is determined by one’s perception of how things are versus how they should be. Comparisons between how things are and what one wants, what one had, what one expected, what others have and what one feels one deserves confine to determine life satisfaction. Large discrepancies among these areas result in greater life dissatisfaction whereas small discrepancies result in greater life satisfaction.

Joseph Sirgy’s theory (1998) suggests that expectation of what one is capable of accomplishing, one’s past circumstances, one’s ideals, what one feels one deserves, what one minimally requires to be content and what one ultimately believes will occur are comparisons that help determine life satisfaction.

Life satisfaction of an individual is the result of advantage situations. These situations are created by socio-economic conditions, environmental conditions, marital adjustment, attitude, aptitude, organizational climate, job satisfaction etc. anxiety, ego
weakness, frustration, guilt proneness, suspiciousness, influence adversely the life satisfaction of an individual.

Life satisfaction denotes an overall evaluation of life. An overall evaluation of life involves all relevant criteria in the mind of the individual: for example how good one feels, how well the expectations are likely to be met and how desirable various factors are deemed to be. According to Diener (1984) "Life satisfaction is an overall assessment of feelings and attitudes about one’s life at a particular point of time ranging from negative to positive. It is one of the three major indicators of well-being: life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. Although satisfaction with current life circumstances is often assessed in research studies, Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith (1999) also include the following under life satisfaction: desire to change one’s life; satisfaction with past; satisfaction with future; and significant other’s views of one’s life." (Beutell, 2006).

Diener et al. (1985) defined life satisfaction as “a cognitive, judgmental process. It is dependent upon a comparison of one’s circumstances with what is thought to be an appropriate standard.”

Both nature and nurture appear to be influential in determining life satisfaction i.e. life satisfaction may have both stable, trait like components (reflecting the effect of a personality predisposition) as well as variable, state like components (reflecting environmental influences). Environment or Personality explanations in isolation may not be sufficient to explain the source of people’s life satisfaction judgement. Determinants of life satisfaction can be searched for at two levels external: conditions and under psychological processes.

**Demographic Variables**

**Culture:** Cultures that are more accepting of differences (e.g. gender, age, ethnicity, religion) and those that demand equal treatment of and equal opportunity for their citizens appear to foster greater overall satisfaction.

**Gender:** Gender equality within a culture i.e. freedom to make choices, equal pay, equal value under law, equal opportunity to education and achievement report greater life satisfaction.
Social Relationships: Human relationships double our joys and halve our sorrows. High levels of social support thus lead to high levels of life satisfaction.

Income: Life satisfaction is anchored to increase in wealth and material goods. Within nations, wealthier individuals are more satisfied than poor individuals i.e. economic disparities among income levels affect satisfaction.

Employment: An individual’s employment status, regardless of income appears to predict life satisfaction such that the unemployed report significantly diminished satisfaction as compared with the employed.

Education: Education influences life satisfaction. The relationship between education and life satisfaction is probably due to the fact that a higher level of education provides access to greater occupational and income opportunities.

Life satisfaction is only partially reflected in behaviour. Some social behaviour tends to be more frequent among the satisfied (active, outgoing, friendly). However, such conduct can also be observed among the dissatisfied. Consequently, estimates of someone’s life satisfaction by his peers are often wrong. Suicidal behaviour is probably more indicative of dissatisfaction than any other behaviour. Since life satisfaction cannot be inferred from overt behaviour, inner consciousness has to be read off by conducting clinical interviews, life review questionnaires and through surveys. If mental processes involved can be understood, then it is theoretically possible to acquire life satisfaction. However, two theories suggest that life satisfaction cannot be permanently raised. The first theory is that life satisfaction is relative. According to this theory, improvements in living conditions would raise life satisfaction only temporarily because the standards on which the comparison is based would simply change. The second theory is that life satisfaction is an immutable trait rather than a variable state i.e. improvement in the quality of life is unlikely to be reflected in life satisfaction.
Life satisfaction is very important in life. It has two aspects – positive and negative. On one side, it is necessary for man’s progress and on the other side it prevents a man from making healthy progress. If he becomes too much satisfied in his life he remains where he is and has no lust for attaining new things. The person who is not satisfied with what he has, would not be contented with what he would like to have in future i.e. to be more satisfied in life, a person should value what he has rather than constantly strive for more and more. John Schindler quotes, ‘It is easier to be satisfied than dissatisfied and much healthier too’. It is easy and much pleasurable to find elements of satisfaction instead of dissatisfaction in the daily run of events. Every human being looks forward to a day when he is supremely satisfied at the end.

According to Wolman (1973), Satisfaction is the attainment of desires and fulfilment of essential conditions. The Dictionary of life considers life satisfaction to be a dynamic process which goes on throughout one’s life (Brown, 1985).

Life satisfaction is a wide term and has received prime importance from all learned and enlightened saints in almost all religious scriptures.

According to Hindus sacred ‘Gita’ Life satisfaction brings Viveka, Vairagya and Vichara (Swami 1970) and opens the doors of eternal bliss and sunshine.

Sharma (1997) in a poetic English version of Sikh scriptures writes that life satisfaction can be attained by hearing Waheguru which is equal to visiting 68 places of pilgrimage. Proverbs 3.13 and 17 of the Holy Bible express the state of satisfied man as ‘Happy is the man who finds wisdom – his ways are the ways of pleasantness and his paths are the paths of peace. Timothy 6.6 quotes that there is a great gain in godliness with contentment (Brown 1986). In Harper’s Bible Dictionary long life is considered to be most satisfying gift of God (Miller and Miller, 1958).

In Indian philosophy, satisfaction with life is thought to be a state of mind. Life is what our thinking makes it. One makes it hell or heaven through one’s thinking. the more we can enjoy what we have, the happier we are.

Life satisfaction is a great trait of one’s personality. Without it all luxuries and facilities of life will have no value. So man must learn to break tension, worries and anxieties of daily living. Some people have a tendency to undermine themselves. they think that all others are happy and fortunate while only they are condemned to lead a life
of misery. This type of attitude leads to dissatisfaction. Life satisfaction in other words may be defined as the attitude people have towards life. Positive attitude connotes satisfaction and negative attitude connotes dissatisfaction in life.

Life satisfaction includes many aspects such as health, wealth, joy and personal, economic, social and psychological status of man. An individual should be satisfied in all these aspects. Satisfaction in these things can help one to retain mental peace. One who is dissatisfied or discontented with life, a kind of frustration will prevail and he cannot step on the ladder of becoming a good citizen. A dissatisfied person is always surrounded by various troubles, obstacles and he faces the hurdles in the performance of duties assigned to him. Instead of becoming a good citizen he becomes an irritable person.

The criterion of life satisfaction of a person is the amount of happiness that an individual obtains through his work in life. Without satisfaction man cannot lead a better and prosperous life. Satisfaction in life helps him to have a positive and favourable attitude that can help him to overcome stresses and strains of daily life and enjoy better physical (Veenhoven 1991) and mental health (Beutell 2006).

1.3.2. JOB STRESS

Stress is ubiquitous phenomenon in human life. Stress is actually the body's reaction to the stressors we encounter (Kaiser and Polezynski, 1982; Terry, 1997). Stress can be defined as "an adaptive response, mediated by individual characteristics and/or psychological processes, that is a consequence of any external action, situation or event that places physical and/or psychological demands upon a person". (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). This definition includes three concepts important to the overall study of stress:

a) Situational demands or stressors that cause persons to adapt;
b) Individuals tend to react and adapt in different ways to the stressors they are presented and,
c) some form of physical and/or psychological responses will occur (Alley 1980; Eskridge and Coker, 1985; Fimian, 1982; Kreitner, 1989).
The term stress is derived from the Latin word 'Stringer'. Later this word used in the 15th century as a shortened or apathetic form of distress (Rees, 1992) to denote obnoxious human experience. The Oxford English Dictionary informs that in the 17th century 'stress' meant hardship, strain or affliction. However, during the 18th and 19th century the term was used differently in different disciplines. The term stress means 'force, pressure, strain, strong effect exerted upon material object or person's organ or mental power'. Throughout the 19th and 20th century the twin words -stress and strain have been used in a non-specific sense. Psychiatrists also described mental tension as nervous stress and strain (Selye, 1976).

Selye (1974) defined stress as 'the non-specific response of the body to any demand made upon it. According to Gold and Roth (1993) "stress is a condition of disequilibrium within the intellectual, emotional and physical state of the individual; it is generated by one's perception of a situation, which results in physical and emotional reactions. It can be either positive or negative depending upon one's interpretation."

Lazarus (1991) defined stress as the response of the people to different kinds of stressors i.e. the sources of stress which reside in an external or internal aversive event as well as in the disposition or sensitivity of the individual to perceive the aversive event. Therefore, internal characteristics may determine physical and emotional responses exhibited by individuals as a result of stressors (Eskridge and Coker, 1985). According to Goodall and Brown (1980) there are two distinct types of stressors those within and without. Within stressors are those from within the individuals. These stressors tend to include individuals' personal values, attitudes and self concepts. Without stressors originate outside individuals and include such things as environmental or work related demands. The extent of stress which the employees perceive as arising from various constituents and conditions of their job is called as job stress. Such stress has been described as arising "when discrepancies exist between occupational demands and opportunities on the one hand and workers capacities, needs and expectations on the other" (NSWTF, 1988).

Stress has been defined as a stimulus and also as a response. The concept of stress is enshrouded by a thick veil of confusion and divergence of opinion (Pestongee, 1987). Stress has been used by researchers as a term for stress producing events and
conditions (McGrath, 1976 and Beehr, 1995) that are social, psychological rather than physical and also as a strain variable (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980).

Stress is mental, emotional, physical and behavioural response to anxiety producing events (Warrick, 1981). For Cox and Mackay (1981) a transaction between a person and his or her situation would signify stress. The term transaction implies the active and adaptive nature of the process. Stress condition refers to an imbalance between environmental supplies and demands and personal capabilities, needs and values.

Stress is both a psychological and physiological response to aversive life events, situations and stimuli as well as to the accumulation of or overexposure to mundane stimuli or common hassles. Stress results from uncertainty about qualitative effects of the procedure, expectations of pain and discomfort. The term stress as used in the field of psychology is a physical or psychological disturbance an individual experiences as a result of what that individual perceives to be challenging circumstances. Everything that gives pressure on the worker during work and everything that the worker has to overcome and endure during work constitutes job stress. Job stress refers to those aspects of the work environment and the work itself, which create some impact (unhealthy) on the worker.

Job is the economic activity that is the life work of an individual. It is one’s usual or principal work or business especially as a means of earning. It is the profession or work that refers to the activity to which one regularly denotes himself. According to the Encyclopedia of Psychology (1972) job can be distinguished from work. Job is a task or an occupational activity performed by an individual in return for a monetary reward. “Jobs are contracts (explicit or implicit) between a person and an institutional unit to perform work in return for compensation (or mixed income) for a defined period or until further notice." (United Nations)

Collins English Dictionary (1990) describes job as ‘a piece of work’. Barber (1990) defines job as a complex inter relationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards. It involves a contractual agreement between employer and employee and denotes not only the specific responsibilities assigned to the
employee but it is the totality of his responsibilities towards the authorities that have employed him.

Job stress is generally defined in terms of relationship between person and environment. Job stress is a mental distress with respect to some anticipated frustration associated with constituents and conditions of job. Maryolis and Kores (1974) defined job stress “as a condition worth interacting with worker characteristics to disrupt psychological or physiological homeostasis. The causal situation conditions are job stresses and disrupted homeostasis is job related strain.”

According to Westman (2005) “Job stress arises when demands exceed abilities, while job-related strains are reactions or outcomes resulting from the experience of stress.”

Caplan, Cobb and French (1975) have defined job stress as any characteristic of job environment that poses a threat to the individual. Job stress is a negative emotion resulting from one’s job experience.

Beehr (1995) defined job stress as “a situation in which some characteristics of the work situation are thought to cause poor psychological or physical health, or to cause risk factors making poor health more likely.”

Stress experienced at the workplace has several origins. It can emanate from:

a) role related factors,
b) nature of job and its inherent characteristics,
c) factors related to interpersonal and group dynamics
d) organizational, structural factors,
e) interfacing with external environment of the organization.

Job Stress includes stress producing events and conditions (SPECs) in the workplace such as role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, interpersonal conflict with a co-worker and frequently recurring daily hassles at work. All such situations, circumstances, events or conditions become SPECs for a person if they produce serious adverse consequences to the individual, sometimes referred to as strains, may either be physical or psychological (Beehr, 1995 and Mc Grath, 1976).
Mc Grath (1976) maintained that behaviour in organization is a product of interaction of three conceptually independent systems i.e.

a) physical and technological environment in which behaviour takes place.
b) the social medium or nature of inter- personal relationships within which the behaviour occurs and
c) the person or self system of the focal person whose behaviour is under consideration

Mc Grath conceptualized six types of stress that originated from the interaction of three embedded systems as follows:

a) Task based stress (difficulty, ambiguity and load etc.)
b) Role based stress (conflict, ambiguity and load etc.)
c) Stress intrinsic to behavioural settings (effect of crowding and under staffing).
d) Stress arising from physical environment itself (extreme cold, hostile forces etc.)
e) Stress arising from social environment in form of interpersonal relations (interpersonal disagreement, privacy and isolation etc.)
f) Stress within persons, system (anxiety, authoritarianism, intolerance of ambiguity etc.)

Job stress may be defined as the experience of unpleasant emotions such as tension, frustration, anxiety, anger and depression resulting from aspects of work.

Stress has been studied for many years by researchers in psychology, sociology and medicine. Researchers have been enormously interested in the topics of stress, affects of stress and stress management (Ivancevich and Mattes, 1980; Seyle, 1974, 1980). The stress experienced by teachers is no different (Burke, Greenglass and Schwarzer, 1996; Farber, 1984; Kyriacou, 1987). According to Kyriacou (1987). Teacher stress is the experience by a teacher of unpleasant emotions, such as tension, frustration, anxiety, anger, and depression by a teacher, resulting from aspects of work as a teacher. Stress among teachers has continued to be studied since 1930’s when articles on the health and happiness of teachers began to appear in various educational journals (Smith and Milstein, 1984). Although stress always involves a transaction between the
individual and the environment, the stress among teachers is reliably associated with a number of variables.

a) Factors intrinsic to teaching like workload and long working hours (Travers and Cooper, 1987), role overload (Pithers and Soden, 1998) Classroom management, evaluation apprehension (Lewis, 1999; Capel, 1997).

b) Cognitive factors affecting the individual vulnerability of stress like internal attributions (Bibou – Nakou et. al, 1999), self efficacy (Friedman, 2000).

c) Systemic factors i.e. organizational factors dependent on climate of the educational institution operating at the instructional and political level (Harris 1999).

Researchers have continued to express the importance of internal characteristics when evaluating stress (Fielding and Gall, 1982).

Stress among teachers results from various internal characteristics like role preparedness (Fimian and Santoro, 1983; Gupta, 1981; Iwanicki, 1983; Pettegrew and Wolf, 1982; Terry, 1997); job satisfaction (Blasé, 1986); Farber, 1984; Pettergrew and Wolf, 1982); life satisfaction (Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1977; Pettegrew and Wolf, 1982)); illness symptoms (Blasé, 1986; Eskridge and Coker, 1985; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1978), Pettegrew and Wolf 1982); locus of control (Bennett, 1997; Byrne 1992; Farber, 1991; Fielding and Gall, 1982; Halpin et al. 1985); and self – esteem (Byrne, 1992; Farber, 1991; Maslach, 1982). Internal characteristics tend to dictate how individuals will react to stressful events. (Fimian, 1982; Adams, 1999). Other studies have concentrated on several of these factors. For example, Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) cite poor inter-professional communication and co-operation as a major source of stress. Otto (1986) listed time pressures as a source of stress. Research conducted by the South Australian Institute of Teachers indicated lack of time as being the case of either moderate or a great deal of dissatisfaction in 75.1% of respondents.

Negative community attitudes were also identified as a cause of teacher stress. These are particularly relevant to teachers because, according to Pitt and Jennings (1984), education systems as social systems have the following major potential stress elements: bureaucratic structure, intensive interaction between individuals and a continuous evaluation of process and product.
In addition, Otto (1989) noted that stress among teachers was induced by "alienating structures and relationships . . . not only within their school but also at the broader level." Manthei and Solman (Manthei & Solman 1988) reporting on a comparative study of New Zealand and N.S.W. teachers, identified seven structural factors which led to teacher stress. These factors (in summary form) are:

1. Pupil Recalcitrance - pupil misbehaviour, and maintenance of classroom discipline
2. Poor Remuneration - salary not commensurate with training required of teachers
3. Curriculum Demands - implementation problems, and frequent changes
4. Low Professional Recognition - disenchantment with other members of staff and the school administration, poor promotional opportunities
5. Poor Working Environment - class size, shortage of equipment
6. Community Antagonism - undeserved public criticism, lack of respect in society for schools and teachers
7. Time Demands - excessive demands of teaching/organisational duties, lack of time for adequate preparation of assistance with individual pupil difficulties.

Louden (1987) has identified five additional factors as being associated with the level of teacher stress:

a. Feelings of ineffectiveness
b. Professional isolation in the classroom
c. Involuntary transfer
d. Lack of opportunities for part-time work
e. The pressure of involvement in educational research and development.

Stress can arise from many sources i.e. the family, the individual, social environmental conditions and the organization. According to Gupta (1981) there are three major types of stressors: environmental, organizational and individual. Smith and Milstein (1984) found stresses to emerge from environment and individuals. Stressors impinge on people at different points in life cycles sometimes occurring off time (at times that are incompatible with personal and social expectations of their occurrence) or at the
bad time (along with other stressors). The stresses and strains experienced in one domain are carried over to the other. If one experiences much distress of work that stress will be carried over to home which will heighten the sense of awareness of even small distresses experienced in family stresses. Likewise, stresses experienced at home, with friends or from other non–work facets can be carried over to the workplace which might heighten and compound the stresses experienced at work.

SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS OF JOB STRESS IN HUMAN SERVICE PROGRAMS:
1. High resistance to going to work everyday.
2. A sense of failure.
3. Anger and resentment.
4. Guilt and blame.
5. Discouragement and indifference.
7. Isolation and withdrawal.
8. Feeling of tiredness and exhaustion all day.
10. Great fatigue after work.
11. Loss of positive feelings towards client.
13. Stereotyping clients.
14. Inability to concentrate or listen to what client is saying.
16. Cynicism regarding clients; a blaming attitude.
17. Increasingly “going by the book”.
18. Sleep disorders.
19. Avoiding discussion of work with colleagues.
21. More approving of behaviour – control measures such as tranquilizers.
22. Frequent colds and flu.
23. Frequent headaches and gastrointestinal disturbances.
24. Rigidity in thinking and resistance to change.
25. Suspicion and Paranoia.
26. Excessive use of drugs.
27. Marital and family conflict.

The phenomenon of stress is highly individualistic in nature. Some people have high levels of tolerance for stress and thrive very well in the face of several stressors in the environment e.g. working under deadlines and time pressures; meeting high standards of performance expectation and working with inadequate resources. Even though there is both good and bad stress some people regard stress as a pleasant experience (Terry, 1997). In fact, some people will not perform well unless they experience a stress which activates and energizes them to put forth their best efforts. Yet others may have very low levels of tolerance for stress and it appears noxious to them. It is very difficult to study stress because individuals tend to experience and react differently to the stressors they encounter. The amount of stress we need to be productive and the amount of stress that causes one to be unproductive can be as individual as one's personality (Terry, 1997).

For every individual there is an optimum level of stress under which he/she will perform to full capacity. Many researchers contend we need certain amounts of stress to remain productive (Alley, 1980; Goodall and Brown, 1980; Kaiser and Polczynski, 1982; Kreitner, 1989; Schamer and Jackson, 1996; Selye, 1980, Terry, 1997) Selye (1976, 1980) used the term enstress to describe good or productive amounts of stress. Distress is the term used to describe bad stress. Productivity levels decrease when individuals are over or under stressed (Alley 1980). If the stress experienced is below this level, then the individual gets bored, motivational level to work reaches a low level and apathy sets. If one operates in a very low stress environment and consequently experiences boredom, the person is likely to have psychological and physical withdrawal from work. Psychological withdrawal will result in careless mistakes being frequently made, forgetting to do things and thinking of things other than work during work hours. Physical withdrawal will manifest itself in increased rates of absenteeism which may ultimately lead to turnover (Hammond and Onikama, 1997). If on the other hand, the
stressors in an individual's environment are too many or too intense, the performance will be adversely affected as individuals expend their energy coping with stress rather than directing efforts towards enhancement of performance, errors will increase, bad decisions will be made and individuals may experience insomnia, stomach problems, psychosomatic illness (Landsmann, 1979, Blase, 1986).

Organizational performance and individuals health are at their peak at optimum levels of stress. Paine (1981) states that “the consequences of high levels of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills have major personal, organizational and social costs and these costs are probably increasing.”

If the stress in the individual’s environment continues to persist over a long period of time or is severe in intensity the continued and/or intense exposure and resistance exhaust the energy or adaptation response of the body and fatigue sets in due to the excessive wear and tear on the body and mind. This has an adverse impact on the physical, emotional and mental health of the individual which reduces the person’s ability to perform well in his/her daily life. Job stress is the reaction of the worker against the role he plays in his work. If the worker perceives that his values are realized within the job, he improvises a positive attitude towards his job and has low stress levels i.e. those who believe that they will be able to master most demands by doing what is necessary or discovering what to do and how to do are less likely to be threatened or feel helpless or hopeless in stressful situations. This is in contrast with chronically anxious individuals who believe that they are incapable of mastering the situation. Such individuals experience stress and become dissatisfied.

The adverse consequences include low performance and productivity, high rates of absenteeism and turnover, loss of customer because of poor worker attitudes, increased alienation of the workers from the job and even distinctive and aggressive behaviour resulting in strikes and mental problems.

Excessive or chronic work stress can cause the professional to feel burned out which is characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). This can adversely affect the physical, emotional and mental health of the individual and can prevent the person from coping with life adequately.
1.3.3. MENTAL HEALTH

Mental health refers to a sound mental condition or a state of psychological well being or freedom from mental disease. It is a condition or a state of harmonious functioning of the human personality. It is a state of one’s peace of mind, satisfaction, happiness, effectiveness and harmony brought out of one’s level of adjustment with his self and his environment.

Mental health stands for the health of the mind. Carter V. Good (1959) in the Dictionary of Education has termed it as ‘the wholesomeness of the mind’ analogous to the wholesomeness of the body implicit in physical health. Mental health in the same way as physical health is concerned with the health of one’s physical organs and their functioning.

Mental health refers to that condition of an individual which results from the normal organization and functioning of his mind. Like physical health, mental health is also an aspect of the totality of an individual. It is the combined outcome of five types of health-physical, emotional, moral, spiritual and social health. Mental health is an important component of the total health of a person because it is both cause and effect of the other types of health.

The preamble of the Charter of the World Health Organization (1980) points out that ‘A nations greatest asset is its people’ more so when they are endowed with the highest attainable standard of health, which promotes creativeness, dynamism, determination, productivity and the self significance to move ahead. Health is basic requirement, not only for the fulfilment of human aspiration but also for the enjoyment of all mankind, of a better quality of life.”

World Health Organization (1952) defines health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely an absence of disease or infirmity”.

Mental health is an all inclusive concept. It touches upon the total personality, of an individual as he perceives himself and the world at large around him. It reflects the true profile of a person. A consistent style of life, a persistent mode of behaviour emerging from one’s attitude, abilities, habits and values all goes to manifest one’s mental health. Virtually, mental health symbolizes the quality of a person.
According to Wolman’s Dictionary of Behavioral Science (1973) “Mental health is a state of mind characterized by emotional well being, relative freedom from anxiety and disabling symptoms, and a capacity to establish constructive relationship and cope with ordinary demands and stress in life.”

Numerous attempts have been made to define the concept of mental health. In the present day field of mental health, clinicians are concerned with disturbed behaviour of all sorts and its severity and duration. At one extreme are grossly and visibly deranged people once called insane, mad and lunatic and diagnosed as psychotic. At the other end are unhappy people unable to cope effectively with life demands; limited in their ability to love, work or find meaning in their lives.

There has been a steady increase in the range of human problems which have come within the ken of mental health fields. With growing psychological – mindedness and the reduced stigma for seeking professional help, clinicians of today are seeing a wide range of “minor maladjustment”. The development of the psychodynamic and psychosocial framework over the past century has provided concepts and techniques for dealing with the confusion, worries, anxieties and personal problems of people who could hardly be called insane.

Consequently the borders of normal and pathological living are becoming increasingly hard to define- what one should be in the purview of mental health and what should be his personality in the outside world. Increasingly the borders expand as professionals reconceptualize their roles and competencies and the public and social institutions reach out for their help.

Overall there has been a shifting of emphasis from psychological illness to psychological health. Szaz (1961) argues that psychological disturbances should be “..........regarded as the expression of man’s struggle with the problem of how he should live.”

World Health Organization (1981) stated, “The scope of mental health programmes has been enlarged to include not only psychiatry, and neurology but also the psychological, biological and other aspects of health and development in general.

There is no clear consensus as to a definition of normality against which particulars types of deviant or disordered behaviour can be considered abnormal.
Discussions of normality and abnormality, mental health and illness are inevitably filled with value laden terms (Jahoda, 1958, Smith 1961). In this context, Offer and Sabsin (1966) note that health refers to a reasonable rather than an optimal state.

The definitions of mental health can be grouped into three categories as medical, psychological and social phenomenon.

**Mental Health as a Medical Phenomenon**

Those who view mental illness in disease terms believe that constitutional factors are largely responsible for many mental conditions and that genetic and biological factors play an important if not prominent part in exploring the causes of mental illness. From a medical point of view, a mentally healthy person is the one whose psychic systems function in a perfectly balanced manner, free from pathological symptoms i.e. mental illness.

**Mental Health as a Psychological Phenomenon**

Those who view mental illness as primarily disturbance of the personality conceive of such problems as repertoires of behavior and patterns of feeling which have become deeply rooted as a result of the child’s social development and which persist through time, although they are inappropriate to effective social functioning and personal comfort. From a psychological viewpoint mental health is the awareness of unconscious conflicts and subsequent self control based on this awareness.

**Mental Health as a Social Phenomenon**

Such theorists maintain that persons are labelled mentally ill because they fail to conform to certain social standards either because of their own unique understanding and viewpoint or because of their failure to develop certain social skills which others define as necessary. They argue that such difficulties are problems in living which develop because of confusion in communication, maintenance of particular social rules and enforcement of certain moral standards.

**The Social Stress Perspective**
The social stress perspective is not based on an elaborate theory or concept. It is increasingly used as a rationale for public policy in mental health. This perspective assumes that every person has his breaking point and that mental illness and psychiatric disability are products largely of the accumulation of stress in life. This perspective lays stress on the idea that mental illness is environmentally caused.

Psychiatrists agree that environmental influences have an important impact on the development and course of some mental illness. They differ, however, in theories of how environmental forces influenced and interacted with biological and personality influences.

The interrelationship of medical, psychological, social environmental orientation of mental health is quite evident. Mental health covers an elusive field and term encompasses a multiplicity of meanings. Jahoda (1958) points out that there is hardly a term as difficult to define as the term mental health.

Jahoda (1958) who was commissioned by the Joint Commission of Mental Illness and Health made a comprehensive survey of the criteria suggested in the literature and the solutions proposed by her for the criterion problem meant a step forward. However, her truly important contribution is her synthesis resulting in the formulation of six criteria of positive mental health which she describes as follows:

1. **Attitudes towards the self**: They’re the accessibility of the self to consciousness; the correctness of the self concept; its relation to the senses to identify and the acceptance by the individual of his own self.

2. **Growth, development and self actualization**: The extent to which the individual utilizes his abilities, his orientation towards future and his investment in living.

3. **Integration**: The extent to which the psychic forces are balanced; a unifying outlook on life and a resistance to stress.
4. **Autonomy**: The aim here is to ascertain whether the self-reliant person is able to decide with relative ease and speed what suits his own needs best.

5. **Perception of reality**: A relative freedom from need-distortion and existence of empathy.

6. **Environmental Mastery**: Under this heading is listed ability to love, work and play; adequacy in interpersonal relationships, adoption and adjustment, and efficiency in problem solving.

Maslow (1954) states that mental health means freedom from disabling and disturbing symptoms that interfere with mental efficiency, emotional stability and peace of mind.

Allport (1961) describes that a mature personality is synonymous with soundness of health as having six salient qualities.

1. Extension of human endeavour beyond immediate self-interest.
2. Warm relations with others because of self-extension; the mature person is not only more capable of intimacy but also of respect and comparison.
3. Emotional security (self-acceptance). This is reflected both in frustration, tolerance and in trust.
4. Realist perception skills and assignments. This includes not only accurate judgement, but also the capacity to lose oneself in one's work.
5. Self-objectification i.e. insight and humour. To know oneself and to laugh at oneself requires mature detachment.
6. A unifying philosophy of life. The mature person has a sense of direction and purpose and a broad personal philosophy.

According to Auckerman (1961), “Positive mental health is a process not a static quality in the possession of anyone, it is not self-sustained. It can be maintained only by continuous striving and the emotional support of others is needed to keep it.
Komer (1962) describes mental health as a set of goals, intimately related to social values and may take on different forms in different societies.

The National Association for Mental Health of America (1964) describes a mentally healthy person as “One who feels comfortable about himself, feels right about other people, and is able to meet the demands of life.”

Bower (1966) relates mental health to the competence with which an individual lives in his environment and the competence of social institutions (home, school, work, recreation etc.) to make this living as effective as possible. This approach considers mental health in terms of the quality of interaction between an individual and his environment rather than its intra psychic manifestations.

Mereness and Karnosh (1966) wrote that to diagnose mental illness the individual must be studied in totality as he is engaged with varying degrees of success in adjusting to his environment and as his environment affects him.

The only reasonable approach to the study of etiology of mental illness is a consideration of an individual’s total life experiences with emphasis upon genetic, physiological, interpersonal, intrapersonal and cultural factors each of which may have contributed to his problems.

Skinner (1960) quoting U.N.E.S.C.O. documents writes “the whole mental health turns upon the solutions sought and found to the twin problems of maintaining personal security and moving forward to resolve the continual challenges presented by the environment”.

Advisory Committee on Medical Research subcommittee (1985) included not only the hazards of the physical environment but also those that were a consequence of human behaviour in the environment. In developing countries infectious diseases, parasitic diseases and malnutrition lead to many cases of mental disorder (WHO, 1975).

Social and environmental factors such as worries, anxieties, emotional stress, tension, frustration, urbanization, changing family structure, population mobility, economic insecurity, cruelty, rejection, neglect and the like determine the individuals attitudes and also provide the “framework” within which mental health is formulated.
Webster’s International Dictionary (1976) states, “The science of preventing the development of psychosis, neurosis or other personality disturbances is called mental health”.

According to the International Dictionary of Education (1977), “Mental health or mental hygiene is the maintenance of satisfactory personality adjustment and a relative absence of “mental disorder”.

Mental Health is a psychological state of well-being, characterized by continuing personal growth, a sense of purpose in life, self-acceptance, and positive relations with others. Some people define mental health as the absence of mental illness, but many psychologists consider this definition too narrow. Mental health can also refer to a field of study encompassing both mental health and mental illness.

ELEMENTS OF MENTAL HEALTH

Psychologists have identified a number of distinct dimensions of mental health. These include self-acceptance, or self-esteem, characterized by a positive evaluation of oneself and one’s past experiences; personal growth reflected in one’s sense of continued psychological growth and development; a sense that one’s life has purpose and meaning; positive relations with others; environmental mastery, the capacity to manage effectively in the surrounding world; and autonomy, a sense of self-determination and the ability to control one’s own life. Self-acceptance, relations with others, environmental mastery, and autonomy usually improve as a person ages and gains life experience. However, many people find that their personal growth and sense of purpose in life begin to decline in midlife.

Some psychologists regard mental health as the ability to maintain a balance between positive and negative emotions, such as elation and sadness. In this view, a person who displays emotional extremes in either direction is less well-adjusted. Other psychologists emphasize the role of one’s environment in influencing well-being. This perspective sees mental health reflected in a person’s overall happiness with various domains of life, such as social relationships, work, and community life.
FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE MENTAL HEALTH

A number of different aspects of life can influence mental health. In a mid-1970s study of people living in the United States, researchers identified critical areas that influence one’s mental health. These areas are: working life, family life, and the social role that one occupies in the community. Negative experiences in these areas, such as an unreasonable boss or a turbulent family life, can reduce one’s overall sense of well-being.

Another important influence on mental health is stress. In general, people experience stress when the demands placed on them exceed the resources they have available to meet those demands. Significant sources of stress include major life events, such as divorce, death of a spouse, loss of a job, and illness or death in the family. These events can overwhelm a person’s ability to cope and function effectively. In addition, one source of stress may lead to another, as when financial hardship follows job loss. People who experience unusually traumatic events, such as happening of unexpected events or natural disasters, may develop post-traumatic stress disorder.

People may experience chronic stress when confronted with a continuing set of demands that reduce their ability to function. Examples of such demands include working long hours under difficult circumstances and caring for a chronically ill relative. Economic hardship, unemployment, and poverty can also produce chronic stress and undermine mental health.

Genetic factors may partly determine one’s level of happiness and mental health. People seem to display a characteristic level of well-being, with some people usually feeling happy and others typically feeling sad or unhappy. Researchers have found that although people’s moods change in response to both positive and negative events, the effect wears off over time. For example, people who win the lottery or receive an unexpected promotion may feel happier at first, but over time they return to their former characteristic level of mental health. One’s genetic background—that is, the genes inherited from one’s parents—explain more than half of the differences in people’s characteristic mood levels. Genes may also partly determine the range of ups and downs that people feel, including whether people have large mood swings or remain stable from day to day.
Health and development are inseparable. Good health enables people to lead productive life socially and economically. Life is profoundly influenced by whether we perceive control over our life as prominently internal or external. Locus of control influences the way we view ourself and the opportunities. A mentally healthy person accepts that change is part of life and he welcomes it. By planning for the future, he can make his own destiny. He takes his own decisions and then accepts responsibility for making a mistake and acknowledges it. He resolves never to make the same error again and profits by his mistakes.

1.3.4. LOCUS OF CONTROL

Locus of control is the perceived source of control over our behaviour. The concept of Locus of control was first developed by Phares (1957) relating to belief about internal versus external control of reinforcement. It was assumed that individuals develop a general expectancy regarding their ability to control their lives. People tend to ascribe their chances of future successes or failures either to internal or external causes. People who consider themselves as responsible for the outcomes of their actions and/or personality characteristics are said to have an internal locus of control. These individuals often believe that they control their destiny. They tend to be convinced that their own skill, ability and efforts determine bulk of their life experience. Persons with an external locus of control, on the other hand, see environmental causes and situational factors as being more important than internal ones. Such persons believe events in their own lives to be a function of luck, chance, fate, powerful others or powers beyond their control and comprehension. These individuals see luck rather than effort as determining whether they succeed or fail in the future.

Locus of control refers to an individual’s generalized expectations concerning where control over subsequent events resides i.e. who and what is responsible for what happens. It is analogous to, but distinct from attributions. Attributions are explanations that people provide, after the fact, to explain why some event has occurred i.e. they are the explanations for the events that have already happened. Locus of control is grounded in expectancy-value-theory, which describes human behaviour as determined by the
perceived likelihood of an event or outcome accruing contingent upon the behaviour in question and the value-placed on that event or outcome.

Locus of control is a personality construct referring to an individual’s perception about the underlying main causes of events in his/her life. Though this concept was developed by Phares, it is well associated with the name of Julian Rotter. The largest body of empirical data about perceived control is derived from Rotter’s (1966) Social Learning Theory. In Social Learning Theory, Rotter described locus of control as ‘the general expectancy of reinforcement of behaviour’ i.e. reinforcement acts to strengthen an expectancy that a particular behaviour or event will be followed by the reinforcement future. Once an expectancy for such a behaviour—reinforcement sequence is built up, the failure of the reinforcement to occur will reduce or extinguish the expectancy. As an infant develops and acquires more experience, he learns to differentiate events which are casually related to preceding events and those which are not.

It follows a general hypothesis that when the reinforcement is seen as not contingent upon the subject’s own behaviour, its occurrence will not increase an expectancy as much as when it is seen as contingent upon one’s own behaviour. Conversely, its non-occurrence will not reduce any expectancy so much as when it is seen as contingent. It seems likely that depending upon the individuals’ history of reinforcement, individuals would differ in the degree to which they attribute reinforcements to their own actions (Rotter 1966).

Locus of Control is an expectancy variable that describes the perception of control that one has over the reinforcement that follows one’s behaviour. The effects of reward of reinforcement preceding behaviour depends in part on whether the person perceives reward as contingent on his own behaviour or independent of it. Acquisition and performance differ in situations perceived as determined by skill or chance.

Rotter believed that behaviour was largely guided by reinforcements (rewards and punishments) and that through contingencies such as rewards and punishments individuals come to hold beliefs about what causes their actions. These beliefs, in turn, guide what kind of attributes and behaviour people adopt.

Locus of Control orientation is a belief about whether the outcomes of our actions are contingent upon what we do (internal control orientation) or on events outside our
personal control (external control orientation). An internal person perceives that he is in control of his fate and that effort and reward will be correlated. But an external person perceives that powerful others or the systems determine how well he can do and that rewards are distributed by such powerful others in a random fashion.

Rotter (1966) classified generalized beliefs concerning who or what influences things along a bipolar dimension from internal to external control. 'Internal control' is the term used to describe the belief that control of future outcomes resides primarily in oneself while 'external control' refers to the expectancy that control is outside of oneself, either in the hands of powerful other people or due to fate/chance. Hannah Levenson (1973) offered an alternative model. His model asserts that there are three independent dimensions: internality, chance and powerful others. According to Levenson's model, one can endorse each of these dimensions of Locus of Control independently and at the same time.

As defined by Rotter (1966), the construct of locus of control refers to a generalized expectancy individuals have concerning the events to which they themselves play a causative role in specified life events. They tend to believe that a given (success or failure) depends on their behaviour, skills and resources; externals believe that controls reside outside of themselves in the form of chance or powerful others.

Rotter (1966) further defined internal external control of reinforcement as, “when reinforcement is perceived as entirely contingent upon actions then it is typically perceived as a result of luck, chance, fate as under the control of powerful others or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. We have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relative permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control.

Locus of control is thus a quality of characterizing person’s predisposition to attribute the responsibility for the result of his activity to outside forces (external locus of control) or to his own capabilities and efforts (internal locus of control). It is a generalized expectancy being an abstraction from the host of experiences in which expectancies have met with varying degrees of satisfaction (Lefcourt, 1972). Thus, locus
of control is conceptualised as referring to a unidimensional continuum, ranging from external to internal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Locus of Control</th>
<th>Internal Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual believes that his/her behaviour is guided by fate, luck, or other external circumstances</td>
<td>Individual believes that his/her behaviour is guided by his/her personal decisions and efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locus of Control, generally, stems from family, culture and past experiences leading to rewards. Most internals have been shown to come from families that focused on efforts, education and responsibility. Children of working mothers show more internal locus of control (Sharma and Gupta, 1997). As the people get older and higher in organizational structures, they tend to be more internal (Mamlin Harris and Case 2001). On the other hand, most externals come from families of low socio-economic status (Rotter, 1972), where there is a lack of life control.

Locus of control is a response to circumstances. Some psychological and educational interventions have been found to produce shifts towards internal locus of control (e.g. outdoor education programs (Hans (2000); Hattie, Marsh, Neill and Richards (1997).

According to Lefcourt (1976), “As a general principle internal control refers to the perception of positive and / or negative events as being a consequence of one’s own actions and thereby under personal control; external control refers to the perception of positive and / or negative events as being unrelated to one’s own behaviour in certain situations and therefore, beyond personal control.

In general, it seems to be psychologically healthy to perceive that one has control over those things which one is capable of influencing i.e. internal locus of control can be referred to as “self agency”. This means that thoughts control action and this executed function of thinking positively affects beliefs, motivation and performances, i.e. self as an
agent consciously or unconsciously directs, selects and regulates the use of all knowledge, structures and intellectual processes in support of personal goals, intentions and choices.

But it is important to consider the subtleties and complexities before forming a notion that internal is good and external is bad. Internal people who lack competence, efficacy and opportunity can become neurotic, anxious and depressed. In other words, internals need to have a realistic sense of their circle of influence in order to experience success. With all the studies done in this area, research finds have shown some characteristics to be more typical to internals and externals. Internal control is manifest as an individual’s tendency to perceive himself as the cause of what happens to him and external control as a tendency to attribute this causality to external forces. This second formulation is an interpretation in terms of “causal attribution” by reference to the attribution theory described mainly by Heider (1958) and Kelley (1967).

These two formulations of locus of control, although apparently equivalent give rise to conceptually very different interpretations. Indeed, there is a difference between an individual’s perceiving of a given determinant as a cause of what happens to him (causal attribution) and his believing that he can control what happens to him (behavioural outcome contingency). In the first case, the individual identifies the probable cause of an event, and each of these causes can be classified as internal or external in relation to himself. In the second case, however, once causality has been attributed to his various personal characteristics or to the environment, the individual analyzes the forces involved and he senses whether he can influence the outcome in question through his own behaviour.

An individual’s belief that an internal cause has an influence on events does not necessarily mean that he believes he can control the event in question. Conversely, when he believes that an external cause has an influence, it does not mean that he believes he cannot control the event. This basic distinction appears to come through the following statement by Wong and Sproule (1984) “External causality does not necessarily imply the absence of internal control”. For example, an individual perceiving the influence of external determinants on a given event can very easily believe that he can control this event, if he is able to manipulate his environment and thus influence the event in
question. Attributing influences to internal or external causes is a concept which differs from that of perceiving control.

Rotter, Seaman and Liverant (1962) “Internal control refers to the perception of positive and / or negative events as being a consequence of one’s own actions and thereby under personal control whereas external control refers to the perception of positive and / or negative events as being unrelated to one’s own behaviour in certain situations and therefore, beyond personal control.” It appears from this definition that the aspect of an individual’s control over reinforcement (perceived behavioural outcome contingent) is closer to Rotter’s concept than it is to the aspect of causal attribution. This is a position which seems to have had the implicit support of several early researches on locus of control. The terms used by these authors to characterize an internal or external locus of control are very revealing in this regard. For example, on the subject of the internal locus of control such expressions are found as “views the outcome of events as the consequences of his own control” (Cromwell, 1967), “a general expectancy that people can control events” (Coan, Fairchild and Dabyns, 1973), “possess power over what happens to him” (Lefcourt, 1966), “has power over what happens to him” (Mischel, Zeuiss and Zeiss 1974), “are usually able to influence their environment and exert control over it.” (Genmill and Heisler, 1972), believe they are skilled in manipulating the environment to get what they want” (Collins, Martin, Asmore and Ross 1973), “the subjects expectancy that his own behaviour would change the probability that reinforcement might occur” (Stephen and Delys, 1973), “expectation that one’s actions generally make a difference...- to increase the subjective probability that any desired outcome can be secured by a particular behaviour (Abramouwitz, 1973). Research, findings have shown the following characteristics to be more typical of internals:

1. Internals are more likely to work for achievement, to tolerate delays in rewards and to plan for long-term goals.
2. After experiencing success in a task, internals are likely to raise their behavioural goals in contrast, externals are more likely to lower their goals.
3. After failing a task, internals re-evaluate future performances and lower their expectations of success. After failure, externals raise their expectations.
4. Internals are better able to resist coercion.
5. Internals are more likely to learn about their surrounding and learn from their past experiences.
6. Internals experience more anxiety and guilt with their failures and use more repression to forget about their disappointments.
7. Internals are less willing to take risks.
8. Internals are better at tolerating ambiguous situations.
9. Internals derive greater benefits from social supports.
10. Internals make better mental health recovery in the long term adjustment to physical disability.
11. Internals are more likely to prefer games based on skills, while externals prefer games based on chance or luck.
12. Internals are more willing to work on self improvement and better themselves through remedial work.
13. Internals find solving their own bouts of depression easier. Likewise they are less prone to learned helplessness and serious depression.

As far as the external locus of control is concerned, the expressions are also quite significant: “they feel that they have little control over their environment “ (Tesser and Grossman, 1969), “feel their destinies are beyond their own control (Levenson, 1975), “as perceived lack of control on awareness that one’s efforts to cope with the world are not effective (Phares, 1976), “lacks power over what happens to him” (Lefcourt, 1966), “has no power over what happens to him (Mischel, et, al. 1974), “believes that the events in his life are for the most part beyond his influence” (Broedling, 1975).

Peterson (1987) in dealing with a theoretical clarification on the concept of locus of control defined internal locus of control as the perception that an individual has of being able to influence the occurrence of reinforcements around him by his behaviour. In the same way, the external locus of control expresses the perception of an individual who believes that influencing reinforcement around him is not within his control.

According to International Dictionary of Education (1977), “Locus of Control is the personality construct referring to an individuals’ perception of the place of events as determined internally by his / her own behaviour against luck, fate or external forces”. 
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Research findings indicate that locus of control has proved to be extremely useful in the prediction of a variety of behaviours (Lefcourt, 1981, 1982). Individuals tend to be very highly discriminative in their social behaviour, hence the effects of individual differences tend to be relatively specific, dependent on the particulars of the psychological situation in which behaviour occurs (Mischel, Zeiss and Zeiss, 1974).

Due to various outcomes individuals change their expectancies for success and failures (Phares, 1957). Individuals are specially prone to react against covert or subtle influence (Ritchie and Phares, 1969; Gore and Rotter, 1963) relate the I-E control dimensions to factors of social action taking; Crown & Liverant (1963) to conformity behaviour; Phares (1965) to ability to persuade others and Rotter and Mulry (1965) to decision time.

Results of these investigations have shown that the individual who tends to perceive reinforcement as contingent upon his behaviour is more likely to attend to, and to learn and remember information that will affect his future goals (Seeman, 1963; Seeman and Evans 1962) and to be generally more concerned with his ability particularly his failure. The individuals who seem to be more internal also appear to have a better need for independence (Crown and Liverant, 1963). Internals tend to become more sensitive to external changes and more likely to respond to them than externals (Lefcourt, 1972; Phares, 1973; Cheung and Chau, 1982).

The teachers perceptions of control regarding the experience of stress, locus of control as a personality dimension has been widely explored. There is some evidence to indicate that teachers with a belief in external locus of control report more stress and may be are more stress prone (Mc Intyre, 1984; Kyriacou and Sutcliffe, 1979; Paine and Fletcher, 1981; Tellenbuck, Brenner and Lofgren, 1983).

Furthermore, Locus of control was found to be an important moderate of life stress, in that internals were able to cope with the effects of stressful events through their relationships while for externals life stress deprived them of a buffer against stressful events (Lefcourt, 1972). Locus of control serves to enhance stability and satisfaction as well as increase life satisfaction.

Some people accept defeat and surrender themselves to the woeful forces of environment and hold themselves responsible for the problem, they use some novel
method and adopt systematic planned steps for the solution of their problems, and they make serious efforts to find solutions to their problems. Proper intellectual development is reflected in the ability to understand and solve problems. To cope up with environment one needs to have a healthy self image and belief in his potential and abilities. A person cannot do creative and satisfactory work if he lacks equilibrium between internal and external self. He may destroy his physical as well as mental health. This will result in dissatisfaction in life.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Life Satisfaction

A man would be completely happy if he is satisfied in all respects of life. A life that involves the satisfaction of very many simple desires gives us pleasure. These desires arise due to a number of behavioural actions that are related to overt or covert behaviour of the concerned individual or these may be environmental i.e. related to social, mental and physical environment. (Wilson, 1968)

Job Stress

Job is a task or an occupational activity performed by an individual in return for a monetary reward (Encyclopedia of Psychology, 1972).

Job Stress is any characteristic of job environment that poses a threat to the individual. Job stress is a negative emotion resulting from one’s job experience. (Caplan, Cobb and French, 1975)

Job Stress is a condition worth interacting with worker characteristics to disrupt psychological or physiological homeostasis. The causal situation conditions are job stresses and disrupted homeostasis is job related strain (Maryolis and Kores, 1974).

Mental Health

Mental health is a condition which permits optimal development i.e. physical, intellectual and emotional aspect of the individual so far as this is compatible with that of other individuals (World Health Organisation, 1983)
Locus of Control

Rotter (1966) defined internal and external control of reinforcement as, “when reinforcement is perceived as entirely contingent upon his actions then it is typically perceived as a result of luck, chance, fate as under the control of powerful others or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. We have labelled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relative permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control.

1.4. RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

We are living in the age of growing complexities and pressures where human constitution and capacities are being taxed severely. Stress has become a predominant feature of modern life exerting far reaching effect on the behaviour and adjustment on as well as off the job. The stress and strains experienced in one domain are carried to the other. Bottling up of stress makes the situation worse at later stage when one has reached the limits of one’s capacity to endure it. This adversely affects physical, mental and emotional health of the individual, which reduces person’s ability to perform well in his/her daily life. Only a mentally healthy person is able to deal with the problems as and when they arise. One enjoys mental health to the fullest extent if one accepts and respects oneself in the very shape and existence. On the other hand a mentally unhealthy person fails to develop a positive healthy self concept and does not attain a happy concept of life. At the same time, such a person has poor perception and lacks proper adjustment in life. A satisfied and healthy person has a state of mind that enables him to experience the greatest amount of happiness and attain the maximum sufficiency in life in spite of the presence of strain and conflict. Dissatisfaction can lead to reactions like empathy, aggression, anxiety and neurosis. It is injurious in terms of money, time, services, job efficiency etc. Since the teachers are the nation builders and minds of young future citizens are moulded by them, the teachers must be satisfied in their life so that they can deliver the goods to the best of their ability. Researchers have drawn attention towards various institutional and personal factors leading to dissatisfaction among teachers.
However the problem of dissatisfaction among elementary school teachers still lacks attention and probe. Hence the present study.

1.5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Every research is done keeping in view certain objectives which are to be accomplished during study. The present study has been undertaken keeping in view the following objectives:

1. To study the Life Satisfaction of elementary school teachers in relation to Job Stress.
2. To study the Life Satisfaction of elementary school teachers in relation to Mental Health.
3. To study the Life Satisfaction of elementary school teachers in relation to Locus of Control.
4. a) To study the difference between various groups of elementary school teachers on the basis of gender (male or female), location of school (urban or rural), type of school (govt. or private), marital status (married or unmarried), and the length of service on the variable of Life Satisfaction.
   b) To study the difference between various groups of elementary school teachers on the basis of gender (male or female), location of school (urban or rural), type of school (govt. or private), marital status (married or unmarried), and the length of service on the variable of Job Stress.
   c) To study the difference between various groups of elementary school teachers on the basis of gender (male or female), location of school (urban or rural), type of school (govt. or private), marital status (married or unmarried), and the length of service on the variable of Mental Health.
   d) To study the difference between various groups of elementary school teachers on the basis of gender (male or female), location of school (urban or rural), type of school (govt. or private), marital status (married or unmarried), and the length of service on the variable of Locus of Control.
5. To find out the difference between elementary school teachers with high and low Job Stress on the variable of Life Satisfaction
6. To find the difference between the elementary school teachers with high and low Mental Health on the variable of Life Satisfaction
7. To study the difference between the elementary school teachers with internal and external Locus of Control on the variable of Life Satisfaction.

1.6. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The field of research is very wide and vast. There are numerous problems. Taking into view the limited time and resources available for the investigator the problem has been limited to the following fields:

1. The study was conducted on the elementary school teachers of Punjab.
2. The study was delimited to the elementary school teachers of five districts of Punjab, namely Jalandhar, Ludhiana, Amritsar, Patiala and Sangrur.
3. The study was restricted to 680 elementary school teacher.

1.7. ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH REPORT

Having presented the importance and need for conducting the present study along with objectives in the introductory Chapter I and also theoretical viewpoints about predictors, Chapter-II deals with the review of related studies and hypotheses. Chapter III provides detailed account of method and procedure employed in the present study. Chapter IV presents the nature of score distribution. Chapter V gives details of analysis of data and discussion of results of the study and Chapter VI deals with summary, conclusions and suggestions for further research. The bibliography and appendices have been given at the end of the research report.