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OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AND STRAIN

Stress has become a major buzzword and a legitimate concern of the present times. Factually speaking, whosoever is born on this platform of the universe has to undergo the stress and strain, though it may vary with different situations and from individual to individual (Shah, 1997).

The volume of stress research continues to grow. The term 'stress' was used in medicine and psychology as early as 1914 by 'Canon' (cf Mason, 1975). Selye (1956), the father of stress research revolutionized the medical field with his proposal of non-specific bodily reactions to many types of demands made upon it. Selye (1956) defined stress as "the state manifested by a specific syndrome which consists of all the non-specifically induced changes within a biological system."

However, the concern regarding stress at work is comparatively new. Newman and Beehr (1979) noted that occupational stress first appeared as a keyword in 'Psychological Abstracts' in 1973, indicating that there was not enough published material prior to this time to warrant this heading. Pioneering work-stress researchers such as Jack French and his colleagues (French et al., 1962; French and Caplan, 1972) and Alan McLean (1966) began their research programs 25 years ago (Cooper and Payne, 1988).

Within the last two decades, a broad interest in occupational stress by academicians has emerged (Cooper and Payne, 1978, 1980; Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980; Cooper, 1983; Quick and Quick, 1984; Beehr and Bhagat, 1985). Rao (1983), Palsane et al. (1986) and Pestonjee (1992) are some of the contributors to the stress research in the Indian context.

It is not an exaggeration to conclude that occupational stress has become a central topic in the field of organizational behaviour (Staw, 1984).

Definitions

Stress is not an easy construct to define, as it means different things to different people. Occupational Stress researchers have typically defined stress in one of the three ways: as a stimulus, a response, or stimulus - response relationship.

A stimulus definition of stress refers to a job stressor which is any environmental event in the work place requiring some type of adaptive response. Using
this definition, a wide variety of working conditions have been studied as examples of stresses, including the role conflict, the role ambiguity, the role of overload (Kahn et al., 1964; Beehr et al., 1976), the danger of accidents, and the pace of work (e.g., Frese, 1985).

In contrast, a response definition of stress is associated with what was referred to earlier as strain. Stress is an individual’s response to work-related environmental stressors. Selye (1976) refers to stress as the reaction of the organism which can be psychological, physiological, or behavioural.

Finally, stress may be defined within a stimulus response approach. Researchers who refer to stress in this way refer to the interaction between environmental stimuli (job stressors) and individual response (strains) (Beehr and Franz, 1987).

Mc Grath (1976) opened that the word stress is used to label an area of study, as is done in other topical areas in industrial and organizational psychology (e.g., leadership, job design). In this context, the term stressor is often used to refer to job or organizational conditions, and the term strain is used to refer to the individual’s response to these conditions.

Strain refers to a person's maladjustive psychological, physiological and behavioural responses to stress. It is interchangeably used with terms such as job tension, job anxiety etc. Operationally, it may manifest itself in reported anxiety, depression, psychosomatic complaints, debilitation and physiological changes in blood chemistry etc.

Stress continues to be defined in a number of ‘different ways’ (Cox, 1978), and at a number of different ‘levels of analysis’ (Cox et al., 1992). Thus, stress has been treated as a stimulus, a response, or as a result of some interaction or imbalance between the individual and aspects of the environment (French et al., 1974; Newton, 1989; Cox 1990).

The concepts such as stress, demand and arousal (Cox, 1985) and stress and coping (Edwards and Cooper, 1988) have been frequently confounded. Some researchers like Eulberg et al. (1988) suggest that a level of precision that avoids the temptation of all inclusiveness is needed while defining stress. Others argue that a more focused research would place less reliance on the exact definition of the concept (Kasl, 1983).
Beehr and Newman (1978) defined job stress as "a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs characterized by changes within the people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning. According to Forman and Myers (1987) stress is the body's physical, mental and chemical reaction to stressors or circumstances that frighten, excite, endanger, confuse, challenge, surprise, anger or irritate—such as unrealistic job deadlines, financial strain or broken relationships. More simply, Reilly and Clevenger (1995) state that stress could be said to occur when there is an imbalance, either real or perceived, between environmental demands and the response capability of the individual. Occupational Stress (OS) thus refers to this imbalance resulting from job-related demands and abilities.

Ivancevich and Matteson (1993) defined stress simply as "the interaction of the individual with the environment". They went on to give a more detailed working definition of stress as "an adaptive response, mediated by the individual differences and/or physical processes, that is a consequence of any external (environmental) action, situation or event that places excessive psychological and/or physical demands on the person."

Luthans (1995) defined stress in a simplified manner as "an adaptive response to an external situation that results in physical, psychological, and/or behavioural deviations for organizational participants."

Models of Stress

The stress literature has a multitude of complex models. Most of the stress models viz., Kahn (1970) and Michigan group and House (1972) identified three major sources of stress viz., personal, organisational and social.

The different models of stress are:

i) Multi-disciplinary model (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980);
ii) Conceptual model of stress (Arsenault, 1983);
iii) Structural model of stress (Hendrix et al., 1985);

These intra-organisational stressor models include factors such as organisational climate, management style, job design and group conflict. Extra-organisational stressors include factors such as family relations, residential area and economic factors.
Correlates of Occupational Stress

A number of variables have been proposed as correlates of stress (Cooper et al., 1988). The available extensive literature on occupational stress demonstrates that the causes of stress are many and varied including those which are intrinsic to the job itself (Rees, 1990). Sharma (1986) identified various factors of stress and listed the most critical ones to be demanding work, role conflict, worries about getting promotion, uncongenial work atmosphere, unhealthy home and family liability etc.

Rees (1990) stresses that any list of stressors will not have uniform effect on individuals. People bring along their differing personalities to work, and in stress studies two personality characteristics have been recognized as important predictors of response to pressure - Locus of Control and Type A:

(a) Locus of Control: People who have an internal locus of control, experience less stress than externally oriented people who think that they cannot control anything. Wadell (1983) also found significant locus of control differences in subjects in different occupations.

(b) Type-A behaviour pattern: Findings of Weber (1983) suggest that Type A persons create a cognitive trap whereby they generate stress regardless of the requirements or reality of the situations.

According to Sharma (1986), no variable other than hostility can explain stress better. Hostility, in fact explains up to 60 percent of variance in stress. He therefore, strongly advocated that hostility is the main predictor of stress and both go together hand in hand. Moreover, he added, that it is clear from the correlations that psycho-physical disturbances are also related to stress and there exists a causal relationship between them.

Evans and Coman (1993) postulated that negative perceptions of the work environment heighten respondents' perceptions of stress. Stressing the importance of personality variables, they opined that higher correlations between job context, stress and personality variables point to relative importance of organizational variables as a source of work-related stress.

The various variables like demographic factors, factors intrinsic to the job, and other factors like tensions that might exist at the interface between home and work, frustrations and disappointments about career achievements, perceptions about the organization and all the stress associated with 'being and working with other people' (Rees, 1990) - can be called as correlates of occupational stress.
**Moderators of Stress**

In the structural model proposed by Cooper and his colleagues (Cooper et al., 1988), the experience of stress is moderated (perhaps enhanced) by individual characteristics of personality, demographic factors and coping strategies with consequent effects on people.

Farne et al. (1994) opined that an increasing number of studies have revealed that some personality variables reduce the immuno - suppressive impact of stressors viz., attributes such as a sense of humour (Martin and Dobin, 1988), internal locus of control (Kubitz et al., 1986), coping efficacy (Bandura et al., 1985), a general capability of adjustment (Levy et al., 1985) and a series of traits called 'hardiness' (Kobasa, 1979).

Brief et al. (1988) and Spector and O'Connell (1994) also suggested that personality can affect both people's perceptions of the job and their affective reactions.

Singh (1991) reported a study that (a) organizational stress could be prevented by attracting highly qualified people and retaining them on equitable compensation; people with high expressive work ethic might also resist stress; (b) promotion of professional management, professional help and adequate welfare provision in organizations would also help prevent stress; (c) neither too tight nor too loose but a balance of both in structuring the organization is ideal for preventing stress; and (d) nurturant task leadership could be used to prevent stress and to produce results especially in the inadequate resource conditions and in relationship oriented cultures.

**Sources of Stress**

According to Cooper and Marshall (1978) “stress is essentially individually defined, and so it must be understood with reference to characteristics of both the individual and his environment”.

The causes of stress can be categorized into extra - organizational, organizational, group stressors, and individual stressors and dispositions. In combination or singly, they represent a tremendous amount of potential stress impinging upon today's job holder at every level and in every type of organization (Luthans, 1995) Fig. G.
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The antecedents of stress or so-called stresses affecting today's employees are summarized in figure F. As shown, these causes come from both outside and inside the organization and from the groups that employees are influenced by and from employees themselves (Luthans, 1995).

The sources of occupational stress can be classified into two main groups: sources of stress at work and individual characteristics. Work stressors could be intrinsic to the job, related to the employee's role in the organization or to career development, relationships at work or the particular organizational structure and climate. Individual characteristics can include levels of anxiety, neuroticism and so on (Fox and Poole, 1995).

However, stress research, in general, no longer directed either environmental stressors on the one hand or personality dispositions on the other. Instead, stress is regarded as a complex phenomenon which occurs and develops through the interaction of the person-environment process (Mitchell et al., 1988).

Thus, a separate cluster of stressors affecting individual characteristics, what Greenberg (1990) calls extra-organizational sources of stress and which include family problems and life crises, although not specific to the work environment, are also now of interest. These 'extra-organizational' stressors once neglected in the past research, can influence employee's performance too.

Holt (1982) divided independent variables in stress research into 'objectively' and 'subjectively' defined stressors, the distinction referring to whether the researcher or the person being stressed defined the stressful stimulus. Variables typically used in stress research can be categorized into four types:

(i) personal characteristics,
(ii) interpersonal factors,
(iii) task properties, and
(iv) organizational.

The latter two categories, task properties and organizational variables, correspond to the so-called 'objective' stressors (Fox and Poole, 1995).


**DAILY HASSLES AND UPLIFTS**

Stressors are of two types (a) Life Event Stress (b) Chrome Stress or daily hassles. Minor events or Daily Hassles and Uplifts are those stressors which a person experiences in the process of his every day life - situations. They are different from major life-events and tend to have different negative behavioural outcomes (Kanner et al., 1981).

Hassles are the minor negative events while uplifts are minor positive events (Stone et al., 1987). Hassles and Uplifts are related to the health of an individual. The influence of stress may be more apparent if it is linked in time with the health outcome investigated, and therefore the best measure for illness research is likely to be minor events (Swartz, 1991).

Researchers have also implicitly assumed that all minor events are equivalent, summing them into an overall measure of everyday stress for analytic purposes (Bolger et al., 1989). Stone et al. (1987) found that increases in the frequency of hassles and decreases in uplifts predicts illness onset. Evans et al. (1988) and Evans and Edgerton (1991) obtained significant effects only for decreases in uplifts. Thus, it is clear that decreases in uplifts may be of primary importance when considering the effects of minor events on illness.

The fact that there is an increase in the daily hassles and a decrease in the number of uplifts experienced by the person some days prior to preceding illness episodes, is also consistent with immunological hypotheses regarding the mechanisms by which psychological input affects physical pathology (Evans et al., 1988).

It has also been seen that the type of event eg., financial, work - related stress or so on is also important in predicting their stressful effect on the person. Evans and Edgerton (1991) carried out a post hoc analysis and found that events which produced effects were mainly interpersonal in nature. They concluded that nature of the event may be of greater importance than the distinction between uplifts and hassles. Totman and Kiff (1979) also found interpersonal stressors to be particularly important.

Bolger et al. (1989) found that interpersonal events were the most distressing type of daily stressors and affected mood differently than other stressors. Interpersonal events were also found to be related to appearance of illness symptoms. In a study, relative changes in opportunities for social activity during the previous three months
predicted Upper Respiratory Infection symptoms whereas simple life events did not (Totman and Kiff, 1979).

Stressing the importance of time-frame in research, Evans and Edgerton's (1991) results suggested that in a very short term, dips in interpersonal events help predict when a particular individual will become ill. They argued that over a longer time period, interpersonal events may predict which individuals will become ill. Daily assessments may not be that effective in identifying individual differences in daily hassles and uplifts resulting in vulnerability to illness.

Lyons and Chamberlin (1994) studied the effect of daily hassles and uplifts on Upper Respiratory Infections (URI). They found that factors which moderate stress effects e.g., optimism, also moderate the effect of interpersonal events on health. The results indicated a negative correlation of uplifts with hassles and a positive correlation with optimism and self-esteem. On the whole, the study found that interpersonal hassles and uplifts did not directly influence URI or non-URI symptoms.

This is contrary to previous research (Evans and Edgerton, 1991; Totman and Kiff, 1979). The time-frame employed in the study may account for the difference in results. Using a two-week interval may have obscured the day-to-day variability in interpersonal events which could be crucial in affecting vulnerability to infectious illness.

To conclude, it may be summarised that there is empirical support for the proposition that daily hassles and uplifts are the stressors which affect an individual's day to day functioning and contribute in determining how effective one is.
BURNOUT

In 1974, Freudenberger introduced the term “burnout” to refer to a set of symptoms associated with frustration, physical fatigue, and emotional exhaustion observed in individuals whose professional responsibilities involved working with demanding patients and clients. The modern day life styles with taxing routines along with fiercely competitive social roles has led to an alarming situation where concepts like stress and burnout have emerged as significant part of our daily lives. Maslach and Schaufeli (1993) reported that well over 2,000 papers, books, book chapters, and dissertations have appeared since 1974 - a statistics that is immediately apparent upon examination of two recent bibliographies of the burnout literature (Kleiber and Enzmann, 1990 ; Lubin, et al., 1992).

Luthans (1995), reported that as far as the increasingly popular term “burnout” is concerned, some stress researchers contend that burnout is a type of stress (Gahster and Schaubroeck, 1991), while others treat it differently. A recent comprehensive review of job - burnout says that it is characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993).

The concept of burnout has been included in the present study because of its growing importance in the studies concerned with helping professions. Buronout is most closely associated with the so - called helping professions such as nursing, education and social work (Evans and Fischer, 1993).

The present study is a venture in a new field - Judiciary.

Definitions

Maslach and Jackson (1986) offered the most widely cited definition of burnout. According to them, it is “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind”. The symptoms associated with the three components include low energy, feelings of lack of control and helplessness, lowered motivation to engage in work, and negative attitudes toward self, work, and others (Pines, et al., 1981). Other authorities (Cherniss, 1980 ; Hallsten, 1993) suggested similar definitions, albeit with somewhat different emphasis and scope.
Webster's International Dictionary (1976) states that "burnout means to fail, to wear out, or become exhausted by reason of excessive demands on energy stores or resources." Meyer (1980) stated that "burnout is the psychological state of mind of a professional worker who feels overworked, overwhelmed and alienated from other staff, from clients, and eventually from himself".

'Burnout' is used to refer to the situation in which what was formerly a 'calling' becomes merely a 'job'. One no longer lives to work but works to live. In other words, the term refers to loss of 'enthusiasm, excitement' and a 'sense of mission' in one's work (Lesson, 1981).

Carroll and White (1982) proposed an ecological perspective of burnout. According to this perspective, burnout is viewed as a form of ecological dysfunction (Carroll, 1980). Burnout occurs whenever a person with inadequate stress management and inadequate need-gratifying skills must work in a stressful and need-frustrating work environment. The dynamic interaction of personal variables and environmental variables usually generates burnout.

Brill (1984) states that "burnout is an exaction mediated, job related, dysphoric and dysfunctional state in an individual, without major psychopathology, who has: (i) functioned for a time with adequate performance and effectiveness in the same job situation but (ii) who will not recover to previous levels without help or environmental re-arrangement."

Maslach (1981) proposed that burnout is a transactional process consisting of the following stages:

1. An imbalance between resource and demand (stress);
2. Immediate, short-term emotional response to this imbalance is characterised by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue and exhaustion (strain);
3. A number of changes in attitudes and behaviour, such as a tendency to treat client in detached and mechanical fashion.

*Transactional Definition of Burnout*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Defensive Coping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Resourses</td>
<td>Tension</td>
<td>Emotional Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irritability</td>
<td>Rigidity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Burnout thus refers to a transactional process consisting of job stress, worker strain and psychological accommodation. It represents a response to an intolerable work situation.

**Assumptions of Burnout**

Carroll and White (1982) listed the following assumptions of burnout.

a. Burnout is caused by prolonged exposure to stress and frustration caused by personal and environmental factors.

b. Burnout is a holistic or psycho - biosocial concept.

c. The quality of interpersonal relationships that distinguish the work environment and other ecosystems of workers is a very important consideration in the study of burnout.

d. Recognition of burnout signs in the individual will depend much on the sign’s origin, severity and duration besides the observer’s theoretical orientation to burnout, his or her experiences and sensitivity to burnout coupled with the honesty of the observer.

e. Signs of burnout occur slowly over time with ever increasing severity.

f. Burnout is a process, not an event (Cherniss 1980 a).

g. Burnout occurs in varying degrees for an individual, varying from relatively mild distractions and energy loss to serious and debilitating illness that may result even in death.

h. Signs of burnout may vary with duration of burnout and with respect to its consistency and intensity.

i. Burnout may be experienced more than once by the same individual.

j. A worker’s awareness of his/her burnout status and concomitant decrement in the quantity and quality of work performance may vary from complete denial to nearly full consciousness of the experience.

k. Burnout can be infectious.

l. Burnout is especially common and severe among professionals who deliver direct care and assistance to emotionally distressed or indigent clients in public institutions or agencies.

m. When the aggregate level of stress and frustration among workers within the work
environment prevents the completion of tasks essential to the primary mission/purpose of the organisation, the organisation itself may be described as burned out.

n. Certain characteristics might be shared by all burned out workers and organisations while others may be unique to particular persons, work sites and organisations.

o. There is no known personality trait or configuration that causes burnout but some characteristics may make an individual vulnerable to burnout.

p. Burnout is not a disease though some physical disorders may arise as a consequence there of.

q. Burnout is more likely to occur among highly motivated workers than less motivated ones.

r. Burnout may lead to subsequent personal plus professional growth and development as well as greater despair and trauma.

Correlates of Burnout

Glass and Mcknight (1996) listed the correlates of Burnout. According to them many of burnout's affective and attitudinal symptoms overlap with diagnostic criteria for unipolar depression given in the third edition of the 'Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders' (DSM-III-R; American Psychiatric Association, 1987). Prior research has identified perceptions of lack of control over various aspects of one's job as antecedent to professional burnout (Jackson, 1989; Cherniss, 1993).

Moreover, perceptions of uncontrollability exacerbate reactions to environmental stressors (Thompson, 1981). Besides this, a number of efforts at developing a conceptual framework that specifies antecedents of burnout identify perceived uncontrollability or some variant thereof, as a major etiological factor (Maslach and Jackson, 1984; Burisch, 1993; Cherniss, 1993; Glass et al., 1993).

Factors Affecting Burnout

Hall and Schneider (1973), as reported by Cherniss (1995), in an extensive study of the work lives of priests, suggested that two qualities in the work environment that were most important for positive career development were 'autonomy' and 'support'. Lack of these may lead to burnout.
More recent studies have continued to find that organizational support, along with autonomy, is important for helping professionals. Leiter (1988) found that poor interpersonal relations among nurses in a general hospital greatly exacerbated burnout. O'Driscoll and Schubert (1988) discovered that problematic interactions between central office administrators and sections of the agency significantly contributed to emotional exhaustion in the staff. Drory and Shamir (1988) looked at a wide range of variables and found that lack of management support was the major correlate of burnout in a sample of prison guards.

**Antidotes to Burnout**

In an investigation of burnout as a function of aspects of role structure for people working in the field of human services, Lieter and Meechan (1986) found that emotional exhaustion occurred less often when a person's social support network within the setting was not concentrated solely within the formal work sub-group. Personal Accomplishment was enhanced by an ambiguous role structure while depersonalization was found to be related primarily to a person's values toward personal relationship and work. Moreover, it was found to be more prevalent among those with concentrated support networks and ambiguously structured roles.

Cherniss (1995) in an intensive longitudinal study of professionals gave certain facilitating factors in the work situation and the individual that seemed to help people recover from burnout or act as an antidote to it.

1. **Finding Meaningful Work**

   There are many ways in which the work setting encourages or inhibits professional caring, commitment and satisfaction.

   i) *Nature of Work itself:* To avoid burnout, the work should be rewarding, and as we know, meaningful work is intrinsically rewarding.

   ii) *Making a significant impact:* Professionals want to feel that they are making a difference in other people's lives. Work that gives them this opportunity seems "meaningful" and thus helps to avoid burnout.

   iii) *Intellectual Challenge:* Professionals thrive on work that is intellectually challenging.
iv) **The Boredom Factor**: Change is important because professionals who have ideal jobs may be especially likely to outgrow these jobs after a period of time. Without change, boredom and stagnation are always potential threats.

v) **Cultivating Special interest on the job**: Instead of just resigning to the situation, cultivating special interests lead to more autonomy and control within that part of their work lives.

2. **Finding Greater Professional Autonomy and Support**

   Meaningful work helps professionals remain dedicated. Provision of autonomy facilitates in making work meaningful.

i) **Bureaucratic Hassles and Organizational Politics**: Presence of red-tapism and lack of autonomy lead to frustration. The conflict regarding political infighting, jealous battles over turf and other forms of bureaucratic warfare make professionals disgusted with their work.

ii) **Role of Autonomy**: Demoralizing bureaucratic obstacles and organizational politics along with lack of autonomy make people succumb to burnout. Greater autonomy also helps to reduce the work pressure and hence avoid overload which is a frequent complaint of professionals.

iii) **Supportive Work setting**: Both tangible and emotional support along with autonomy is needed by even seasoned professionals. Various factors leading to supportive work settings can be categorized as - trust and confidence of the superior; positive feedback and recognition to remain motivated; active interest of the superior; flexibility in dealing with conflicts between work demands and family responsibilities; organizational support through additional training; stimulating and supportive colleagues for emotional support and technical guidance.

3. **Personal Qualities and Earlier Experiences**

   The nature of individual values and outlook can contribute in causing or avoiding burnout.

i) **Challenging earlier experiences**: Presence of resilience can help resist burnout. A more active stance at encountering stress and disappointment besides seeking ways of overcoming difficulties rather than giving up or giving in can avoid burnout. Challenging work experiences also help to recover from burnout by
leading to the development of more realistic expectations and enhancing a person’s feeling of self-efficacy.

ii) Developing career-insight early in the career: A realistic idea of one’s strengths, weaknesses, and preferences helps in making better career decisions. Virtually all the professionals develop greater career-insight over time but those who resist or recover from burnout develop it sooner.

iii) Greater organizational Negotiation Skill: The more successful professionals learn effective ways to approach organizational conflicts and hassles. Greater organizational negotiation skill helps professionals remain committed and satisfied in their work. In fact, as Dalton (1989) opined, "professional employees find it hard to maintain a sense of efficacy without 'organizational and people skills and interests'."

iv) Actively Pursuing Professional Development: Individuals who do not consider themselves as 'finished products' but seek out learning experiences and enter them with open, active curiosity resist burnout. Such attitudes along with formal training programs help alleviate burnout in two different ways. First, they provide professionals with specific tools that help them to be more effective in their job. Moreover, they provide intellectual stimulation. At the same time, intellectual curiosity has been found to be an antidote to professional burnout.

v) Striking a balance between work, family and leisure: The most successful professionals sustain a strong commitment to their work by modulating their involvement in work by striking a fine balance between work and other parts of their lives. They consider family commitments and leisure pursuits to be at least as important as their careers. They don't simply work to live, as burned out professionals do, but neither do they just live to work.

vi) Need for Achievement- More Realistic Goals and Expectations: Feelings about achievement are also important. Professionals who are least likely to recover from burnout tend to set extremely high goals for themselves. They are more perfectionist and never seem to feel that they have done enough. Those professionals who recover from burnout or avoid it altogether, also set high goals but their goals are more realistic or become more realistic over time. They are also less compulsive about trying to achieve these goals.
Finally, Cherniss (1995) concluded that work environment exerts a strong effect on professional commitment. Individual factors are important but the work-setting influences can't be ignored. Ultimately it is the dynamic interaction between individual and the work-setting that determines how a professional will deal with burnout.

**COPING**

When stress crosses an optimum level, it loses its positive aspect and becomes 'distress'. Such a stress does not maximise performance but decreases effectiveness. With the development of increasingly sophisticated models of stress and the influences of intervening variables, has come increased interest in intervening variables, such as coping (Baum, 1990). Several coping measures and models have been proposed and there are now a number of ways to conceptualize and categorize the ways people cope with threatening or demanding situations (Carver et al., 1989; Endler and Parker, 1990).

Coping according to Newman and Beehr (1974) is an adaptive response to job stress, a response intended to eliminate, ameliorate or change the stress producing factors in the job context, or intended to modify the individual's reaction to stressful job situation in a beneficial way. Psycho-neuroimmunological research on human beings suggests that (a) exposure to psychosocial stressors has an immuno-suppressive effects, and (b) the level of negative mood (e.g., anxiety, depression) may aggravate this relationship, while (c) some other personality variables (e.g., coping efficacy, sense of humour) may moderate it (Kiecolt-Glaser and Glaser 1991).

Coping behaviours are attempts by individuals to deal with stressful transactions. The notion of coping can be applied not only to methods of handling specific episodes but also to styles or patterns of cognitions and actions which individuals characteristically adopt to avoid or reduce stress (Robinson and Inkson, 1994).

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) and others viz., Pearlin and Schooler, (1978) initiated studies of coping with general life stress. Coping mechanisms have also been studied in relation to job-induced stress (Osipow and Davis, 1988). A small body of literature has developed on the use of coping mechanisms by human service workers...
attempting to deal with the special type of job-strain referred to as burnout (Shinn et al., 1984). Although the specific sources of job-strain may be different in human service work, the procedures for coping with this strain, the strategies and styles are presumably like those used for stress and strain generally.

These procedures may involve gathering information, planning, drawing on past experiences, venting feelings, prayer, distracting oneself, confronting others, seeking others' counsel, and numerous other strategies. When other people are used as sources of information, appraisal and direct assistance, the social support system becomes a coping resource (Robinson and Inkson, 1994). Thoits (1986) has suggested how the processes involved in the much studied direct and buffering benefits of a supportive social environment can be integrated with the study of coping.

**Definitions**

According to White (1974), coping is a process involving effort on the way towards solution of problems. Coping would occur when an individual confronts a fairly drastic change or problem that defies familiar ways of behaving, requires the production of new behaviour and very likely gives rise to uncomfortable efforts like anxiety, despair, guilt, shame or grief - the relief of which forms part of the needed adaptation.

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) reported coping as a behaviour that protects people from being psychologically harmed by problematic social experiences. According to Pearlin and Schooler coping protects by (a) eliminating or modifying stresses; (b) perpetually controlling the meaning of stressful experience, thus neutralizing its problematic character; or, (c) keeping emotional consequences within manageable bounds.

According to Schuler (1984) coping is a process of analysis and evaluation to decide how to protect oneself against the adverse effect of any stressor and its associated negative outcomes. Dewe et al. (1996) defined coping with a focus on stress. Coping may be defined in terms of the response to work or work-related encounters that tax individual abilities and resources. According to them, "coping is defined as the cognitions and behaviours, adopted by the individual following the recognition of a stressful encounter, that are in some way designed to deal with that encounter or its
Although individuals are constantly in a state of adaptation, and while an understanding of how individuals deal with ordinary everyday events is important (Newton, 1989), the intent of the above definition is simply to reflect those encounters where normal functioning is significantly disrupted. One might also assume from this definition that coping is 'typically positioned' somewhere between stress and health in a simple linear model (Edwards and Cooper, 1988).

The use of a transactional framework to define stress is usually associated with a conviction that coping is a major factor in the overall process (Folkman et al., 1986; Cox and Ferguson, 1991). As with stress, a number of different theoretical approaches have contributed to our understanding of this concept. These include coping as psycho-analytical process; as a personal trait or style; as description of situationally-specific strategies; as a sequences of stages; and as a classification or taxonomy of strategies (Cox and Ferguson, 1991). From critiques of such approaches, certain themes emerge. These are that coping should be viewed as: (1) relational in that it reflects the relationship between the individual and the environment (Folkman, 1982); (2) a process in contrast to the more traditional trait-content oriented approaches (Edwards 1988; Cox and Ferguson, 1991).

Types of Coping Strategies

Some researchers usefully distinguish between problem-focused (directly addressing the stress-creating matter) and emotion-focused (adjusting or responding to the matter through an emotional change) coping styles, while others add a third style - appraisal-focused coping based on cognitive analysis, redefinition and avoidance.

It has been learnt that some ways of coping seem to be better suited to certain kinds of situations than are others. For example, problem-focused coping, directed at changing or eliminating sources of stress, is associated with more positive outcomes when the source of the stress is controllable and with poorer outcomes when it is not (Vitaliano et al., 1990). Coping can help a person under stress through reactive or operative individual strategies or through the development of a more hyperactive set of strategies at the organizational level. The idea behind these organizational strategies is to remove existing or potential stressors and thus, like preventive medicine, prevent the
onset of stress for individual job holders (Luthans, 1995).

Coping assessment generally studies discrete situations and has not systematically examined overall coping patterns. Lester et al. (1994) examined a more general pattern, coping flexibility, and correlates of this style of approaching stressful situations. Flexible coping is reflected by systematic use of wide variety of different coping strategies in different situations rather than more rigid applications of a few coping strategies across settings.

As one might expect, greater coping flexibility has been linked to better adjustment, less depression, and fewer physical ailments in studies of chronic illness and alcoholism (Ell, 1986). Conversely, rigid styles have been associated with higher levels of depression and higher relapse rates in alcoholics (Shapiro, 1986; Gidden, 1988). Pearlin and Schooler (1978) asked 2300 people how they coped with problems across several aspects of their lives. No single coping mechanisms was effective at reducing stress in all situations, and "having a particular weapon (coping strategy) in one's arsenal [was] less important than having a variety of weapons" (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978). As the number of different coping strategies endorsed for any given aspect of life stress increased, reported stress in that area got decreased.

**Measurement of Coping**

Coping has been measured in a number of different ways, and there are no simple answers as to which approach is the best (Cohen, 1987).

The measurement of coping strategies is not highly developed (Cohen, 1987). As with most variables in social and behavioural research, there is no single preferred instrument. Some measures follow a trait approach, eliciting from respondents reports of procedures they usually initiate when they feel under stress. Other measurement approaches emphasize the 'state' or episodic nature of coping. They measure how a respondent reacted to a particular stressor occurring at a particular time.

Two of the most commonly used measures of coping, Folkman and Lazarus' (1980) Ways of Coping scale and Billings and Moos' (1984) coping measure, follow this latter (state) emphasis. The work of these researchers has introduced distinctions among discrete coping foci and methods, referred to with such labels as problem-focused, emotion-focused, cognitive-behavioural, escape/avoidance and denial coping.
Koeske et al. (1993) assumed that people develop relatively stable, situation-specific styles of coping that are best assessed by eliciting respondents' specific reports of how they have reacted to particular stressors.

The study of the role of various problem-focused and emotion-focused Ways of Coping in enhancing the effectiveness of Judicial Officers is one of the aims of the present investigation.

**OCCUPATIONAL STRESS, STRAIN, DAILY HASSLES, BURNOUT, WAYS OF COPING AND EFFECTIVENESS**

In 'The Stress of Life' Selye (1956) described that 'complete freedom from stress is death' and that all stress is not detrimental. A certain level of the anxiety of stress drives an individual towards achievement, while heavier stress would tend to debilitate and retard the performance. The positive effects of stress have been given due importance in stress research (Weiss et al., 1982; Aditya and Sen, 1993).

It is the dysfunctional effects of high levels of stress that are a major concern for the contemporary society in general and for effective human resources management in particular. Negative consequences of stress include strain, emergence of burnout effects, job dissatisfaction, feeling of alienation, and lowering of personal and organizational effectiveness.

Research indicates that the relationship between stress and performance is a function of various personal and psychological factors. Baron (1986) concluded that:

(i) The performance of many tasks is in fact strongly affected by stress.
(ii) Performance usually drops off sharply when stress rises to high levels.

The effects of stress on individuals may be problems of mental or physical ill-health and a reduction in job satisfaction (Rees, 1990). According to Schaubroeck et al. (1992) and Burke et al. (1993), there are indications that levels of difficulty and nature of tasks being performed along with personal dispositions such as Type A, personal control, learned helplessness, self-efficacy and psychological hardiness along with other psychological dispositions such as negative affectivity - affect the relationship between stress and performance.

The relationship between stress and work performance and productivity now includes "work place well being" (Fox and Poole, 1995). Stress is detrimental for well
being. Well being is important because work place well being enhances effectiveness. A look at the consequences of continuous stress proves that it acts as a hindrance in the effective functioning of Individuals. Numerous studies that have probed into the consequences of living under continual and/or severe stress so far equivocally prove that:

(a) Occupational Stress produces mental illness (Eisenstadt, 1966; Wolfe and Goodell, 1968; Jaco, 1970 and Toffler, 1970);

(b) it is related to various kinds of maladjusted behaviour such as suicide and withdrawal (Eisenstadt, 1966; Spradly and Phillips, 1972);

(c) it is the cause of disease (Ogilvie, 1964; Dodge and Martin, 1970; Cummings and Cooper, 1979; Bammer and Newberry, 1982);

(d) it leads to violent behaviour (Coser, 1957; Toffler, 1970; Borg, 1971 and Chen and Spector, 1992);

(e) it may result in the use of drugs (Toffler, 1970; Marlowe, 1971).

Sharma (1986) summed up the various consequences of stress as - dissatisfaction with the job; poor mental health; hostility indicated by intolerance to authoritarian and incompetent behaviour; monotony and boredom; psychological fatigue; low self-esteem created by lack of timely promotion. Such behaviours at work certainly lead to lower Effectiveness.

According to Chen and Spector (1992), stress had the strongest impact on aggressive actions such as sabotage, interpersonal aggression, hostility and complaints. These types of psychological problems from stress, are especially relevant to poor job performance (McGrath, 1976).

The psychological problems arising from continuous exposure to stress lead to work behaviours like resentment of supervision, inability to concentrate and make decisions besides job dissatisfaction (Cooper and Marshall; 1976; Beehr and Newman, 1980). Such outcomes of stress hinders the effectiveness of any person or organization.

Continuous exposure to stress and inability to evolve effective coping strategies or lack of moderating variables may lead to Burnout. Burnout is accompanied by feelings of frustration, physical fatigue and emotional exhaustion. These are detrimental for overall effectiveness in work situation. Burnout is a type of stress (Ganster et al., 1991) which leads to lowered effectiveness. Anderson (1976) examined relationship among stress, coping behaviours and performance of 93 owner-managers.
Problem-solving coping behaviours revealed an inverted-U relationship with perceived stress, while emotional coping behaviours displayed a positive linear relationship. Perceived stress and organization performance displayed a curvilinear, nearly inverted-U relationship.

Zippo (1980) presented in a study 'The executive under stress: A profile', saying that the profile is that of an executive who is both physically and emotionally at risk from stress. Sailer et al. (1982) in their study on stress, 'causes, consequence, and coping strategies' found that knowing how and when to apply stress-management strategies could increase managerial effectiveness and employee-productivity, improve the quality of work life and benefit the organization as well as the individual.

While Occupational Stress can exact heavy tolls from the employees in terms of mental and physical health and much reduced quality of life, it is also expensive to employers. Clement and Gibbs (1983), reported that employers pay around 80 per cent of all private health insurance premiums. Furthermore, worker compensation laws are increasingly awarding benefits for injuries and sickness resulting from Occupational Stress (Ivancevich et al., 1990). Greenberg (1990) stated that the consequences of Occupational Stress for executives alone are costing businesses between 10 and 19 billion dollars per year. Direct expenses include such costs as worker benefits, sick pay and health bills. Hence, Occupational Stress is a negative contributor to Effectiveness.

Dehra (1989) studied role conflict in relation to personality, marital adjustment and job satisfaction in one hundred primary government school married female teachers classified into two groups on the basis of their teaching experience. She concluded that female school teachers have a definite pattern of role conflict which is correlated with job and personality variables and therefore hint at some probable intervention through psychological support and guidance for optimising their effectiveness, adjustment and improving their quality of life.

Research on major stressors of professional managers has been reviewed by Glowinowski and Cooper (1987). Business executives are frequently stereotyped as suffering health-threatening levels of job-related stress due to their high responsibilities and as practising unhealthy lifestyles viz., 'workaholism', little exercise, excessive smoking and alcohol consumption, high CHD risk. There is evidence that
most business executives are generally able to avoid excessive stress and enjoy relatively good health (Fletcher, 1988). Nevertheless within any occupational group there will be major differences of stress level.

Srivastava (1991) examined the moderating effect of approach and avoidance modes of coping on the relationship of occupational stress and job performance. Significant inverse relationship was obtained between perceived occupational stress and performance. Further analysis yielded that approach mode of coping attenuates, whereas avoidance mode of coping intensifies the inverse relationship between occupational stress and job performance.

"When people try to find meaning in their life through work and feel that they have failed, the result is burnout" (Pines, 1993). As Maslach and Schaufeli (1993) pointed out, all the burnout definitions have five common elements: “First, there is a predominance of dysphoric symptoms such as mental or emotional exhaustion, fatigue, and depression. Second, the accent is on mental and behavioural symptoms rather than on physical symptoms, although some authors mention atypical physical complaints as well. Third, burnout symptoms are work-related. Fourth, the symptoms manifest themselves in “normal” persons who did not suffer from psychopathology before. Fifth, decreased effectiveness and work performance occur because of negative attitudes and behaviors”.

Luthans (1995) reported subtle but very real effect of stress on the styles and effectiveness of executives in key positions. According to him, managers who are under constant stress may become very moody and irritable. Such managers may realize this shortcoming and suffer a loss of self-esteem. They may procrastinate and may be unable to make immediate decisions. This may lead to dissatisfaction with the job, co-workers and seniors.

Thus, continuous stress and effectiveness display a constant negative relationship. Continuous stress leads to health related problems which influences effectiveness. Research on the health-related outcomes of job stress has increased substantially over the past two decades (Frone et al., 1995). In general, job stressors have been implicated in the etiology of psychological health, physical health and health-related behavioural outcomes (Beehr and Newman 1978; Harris and Heft, 1992; Sullivan and Bhagat, 1992). Nonetheless, not all studies have supported relationships between job stressors and health-related outcomes. Mixed results are not surprising,
however, when one considers that all the major models of job stress posit that a host of interpersonal factors may moderate the relationship between job stressors and employee health (House, 1974; Hurrel and Murphy, 1992).

Hodapp et al. (1988) reported that excessive or inappropriate stress produces psychosomatic symptoms. Dehra (1989) found role conflict to be positively, though not significantly, related to psychosomatic symptoms in female government primary school teachers.

Nakano (1989) examined the relationship among Psychological/Physical symptoms, daily hassles and intervening variables of stress in 128 Japanese adults (32-63 years old). As expected there was a strong association between daily hassles and physical symptoms. Psychological and Physical symptoms were related to avoidance, emotion-focused coping and Type A behaviour. Individuals with high symptoms tended not to use problem-focused coping and showed more Type A behaviour plus avoidance than active-cognitive coping.

Fame et al. (1994) found a clear negative relationship between number of hassles and Salivary Immunoglobulin A (S-IgA) which acts as a first line of defence against infectious diseases in respiratory, intestinal and urogenital tracts. Thus, more hassles lead to a lessened defensive ability against infectious diseases.

Effective Coping

The negative effects of stress can be countered with effective coping. Several researchers have found evidence that attempting to exert cognitive or behavioural control over a problem was a useful coping approach. Such behaviours not only reduce stress, but also enhance effectiveness in work. Billings and Moos (1984), for example, found that a problem-focused approach served people better than orienting to the affect that the stress has produced within oneself. More recently, Moos et al. (1990) found that 'positive reappraisal' facilitated stress resolution of older adults with drinking problems, whereas 'cognitive avoidance' and emotional discharge increased depression and symptoms. Latack (1986) found that various procedures that enable the individual to exercise control in the work setting may be helpful, whether they involve planning, seeking help from others, confronting others or fostering positive cognitions. But there are sometimes costs to control-oriented approaches. Glass (1977) for example, has suggested that it may be the Type A personality's drive to exert control over the environment that elevates her/his health risks, an outcome that seems especially likely.
in uncontrollable or unsolvable environments.

Mullen and Suls (1982) reviewed 26 studies comparing such vigilant, control-directed coping strategies with procedures involving denial, escape or avoidance. They concluded that vigilant approaches were more adaptive than avoidance strategies in the long run (over months), but the opposite was found for immediate and very short run effects. Cohen et al. (1986) suggested that avoidance-oriented strategies might be protective in intractable environments, which permit little feedback or chance of control. Experimental research by Holmes and McCaul (1989) suggests that even an avoidant strategy is better than no strategy at all.

Cohen (1987) emphasizes that specific contextual factors can affect which style of coping produces better adaptation. There seems to be no coping style that is more adaptive across all situations. She also suggested that the capability of implementing many different strategies, flexibility in coping is critical to effective coping while Cohen and Edwards (1989) conclude that the few relevant studies that have been done support the utility of flexibility.

Parkes (1986) found that individual differences and environmental and situational factors were significant predictors of coping effectively and that patterns of main and interactive effects were different for each type (general coping, direct coping and suppression) of coping.

Koeske et al. (1993) in addition to past research provide additional evidence that, in some situations at least, behavioural and cognitive styles of control coping cannot be differentiated. They also report a more reliable benefit to stressed workers who use Control than exclusively Avoidance coping.

Taking an overall view, the results suggest that Control coping strategies were commonly used by the intensive case managers, and that they facilitated the workers’ ability to deal with a difficult and challenging work obligation. There was little evidence, however, that avoidance strategies benefited the worker, unless they were used in conjunction with control oriented strategies. Koeske et al. (1993) also evaluated the buffering role of dominant coping procedures. Effective copers should be buffered against the negative consequences of stress by the implementation of their strategies. As stress conditions increase, the effective copers, being insulated by the procedures they enact, should show less negative effects.
Scheier et al. (1986) found modest but reliable positive correlations between optimism and problem-focused coping, seeking of social support and empathizing positive aspects of the stressful situation. Pessimism was associated with denial and distancing, with focusing on stressful feelings, and with disengagement from the goal with which the stressors was interfering. Shinn et al. (1984) in a study of group therapists working in a variety of settings, found that most of them coped with stress on the job by focusing on interests outside the job or by "adopting a positive outlook." Lester et al. (1994) examined coping flexibility and correlates of this style of approaching stressful situation. This coping style was found to be quite effective. Greater flexibility was associated with greater well-being and achievement while negatively correlated with stress reactions and alienation.

Coping research has led to even overall theories being developed on coping with stress (Edwards, 1992). The various coping styles can be used for individual coping strategies i.e. exercise, relaxation, behavioural self-control, cognitive therapy, networking etc. as well as organizational coping strategies like creating supportive organizational climate, enriching the designs of tasks, reducing conflict and clarifying organizational roles, planning and developing career paths and providing counselling (Luthans, 1995). Coping strategies can be taught, and prevailing styles reconstructed. Workshops often define goals related to such learning. Research by Koeske et al. (1993) suggests that attending to and shaping coping pattern can benefit human service workers confronted with challenging clients. With minimal effort the general control coping strategies identified as beneficial can be contradicted for particular work environments where they can be taught and practised as a part of burnout alleviation schedule.

Therefore, it can be safely concluded that effective coping leads to behaviours that help an individual to be effective in his functioning within his work area as well as the life-situations on the whole. Thus, review of literature suggests that detrimental effects of occupational stress, strain, daily hassles and burnout may lead to ineffective behaviours while effective coping strategies along with moderating personal and organizational dispositions and presence of experiences of uplifts may enhance effectiveness. The same hypothesis will be tested in the present study.