Chapter - 2

CONCEPT AND RELATED RESEARCHES

In the present chapter an effort is made to explain and elaborate upon the various HR concepts which constitute the core of the present research work. The focus is mainly on three HR concepts, namely, Organizational Role Stress (ORS), Role Efficacy (RE) and Learned Helplessness (LH). Each of these three are discussed in some detail, both in terms of conceptual clarification and relevant researches.

2.1 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS (ORS)

2.1.1 WHAT IS STRESS

From the viewpoint of physical sciences the phenomenon of stress is evident in all material when they are subjected to “force, pressure, strain or strong effort”. Every material—steel, rock, or wood—has its own limits up to which it can be stressed without being damaged. Similarly, human beings can tolerate certain levels of stress. Damage—psychological or physical—occurs when they are continually exposed to low or high levels of stress. But unlike physical structures, human beings have also the unique ability to move, change or modify their relationship with the stress situation.

Stress has been approached in at least four different ways first as the stimulus or external force acting on the organism, second as the response or change in physiological function, third as the interaction between an external force and the resistance to it, and finally a comprehensive view in taken encompassing all the three.

2.1.2 STRESS AS EXTERNAL FORCE

The external force approach to the phenomenon of stress focuses on the circumstances which people experience as stressful. Stress is treated as an independent variable, more or less beyond the control of the individual.

According to Weitz (1970), the most stressful stimuli are:
  - speeded-up information processing.
  - noxious environmental stimuli.
  - perceived threat.
  - disrupted psychological function.
  - isolation and confinement.
  - blocking.
  - group pressures, and
  - frustrations.

2.1.2.1 Physiological Function

Stress is considered as a response to a situation which demands that the individual adapt to a change physically or psychologically. Hans Selye (1956), the father of modern stress research, defined stress as “the nonspecific response of the body to any demand made upon it”. Based on the experiments carried out on infra-human subjects he proposed the theory of General Adaptation Syndrome (GAS), which states that when an organism is confronted with a threat, the general physiological response occurs in three stages.
2.1.2.2 Alarm Reaction

The first stage includes an initial "shock phase" in which resistance is lowered, and a "counter-shock phase" in which defensive mechanisms become active. Alarm reaction is characterized by autonomous excitability: adrenalin discharge; increased heart rate, increased muscle tone and change in blood content; and gastro-intestinal ulceration. Depending upon the nature and intensity of threat and the condition of the organism, the periods of resistance vary and the severity of symptoms may differ from mild to severe.

2.1.2.3 Stage of Resistance

Maximum adaptation occurs during this stage. The bodily signs characteristic of the alarm reaction disappear. Resistance increases to levels above normal. If the stressor persists or the defensive reaction proves ineffective the organism deteriorates to the next stage.

2.1.2.4 State of Exhaustion

Adaptation energy is exhausted. Signs of the alarm reaction reappear and resistance level begin to decline irreversibly. The organism, collapses. A diagrammatic view of these stages is shown in the following figure 2.1.

![Diagrammatic View of Stages](image)

In a major critique of the GAS approach, Pestonjee (1987) has found the following :-

The first major shortcoming of the theory is that it has evolved out of the researches carried out on infra-human subjects. In such experiments the stressors are usually physical or environmental whereas the human organism is not always afflicted by such stressors.

Secondly, Selye’s work on stress depends on the existence of a non-specific physiological response. But as it has been noted by researchers that there are certain stimuli for example: exercise, fasting and heat, which do not produce non-specific response and hence General Adaptation Syndrome does not occur.
Thirdly, intra-psychic or social (interpersonal and interactional) factors emerge as major stressors in human beings. These have not been given their due place in this approach.

And lastly, the reactions of intra-human subjects are more direct perceptible and (hence) easily measurable. This is not true of human subjects because in human beings responses are always mediated through several layers of cultural and social filters.

In a variation of this approach, Gmelch (1982) suggests that, stress is used to refer to the highly energized psycho-physiological state when an organism is faced with a situation that threatens or places unusual physical or psychological demands on it.

### 2.1.3 STRESS CLASSIFICATION

Figure-2.2

**Stress Classification**

- Overstress (Hyperstress)
- Good Stress (Eustress) (Distress)
- STRESS
- Bad Stress
- Understress (Hypostress)

The extremes of this highly energized state are: hyperstress where there is over-activation or heavy demands in terms of time or responsibilities; and hypostress in which the individual suffers from lack of activation, characterized by lassitude and boredom. Refer Fig.2.1 given above (Gmelch (1982)).

### 2.1.4 INTERACTIVE APPROACH

According to this approach, stress is looked upon as an interactional outcome of the external demand and internal resources. Lazarus (1966) maintains that “stress occurs when there are demands on the person which tax or exceed his adjustment resources”. McGrath (1976) explains “there is a potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capacities and resources for meeting it under condition where he has expected a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it”.
2.1.5 COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

This approach views stress not only in interactive terms but also as an individual phenomenon, peculiar to the individual and his environment, it is seen as the situational outcome.

Stress is considered either as an external force acting on the organism a change in the physiological function due to an external stimulus or as an interaction between external forces and internal resistance. Physiologist Canon (1932) spoke of the "wisdom of the body". An organism is "endowed with an automatic equilibrium maintaining tendency" which is helpful in preserving its existence in the face of a hostile environment. Canon called this tendency homeostasis to indicate the coordinated physiological processes that maintain the steady state of the organism. Whenever the homeostasis balance of an organism is disturbed, the entire organism is mobilized in an effort to restore it. He also noted that in a situation of external threat or severe stress, an organism resorts to a fight or flight response. A person is called brave when he fights, and labelled coward, discreet or wise if he adopts the flight response. The internal cost or the bodily wear and tear is the same in both the options. This was a very major scientific discovery.

2.1.6 SOURCES OF STRESS

There are two types of social systems to which we all belong: the primary system, and the secondary system. Family and religious, ethnic, regional, and linguistic groups are the examples of the primary social systems. Membership of these systems is involuntary and automatic. The family ties are strong because one acquires one's basic identity as a member of family. The secondary system to which we relate are the social groups such as neighborhood, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and clubs. Membership of these systems is optional. The functional requirements and role-related expectations from the primary and the secondary systems differ. The demands made on the individual in one system have their effects on his performance in the other and often prove to be a source of stress. Further, the resources from one system can also be invested in the other system to take care of the problems arising in it.

2.1.7 ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS

Organizational membership is a dominant source of stress. Organizational role stress covers a wide variety of stresses arising from one's membership in a work organization. The term role refers to the demands communicated by significant others, either in the organization or outside. Pareek's (1981) signal contribution to the organizational role research lies in identifying as many as ten different types of organizational role stresses. They are described briefly here.

i) **Inter-Role Distance Stress (IRD)** is experienced when there is a conflict between organizational and non-organizational roles. For example, the role of an executive versus the role of a husband.

ii) **Role Stagnation Stress (RS)** is the feeling of being stuck in the same role.
iii) Role Expectation Conflict Stress (REC) arises out of conflicting demands originating from colleagues, i.e., superiors, subordinates, and peers in the organization.

iv) Role Erosion Stress (RE) arises when a role has become less important than it used to be, or when somebody else gets the credit for doing what needs to be done in one's own role.

v) Role Overload Stress (RO) is the feeling that one is required to do too much or doing things of considerable importance.

vi) Role Isolation Stress (RI) is characterized by the feeling that others do not reach out easily, indicative of the absence of strong linkages of one's role with other roles.

vii) Personal Inadequacy Stress (PI) is depicted by the absence of adequate skills, competence, and training to meet the demands of one's role.

viii) Self-Role Distance Stress (SRD) arises from a gap experienced between one's concept of self and the demands of the role.

ix) Role Ambiguity Stress (RA) is experienced when there is a lack of clarity about the demands of the role.

x) Resource Inadequacy Stress (RIn) arises when the human or material resources allocated are inadequate to meet the demands of the role.

2.1.8 BURNOUT STRESS SYNDROME (BOSS)

All gainful activities classified as work or job is fraught with some risk of stress. In a recent treatise on stress, Paine (1982) has observed:

"Burn out stress syndrome (BOSS), the consequence of a high level of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills have major personal, organizational and social cost — and their costs are probably increasing"

BOSS is a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress. Four types of consequences can arise from it (Veningle and Spradley, 1981):

- depletion of energy reserves.
- lowered resistance to illness.
- increased dissatisfaction and pessimism, and
- increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work.

They have also identified five distinct stages in a burn-out:

- honeymoon.
- fuel shortage.
- chronic symptoms.
- crisis, and
- hitting the wall.
2.1.8.1 Honeymoon Stage

In the honeymoon stage, there is a euphoric feeling of encounter with the new job. There is excitement, enthusiasm, pride, and challenge. Dysfunctional features emerge in two ways. Firstly, the energy reserves are gradually depleted in coping with the demands of a challenging environment. Secondly, habits and strategies for coping with stress are formed in this stage, which are often not useful in coping with later challenges.

2.1.8.2 Fuel Shortage Stage

In an attempt to deal with job-related crisis, some individuals overdraw on reserves of adaptation energy and realize too late that the energy reserves are limited. In the fuel shortage stage, there is a vague feeling of loss, fatigue, and confusion. The symptoms are job dissatisfaction, inefficiency, fatigue, and sleep disturbance, leading to escape activities such as increased eating, drinking, and smoking. Future difficulties are signalled at this stage.

2.1.8.3 Chronic Symptom Stage

The physiological symptoms become more pronounced and demand attention and help at this stage. Common symptoms are chronic exhaustion, physical illness, anger, and depression. A sense of fatigue and exhaustion overtakes the individual.

2.1.8.4 Crisis Stage

When these feelings and physiological symptoms persist over a period of time, the individual enters the stage of crisis. He feels oppressed, there is a heightened pessimism, and self-doubting tendency is ascendant. One develops an "escape mentality." Peptic ulcers, tension headaches, chronic backache, high blood pressure, and difficulty in sleeping are some of the better-known symptoms of the crisis period. They may become acute.

2.1.8.5 Hitting the Wall Stage

The phrase "hitting the wall" is taken from athletics. It is said that a marathon actually begins at the "twenty-mile mark with six miles yet to go." It is at this point that a marathon runner feels that he has hit the wall. It is an experience so devastating that it can completely knock a person out. The marathon runner experiences this when he finds his glycogen reserves are used up. The body is becoming dehydrated, and the body temperature is shooting up to 106°-107°F with an accompanying loss of blood volume. This leads to muscle paralysis, dizziness, fainting, and even complete collapse. Similar experiences have been observed in the executive world at times. With all the adaptation energy depleted like the glycogen of a marathon runner, one may lose control over one's life. It may be the end of a professional career. While recovery from this stage may elude some, other may be resourceful enough to tide over the crisis.
2.1.9 RUSTOUT STRESS SYNDROME (ROSS)

Researchers have observed a phenomenon which is the opposite of BOSS. ROSS is indicative of stress underload occurs when there is a gap between what the executive is capable of doing and what he is required to do. Stress underload can arise due to both qualitative and quantitative aspects of work. Clearly a situational appraisal is a prerequisite for countering stress.

2.1.10 WHAT CAN AN ORGANIZATION DO?

What can an organization do to alleviate stress? Some proactive interventions are listed below:

i) **Undertake a stress audit.** Study systematically the dominant stresses prevalent in the organization, its departments and divisions. A stress audit should include data gathering on the climate of the organization, role stresses, satisfactions and frustrations.

ii) **Use scientific inputs.** Disperse information on how to face stressors in the organization and outside. People derive immense benefits from knowing something about the fundamentals of the stress response, dietetics, exercises, and meditation.

iii) **Check with the company doctor.** What can he do to help the employees cope with the identified stress? Several progressive public as well as private sector organizations depute their chief medical officers or consultants to attend stress management programmes. They have acted as a valuable resource to fellow participants and to their organizations.

iv) **Spread the message.** The importance of regular habits of work, leisure, proper diet, exercise and mental peace should be emphasized.

2.1.11 WHAT CAN AN INDIVIDUAL DO?

Gmelch (1982) suggests the following five strategies to overcome stress affliction.

i) **Take a hard look at yourself.** Determine where stresses originate in your life. Critically examine your own contribution to stresses experienced by others around you, be they in the organization or outside it.

ii) **Stay alert.** Do things, other than your job, which give you a sense of meaning and satisfaction.

iii) **Take risks.** Growth and productivity result from taking moderate risks in various types of activities.

iv) **Avoid isolation.** Withdrawing from others can lead to isolation and depression. Keep the channels of communication open with colleagues, friends, and the family.

v) **Stretch for success.** Stretching for success keeps you on your toes. Make an effort with the hope to achieve your goals. Effort and desire to overcome the obstacles are essential to tide over ROSS.

vi) **Overcome obsolescence.** Update your knowledge and skill to face the challenge brought about by the changing technological environment.

Pareek (1982) shows how a burnout situation can be converted into a glowup situation using appropriate strategies which can influence both personal (non-work) life and organizational (work) life. (*Figure 2.3*)
Figure-2.3
Executive Glow up and Burnout:
Contributing Factors and Conversion Strategies

Note: Dotted lines show conversion strategies
Source: Pareek U: 1982: Executive Glow up and Burnout (Mimeo) Ahmedabad, Indian Institute of Management
2.1.12 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The stress response has been often misunderstood due to lack of scientific knowledge about it. It is natural and healthy to maintain optimal levels of stress. Success, achievement, higher productivity and effectiveness call for stress. However, when left unchecked or unmanaged, stress can cause problems for performance and health and well-being.

The results of the study suggest that stress is the significant predictor of depression. On the basis of the findings it can be concluded that:

- If there is high level of role conflict among managerial personnel they will feel more depressed.
- High level of role ambiguity will ultimately lead to depression.
- Managerial personnel with external locus of control have more depression than managers with internal locus of control.

2.1.13 Recent Researches on Organisational Role Stress:-

i) In his paper on “Determinants of Role Stress – An Empirical Study” (2006), Dr. Avinash Kumar Srivastav studied a large public sector industry where he administered ORS Scale, Role pics (0), and MAOC instruments for measuring ten types of role stress, eight types of coping strategy and six types of organizational climate on 48 randomly selected respondents. Age, hierarchical level and qualification level were the three personal variables recorded.

The studied concluded as follows:

(a) RE and PI are not determined by the personal, climate and coping strategy variables considered in the study.
(b) Age is a determinant only for SRD.
(c) Control climate is a determinant of 4 types of role stress and the total role stress,
(d) Impunitive coping strategy is a determinant for 2 types of role stress.
(e) Defensive coping strategy is a determinant only for RO.
(f) Extrapunitive coping strategy is a determinant for 4 types of role stress and the total role stress.
(g) Intropsistive coping strategy is a determinant only for IRD.
(h) Extrapersistive coping strategy is a determinant for 2 types of role stress.
(i) 6.97 to 31.84 percent of variance in 8 types of role stress and total role stress is determined by 7 of the 1 personal, climate and coping strategy variable considered in the study.
The recommendations given by him were as follows:

(a) Further research is recommended on the possible determinants of role stress. We need to explore and determine the additional independent variables whose inclusion in multiple regression would yield to a better fit, enabling higher order of prediction for the variance of different types of role stress and the total role stress. Some of the additional variables could be (i) personality variables, (ii) coping skills and resources, (iii) organizational system, structure, culture and working environment.

(b) Further investigation is needed to find out the reasons for lack of relationship of RE and PI with the 17 variables of study.

(c) For proactively managing the role stress in the organization, the following measures are recommended:
   (i) Control climate should be de-emphasized by promoting individual, team and organizational empowerment (Murthy and Srivastav, 1994).
   (ii) Impunitive, Extrapunitive and Defensive coping strategies (i.e. accepting the problems as unavoidable, blaming others for the problems, denying or rationalizing problems) need to be discouraged.
   (iii) Intropersistive and Extrapersistive coping strategies (i.e. functional problem solving through self-effort an external-effort) need to be encouraged.
   (iv) Wherever feasible and appropriate, higher age role occupants may be preferred for roles prone to higher role stress.

ii) In his paper on "Role Stress and Ageing in the Organization – An Empirical Study Across functions" (2006) by Dr. Avinash Kumar Srivastav. His focal areas were ORS functions and Ageing. Study was done on a large public sector industry having a number of multi locational manufacturing units. ORS Scale was used to measure ORS, on 453 randomly selected individuals from different units, functions and division of the organizations.

This study concluded as follows:

Significant differences in role stress experience an impact of ageing thereupon across the functional groups in the organization have been revealed by the study. One of the important findings of the study is that role stress increases with age in R & D while it reduces with age in quality, production and miscellaneous functions. Implication of this finding is that young people should be periodically recruited for R & D, and after they grow older in R & D, they should be shifted to non-R & D functions.

iii) In his paper "Organisational Climate as a Dependent Variable and its Relationship with Role Stress, Coping Strategy and Personal Variables" (2007), Dr. Avinash Kumar Srivastav studied six motives of organizational climate, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategies on 155 randomly selected executives in a public sector industry.
In his study he concluded and recommended as follows:

Models for predicting motives of organizational climate from personal, role stress and coping strategy variables have been developed in this paper by using step-wise multiple regression. Six motives of organizational climate, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategy were measured on 155 randomly selected executives in a public sector industry. Three personal variables (age, management level and qualification) were also recorded for each respondent. Self-Role Distance emerged as a determinant of Achievement, having a negative relationship. Qualification level, Self-Role Distance and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Expert Influence with the first two factors having negative relationships and the last factor having appositive one. Role Overload and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Extension, both having positive relationships. Self-Role Distance, Personal Inadequacy and Role Isolation emerged as determinants of Control, with the first and third factors having positive relationships and the second factor having a negative one. Role Stagnation and Personal Inadequacy emerged as determinants of Dependency, with the first factor having a positive relationship and the second factor having a negative one. Intropersistive coping strategy emerged as a determinant of Affiliation, having a positive relationship.

(i) Dominant climate has emerged as a moderating variable in this study. Unconventional relationships of climate with personal, role stress and coping strategy variables; reported in this study are possibly dependent upon the dominant climate obtained in the organization.

(ii) Lack of relationship of organizational climate motives with several of the 21 independent variables considered in the study points to multiple co-linearity of independent variables. Intercorrelations: (a) among role stress variables (Srivastav, 2006 b), (b) among coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 2007 b), (c) between personal and role stress variables (Srivastav, 1995, 1997, 2005, 2006 d), (d) between personal and coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 2006 e, 2007 c) and (c) between role stress and coping strategy variables (Srivastav, 1995, 1997), have already been reported.

(iii) Models for prediction of motives of organizational climate from three personal variables, ten types of role stress and eight types of coping strategy considered in this study have high validity, their level of significance ranging from 0.0054 to 0.0001.

(iv) Marginal predictability of organizational climate motives as above is in the range 3.8 - 11.25 per cent, which points to the need for finding out the additional variables that may be determinants for the different motives of organizational climate.

(v) Personal Inadequacy is a determinant of four motives of organizational climate. Self-Role Distance is a determinant of three motives. Qualification level, Role Overload, Role Isolation and Intropersistive Coping Strategy have individually emerged as determinants of one of the motives of organizational climate.
Recommendations
(i) Further research on the determinants of organizational climate need to be conducted under different types of dominant organizational climate.
(ii) Additional variables such as those related to personality, organizational system, structure, culture, working environment, etc. need to be examined for inclusion in multiple regressions to obtain a better fit, enabling higher order of prediction for the different motives of organizational climate.
(iii) Self-Role Distance needs to be minimized (Srivastav, 2006 a) for strengthening Achievement and Expert Influence motives and for weakening of Control motive of organizational climate.
(iv) Over-qualified employees may be dysfunctional, particularly when Expert Influence is weak.
(v) Organizational members should be sensitized to the need for enhancing their competence. This will strengthen Expert Influence and Extension motives of organizational climate and weaken Control and Dependency motives of organizational climate, making it more functional.
(vi) Organizational members need to be sensitized for having a reasonable workload. Moderate Role Overload may be functional when Extension is very weak. Role Overload need not be indiscriminately minimized.
(vii) Role-Interlinkages among roles related to critical roles need to be strengthened (Srivastav, 2006 a). This will lead to reducing Role Isolation, contributing to weakening the Control motive of organizational climate.
(viii) Role Stagnation needs to be minimized (Srivastav, 2006 a), for weakening of Dependency motive of organizational climate.
(ix) Intropersitve coping strategy (i.e. problem solving through self-effort) need not be indiscriminately promoted, lest it becomes dysfunctional in strengthening the Affiliation

iv) Avinash Kumar Srivastav and Udai Pareek

Table 2.1 given below furnishes the validity of items in the ORS scale. It can be seen that thirty-seven out of the fifty items have acceptable validity. Twenty-four items have high validity. Seven items have moderate (acceptable) validity. Six items have marginal (acceptable) validity Thirteen items have unacceptable validity. Items with unacceptable validity need to thoroughly examined, substituted for, or modified to ensure their validity. Items with marginally acceptable validity may also be looked into for improving their validity.
### Table 2.1
**Item Validity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Validity Items</th>
<th>Moderate (Acceptable) Validity Items</th>
<th>Marginal (Acceptable) Validity Items</th>
<th>Unacceptable Validity Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,41</td>
<td>21,31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,43</td>
<td>3, 23</td>
<td>6, 46</td>
<td>4, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 34, 44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 25, 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18, 28, 38, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17, 27, 37, 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 39, 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item wording issues, such as (a) use of comfort items versus stress items, (b) positive statements versus negative statements, (c) simple sentences (which are easy to understand) versus complex sentences (which are not so easy to understand), and (d) offering a single option (seeking single response) verses offering multiple options (seeking multiple responses) under the same item, need to be carefully considered.

Table 2.2 furnishes the validity index for the constituent subscales of the ORS scale. It can be seen that eight out of the ten subscales have acceptable validity. The validity index for four subscales is 1.0, and for another four subscales it is 0.8.

**Self-Role Distance (SRD)** has not emerged as a clear factor. The SRD subscale needs to be completely redesigned.

### Table 2.2
**Subscale Validity Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scales</th>
<th>Validity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI, IRD, REC, RI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA, RS, RO, RRn</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role Erosion (RE)** is being split into two parts, namely *deprivation* (or erosion) and *desire to do more* (or under-load). RE items representing deprivation are clustering under *Role Stagnation (RS)*. RE and RS are thus being merged; the two concepts need to be separated. The RE subscale, therefore, should be thoroughly worked on.

Strong clustering of RE items representing the desire to do more reflects that role occupants are experiencing *Role Under-Load* and want to have additional responsibilities. The study therefore points to the existence of an additional type of role stress, namely, *Role Under-Load (RU)*, for which a new subscale has to be developed.
v) Dr. P. Pathak

In his exploratory research P. Pathak (2007) suggested in qualitative terms how stress and its various components affect the coal industry executive. Further, the research also tells how to executives deployed at surface operations are different from those who have to go underground with regard to the stress profile. It has also been attempted to find out to what extent the two groups of executives (i.e. Surface and Underground) differ as far as stress level is concerned. Since the scale which we have used for measuring occupational stress is standardized tool, there was little difficulty in doing so. The executives could be easily classified into high, moderate and low stress groups (i.e. Group A) and remaining 48 were from the underground group (i.e. Group – B). The results are summarized in table that follows. First table gives a clear idea about the overall stress level among the two groups of executives. The next table gives a somewhat processed data representing number of executives (surface, underground and total) belonging to different stress levels with regard to twelve different occupational sub-stressors.

On the basis of different investigations and research work done by renowned scholars, following methods/techniques of tackling with stress may be attempted by executives themselves:

- Withdraw physically from the situation, temporarily;
- Change to different tasks or job activity;
- Change to an engrossing non-work or play activity or music or dance of one’s choice;
- Modify one’s own focus of attentions;
- Analyze the situation and change strategy of attack;
- Undertake quiet activity by oneself e.g. taking a walk while keeping mind a complete blank;
- Engage in physical exercise;
- Aggress and ventilate feelings
- Talk through with spouse (emotional catharsis and / or analysis);
- Talk through with others (emotional catharsis and analysis);
- Laugh as much as you can, keep comic-books handy, share a joke with a friend
- Help others;
- Take a nap or sleep;
- Build body resistance to frustrations by regular sleep, regular exercise, yoga;
- Compartmentalize work and home life;
- Extend weekends or vacations;
- Take more water when stressed;
- Add fibrous foods in your diet.

The above suggested methods of coping with stress have many advantages as they functions in number of ways. As stress is perceived as imbalance between demands has important consequences, coping techniques help in dealing with social and environmental demands. They also help in increasing motivation to meet those demands. And more importantly, they help in maintaining a state of psychological equilibrium in order to direct energy and skill toward meeting external demands.
2.2 ROLE EFFICACY

Role:

Role is the position one occupies in a social system, and is defined by the functions one performs in response to the expectations of the significant members of a social system, and one's own expectations from that position or office.

Role and office (or position) are separate concepts, though two sides of the same coin. According to Katz and Kahn, “role is essentially a relational concept, defining each position in terms of its relationships to others and to the system as a whole”. While office is a relational and power-related concept, role is an obligational concept (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

A role is not defined without the expectations of the role senders, including the role occupant. The position of a personnel manager may be created in an organisation, but his role will be defined by the expectations (stated or unstated) that different persons have from the personnel manager, and the expectations that he, in turn, has from the role. In this sense, the role gets defined in each system by the role senders, including the role occupant.

The concept of role is vital for the integration of the individual with an organisation. The organisation has its own structure and goals. Similarly, the individual has his personality and needs (motivations). All these aspects interact with each other and to some extent get integrated into a role. Role is also a central concept in work motivation as it is only through this that the individual and organisation interact with each other and get integrated.

An organisation can be defined as a system of roles. However, a role itself is a system. From the individual's point of view, there are two role systems: the system of various roles that the individual carries and performs, and the system of various roles of which his role is a part. The first, we will call role space and the second, a role set (Udai Pareek, Training Instruments in HRD and OD, 2002).

A person performs various roles that are centered around the self and are at varying distances from the self (and from each other). These relationships define the role space, which then is a dynamic interrelationship between the self and the various roles an individual occupies.

Similarly, role set is a pattern of interrelationships between one role (called the focal role) among many others. In a role set map, the focal role is in the centre.

The concept of job is more prescriptive in nature, while role includes more discretionary part of work. A job assumes the relationship of the worker with his supervisor whereas the role emphasises his relationship with all those who have expectations from him (as he has from them). Recently, much emphasis has been given to the development of roles and making them more effective in an organisation.

To sum up, the concept of role goes beyond the individual job holder, and indicates a need to involve other significant persons in defining role requirements. The focus on roles can be useful in planning organisational effectiveness. Herzberg (1968) drew attention to the need for humanising jobs and giving more dignity to them. The work redesigning movement highlighted the need for involving job holders in work-related decisions and giving them more autonomy in work-related matters. These concepts are well explained in following Boxes and exhibits.
Box-2.1
Office (or Position) and Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office / Position</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is based on power relations</td>
<td>is based on mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has related privileges</td>
<td>has related obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is usually hierarchical</td>
<td>is non-hierarchical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is created by others</td>
<td>is created by others and the role occupant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is part of the structure</td>
<td>is part of the dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is evaluative</td>
<td>is descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Udai Pareek, Making Organizational Roles Effective, 1993

Box-2.2
Work-Related Terms

Work is a wider concept linking a person with his tools and with others performing a similar activity.
Office or position is a specific point in an organizational structure, defining the power of the person occupying it.
Role is the set of obligations generated by the ‘significant’ others and the individual occupying an office.
Job is a specific requirement to produce a product or achieve an objective.
Function is a group of expected behaviors for a role.
Task is a specific activity of the function often bound by time.

Example: An individual X may occupy an office of Branch Y of a bank. As a part of this office the individual reports to the Regional Manager. Similarly, a large number of persons, in turn, report to X. His role is to develop the branch by getting a successively larger market share of deposits and advances. One of the functions under this role is to increase deposits. One task which he performs, as part of this function, is to undertake a survey of the potential depositors, another is to contact the prestigious and ‘big’ depositors personally.

Source: Udai Pareek, Making Organizational Roles Effective, 1993

Figure-2.4
Role as an Interacting Region between an Organization and the Individual

Source: Udai Pareek, Making Organizational Roles Effective, 1993
2.2.1 THE CONCEPT OF ROLE EFFICACY

Personal efficacy is the potential effectiveness of a person in personal and interpersonal situations. Role efficacy is the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a particular role in an organisation. (Omer Bin Sayeed & Udai Pareek, Actualizing Managerial Roles – Studies in Role Efficacy, Edition 2000.)

The performance of a person working in an organisation depends on his own potential effectiveness, technical competence, managerial experience, etc. as well as on the design of the role that he performs in an organisation. It is the integration of the two (the person and the role) that ensures a person's effectiveness. Unless a person has the requisite knowledge, technical competence and skills required for the role, he cannot be effective. Equally important is how the role, which he occupies in the organisation, is designed. If the role does not allow the person to use his competence, and if he constantly feels frustrated in the role, his effectiveness is likely to be low.

The integration of a person and a role comes about when the latter is able to fulfil the needs of the individual, and when the individual in turn is able to contribute to the evolution of the role. The more we move from role taking to role making, the greater is the likelihood of the role being effective. Role taking is responding to the role expectations of others, while role making is taking the initiative to creatively design the role so that the expectations of both others and the role occupant are integrated. The effectiveness of a person's role in an organisation will depend upon his own potential effectiveness, the potential effectiveness of the role, and the organisational climate. The potential effectiveness can be termed as efficacy.

2.2.2 ASPECTS OF ROLE EFFICACY

Role efficacy has several aspects. The more aspects there are, the higher is the efficacy. These aspects can be classified into three groups or dimensions. One dimensions is role making (as opposed to role taking). The former is an active attitude towards defining and making one's role as one likes, whereas the latter is a passive attitude that mainly responds to others' expectations.
2.2.3 Dimensions of Role Efficacy are

**Box-2.3**

**Dimensions of Role Efficacy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE MAKING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Role Integration</strong></td>
<td>Consonance between of individual’s skills &amp; his/her role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Full Integration, Partial Integration and Distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-activity</strong></td>
<td>Taking initiatives, responding to expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pro-activity, Reactivity, Negative Reactivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities to try out innovative and unconventional ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Creativity, Routine, Boredom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confrontation</strong></td>
<td>Responsible in problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Confrontation, Transfer, Avoidance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE CENTERING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centrality</strong></td>
<td>Realizing importance of one’s own role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Centrality, Usefulness, Peripherally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence</strong></td>
<td>Use of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Influence, Desired influence, Powerlessness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Growth</strong></td>
<td>Individual’s opportunity to grow and develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Growth, Learning, Stagnation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE LINKING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Role Linkage</strong></td>
<td>Linking one’s role with other’s in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Linkage, Isolation, Distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helping Relationship</strong></td>
<td>Seeking help from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Helping, Indifference, Hostility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Super-ordination</strong></td>
<td>Going beyond the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Super-ordination, Ordination and Deprivation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 LEARNED HELPLESSNESS (LH)

(D M Pestonjee, Prathap Reddy, “Development of Psychometric Measure of Learned Helplessness (LH)”, WP No.746, May 1988, IIM Ahmedabad)

2.3.1 Introduction

We frequently come across people who make such statements that they do not like many things in the society, in their neighbourhood, in their organizations, in their jobs and so on but they cannot do anything to alter or eliminate those "undesirable things". Underlying these statements is their feeling of uneasiness with the existing environmental conditions and their inability to change them for the better. The psychologists describe this phenomenon as "learned helplessness" (LH).

2.3.2 Concept of Learned Helplessness and Early Researches

2.3.2.1 THE CONCEPT OF LEARNED HELPLESSNESS (LH)

The learned helplessness (LH) is the cognitive state of "being" (an individual or an animal) which believes that whatever it does is not going to alter the outcome of an event. In other words, it comes to believe in response-outcome non-contingency. Stated differently, LH is the notion that after repeated failures at a task, an individual becomes passive, remains so even after the environment changes such that makes success possible. This concept of LH was first developed by Seligman and his colleagues (Seligman and Maier, 1967; Overmier and Seligman, 1967).

2.3.2.2 LH IN ANIMALS

The phenomenon of LH was first observed in animals by Seligman and Maier (1967) and Overmier and Seligman, (1967). They observed that when the dog in an experiment was repeatedly exposed to inescapable electric shocks, the dog discontinued efforts to escape from the shocks after some time, and remained so even after the situation was changed so that the escape was possible. Overmier and Seligman, (1967) suggested that the interference in the dog's escape response or lack of it was a "learned helplessness" state. Their explanation for the dog's passive behaviour was that during the experiment, the dog learned that the shocks were independent of its behaviour and this learning was transferred to new situations inhibiting escape responses in those altered situations. Later, occurrence of this LH phenomenon was also reported in cats and fish (Padilla et al, 1970) and rats (Braud et al, 1969).

2.3.2.3 LH IN HUMANS

More recently, researches have documented the phenomenon of LH in humans (Hiroto, 1974; Hiroto & Seligman, 1975; Rodin, 1976). In early studies the human subjects were exposed to a "training task" in which they received treatments similar to those used in research on animals ie; escape/avoidance tasks (Krantz et al, 1974).
Later researches replaced the simple escape/avoidance tasks with more complex ones such as anagram solutions (Hiroto & Seligman, 1975; Gatchal & Proctor, 1976), and cognitive problem solving such tasks (Dweck and Bush, 1976; Diener and Dweck, 1978). In most of these studies, results obtained were similar to those observed in animals. The range and variety of tasks in which these studies documented LH in humans support Seligman's original notion (Overmier & Seligman, 1967) that LH is a fundamental type of learning which leads to motivational, cognitive and emotional deficiencies. Seligman (1973, 1974, 1975) had postulated that the major causal factor for the development of LH is the individual's belief or expectancy that his/her responses (actions) would not influence or alter the probability of an outcome (expectancy of response-outcome independence).

According to Seligman (1975) development of LH follows the individuals repeated exposure to perceived or actual uncontrollable outcomes resulting in expectation that future outcomes would be uncontrollable.

As research with human progressed, a number of investigators had pointed out the inadequacies of original LH model in humans (Abramson et al., 1978; Miller and Norman, 1979). The first set of inadequacies related to the issue of individual differences, and the fact that there may be more than one type of human helplessness. For example, how is it that individuals exposed to similar uncontrollable tasks often reach to quite different conclusions? The second set of inadequacies relates to the generality of helplessness across situations, and chronicity or persistence over time. That is, when and where helplessness will generalize once people believe that they are helpless in one situation? Abraham et al. (1978, 1980) and Miller & Norman (1979) had presented an attributional model of LH to resolve these problems.

### 2.3.3 Attributional Models of LH

The attributional model of LH is presented in Fig 2.5. The model indicates that when an individual is repeatedly exposed to perceived or actual uncontrollable outcomes, he may tend to expect that future outcomes will also be uncontrollable, and hence become passive or inactive. Research in LH in human so far was concerned on manipulating antecedent conditions, assuming LH state would follow, and hence measuring only consequences of LH. As a result, large variations observed in the consequences of LH could not be properly examined. This requires measurements of attributions and resulting LH state. The present study mainly concentrates on these issues.
2.3.3.1 CAUSAL ANTECEDENTS

Even though Abramson et al's (1978, 80) attributional model of LH was silent on determinants of attributions people make for their expectancy of response outdoor independence, attribution theorists (Kelly, 1967; Weiner, 1974, 1980) had discussed about causal antecedents of attributions. Reviewing the LH literature, Miller and Norman Miller and Norma (1979) had identified several situational cues that could influence the type of attributions people make. These antecedent conditions could be obtained by the individuals either through actual experience, or through vicarious learnings.

2.3.3.2 ATTRIBUTIONS

As indicated in Figure 1, people make several types of attributions for the success or failure on a task, and particularly for their experiences of response outcome non-contingency. Abramson et al (1978, 1980) used three attributional dimensions (i) internal - external (ii) stable-unstable (iii) global-specific.

Attributions to Internal-External Causes:

Internality is defined primarily in terms of a "self-other" dichotomy. When individuals believe that outcomes are more likely or less likely to happen to themselves than to relevant others, they tend to attribute these outcomes to themselves ie; internal factors. Conversely, when individuals believe that outcomes are likely to happen to themselves as to relevant others; then they make external attributions. Internal attributions of response-outcome non-contingency are likely to result in personal helplessness, whereas external attributions of response-outcome non-contingency may result in universal helplessness (Abramson et al 1980). Personal helplessness is categorized by the belief that an outcome is independent of one's own responses. On the other hand universal helplessness is categorized by belief that an outcome is independent of one's own responses as well as the responses of relevant others. Examples of internal attributions are one's effort level, skill, ability etc. whereas attributions to task difficulty, luck etc. represent external dimension.

Attributions to Stable – Unstable Causes:

In an attempt to explain the consistency of an expectation over time, attribution theorists (Weiner et al, 1971; Weiner, 1974) had introduced stable-unstable attributional dimension which is orthogonal to internal-external dimension. Stability refers to the relative performance associated with an attribution. That is, if an individual attributed response - outcome non-contingency to a stable factor; it may result in a helplessness state which is likely to persist over a period of time but under similar conditions situational cues. Examples of stable attributions could be one's ability, task difficulty etc unstable attributions, on the other hand, may result in a helplessness state which may not last long. It will fade away quickly as time passes. Examples of unstable attributions are mood of the person, effort level, luck etc.
Attributions to Global Specific Causes:

To account for the generality of helplessness across tasks and situations, Abramson et al (1980), and Miller & Norman (1979) suggested a third dimension, namely global-specific attributions which is orthogonal to internality and stability dimensions. Attributions to global factors affect expectancy and hence performance in a wide variety of situations and tasks, whereas attributions to specific factors may result in helplessness only in the original situation.

All the three dimensions of causal attributions described above are continuous rather than dichotomous. These three dimensions of attributions, namely internal-external, stable-unstable, and global-specific can be grouped together in different combinations which will result in eight types of causal attributions, these are:

1. Internal - global – stable
2. Internal – global – unstable
3. Internal – specific – stable
4. Internal – specific – unstable
5. External – global – stable
6. External – global – unstable
7. External – specific – stable
8. External – specific – unstable

Each of these combinations has a different implication for the future expectations of the people, and their performance on subsequent tasks.

2.3.4 Learned Helplessness and Related Studies

Learned helplessness is a term Seligman and his associates (1967) used to describe the results of learning the inability to control events. Helplessness training (exposure to uncontrollable stimuli) reduces the motivation to control outcomes, interferes with the learning of response-outcome relationships and produces fear and depression. These effects are expected to generalize beyond immediate task situation of the initial helplessness training (Weiss, 1996). Exposure to uncontrollable outcomes does appear to have important effects on human task performance and mood. However, effects on performance are not always negative. Theoretical explanations offered by Wortman and Brehm (1975) and Abrahamsen et. al (1978) have incorporated an initial desire to regain control over helplessness and initial attempts to increase motivation.

Learned helplessness is a predictor of employee outcomes: An applied model by Dawn S. Carlsonand K. Michele Kaonar - In order to be competitive, organizations are finding ways to become more efficient and effective. One key component in this process is "Human resources". In an effort to encourage employees to work to their potential, organizations have installed a variety of Human resource plans designed to make employees responsible for their behavior. However, many of these plans fail. One possible reason for their failure is that the employees are not capable of understanding the link between effort and performance. Individuals who fall into this category are considered Learned helpless. To better understand why some individuals cannot link effort and performance, a model is presented that depicts how individuals become Learned helpless, and the potential organizational consequences of Learned helplessness. Testable propositions are derived from the model.
**Environmental enrichment:** *The influences of restricted daily exposure and subsequent exposure to uncontrollable stress* by David R. Widman, Glenn C Abrahamsen and Robert A.

**Rosellini** - Environmental enrichment has been proposed to enhance an animal's subsequent ability to learn. The purpose of the present study is two-fold. The first is to demonstrate that restricted daily exposure to environmental enrichment is capable of producing effects similar to those using more standard exposure when compared to the most appropriate control, a group given social exposure. The second is to examine the proposed learning enhancement of environmental enrichment on an operant task both before and following exposure to uncontrollable stress. Uncontrollable stress, as interpreted by Learned-helplessness theory, results in the formation of an expectancy of response-reinforce independence which proactively interferes with the subsequent acquisition of response-outcome associations. It may be possible, then, that environmental enrichment and uncontrollable stress may interact in such a way as to allow the potential learning effects of environmental enrichment to be assessed on an operant task. Rats were exposed to differential environments; one group exposed to an enriched environment and another exposed to a social environment 2 hours daily for 30 days. Each group was then tested on the object-exploration test. Following the acquisition of an appetitive-operant response, a subset of these two groups was exposed to either controllable, uncontrollable, or no stress using parameters known to induce learned helplessness. Animals were then tested on an appetitive-non contingent test. It was found that, while the enrichment procedure was effective in producing effects on the object-exploration test, environmental enrichment did not modify the acquisition of the operant or the effect produced by uncontrollable stress on the appetitive-non contingent test.

**Learned helplessness in humans:** *A developmental analysis* by Frank D. Fincham Kathleen M. Cain - The investigation of Learned Helplessness (LH) in children is integrated with (a) research on LH in adults and (b) basic developmental research relating to the processes which theoretically mediate LH. It is concluded that developmental changes in perceptions of non contingency, causal understanding and expectations of future non contingency are all likely to influence the process whereby children of different ages manifest LH. Several sets of hypotheses relating to each of these variables are presented. In addition, it is argued that developmental research on LH should examine the relationship between the components of the attributional reformulation of LH and should be explicit about the conceptual status of these variables. Finally, several approaches to understanding the origins of individual differences in LH are evaluated.

**Learned helplessness in high school students following experience of non contingent rewards** by Nicholas J. Buys and Anthony H. Winefield- High school students differing in achievement motivation were subjects in a learned helplessness experiment using a yoked triadic design with non contingent rewards. A strong helplessness effect was observed in both high- and low-achievement motivation groups. A post experimental questionnaire revealed that perceived response-outcome independence was induced under the non contingent reinforcement condition, but was not associated with perceived failure. The results were seen as strong support for the original Learned helplessness model in two important respects. First, they refute recent claims that Learned helplessness depends on aversive outcomes, and second they show that human helplessness can be distinguished from experimenter-induced failure.
Chawla, A in *Learned helplessness in the banking sector: interaction of individual and role characteristics* and Balakrishnan, S in *Learned helplessness in organizations* analyse that organizations differ with respect to various dimensions of Learned helplessness. The null hypothesis that high performing banks and low performing banks have no difference with respect to all 8 factors of Learned Helplessness is rejected. And this fact has been validated by this study as well.

A critical analysis of theoretical and methodological issues in Learned helplessness is presented. The focus is on Learned helplessness as a behavioral trait independent of contextual conditions. Learned helplessness has been studied exclusively in achievement settings using achievement tasks, perceived as maladaptive behavior requiring some intervention strategy or re-training program. The future implication of study could be that it is studied as an adaptive response to situational demands.

The above studies show that Learned helplessness differs in humans, animals and organizations. Gap in literature has been identified in studies showing correlation between learned helplessness and performance of organizations or banks. So this has been taken up as the subject of analysis in the study.

### 2.3.5 LH Factors

**Factor 1** consists the undesirable aspects of one’s jobs, a specific stimulus and the attributions for these were generally made to the organizational culture, an external, stable stimuli. This factor represents *external-specific-stable* attributions.

**Factor II** includes orientation which is based on internality combined with temporary circumstances. This represents *internal-specific-unstable* attributions.

**Factor III** has two items. Both these items relate to one’s ability or lack of it to control the outcome of the events, likely to happen to him/her. Both these represent internal/global causes which are stable in nature. This represents *internal-global-stable* attributions.

**Factor IV** has three items. All three items relate to the undesirable elements in the culture of one’s organization, and his/her inability to do anything about them. This represents *external-specific-unstable* attributions.

**Factor V** has three items that relate to one’s effort level. An internal, unstable cause and the results he/she gets. This represents *internal-global-unstable* attributions.

**Factor VI** has two items relating to the lack of control over the events in general that are occurring around us. As these represent general, stable and external attributions, we may consider this factor as that representing *external-global-stable* attributions.

**Factor VII** has two items that relate to one’s ability to control or not able to control the outcomes of a specific event like getting into an accident. This represents *internal-specific-stable* attributions.

**Factor VIII** has two items that relate to the effort expended and the results obtained by people in general. This represents *external-global-unstable* attributions.
2.3.6 Uses of LH Scale

Most individuals possess skills, abilities, and opportunities for successful performance, but they fail to perform because of expectations of response-outcomes non-contingency formed on the basis of their past experiences rather than on the basis of their past experiences rather than on the basis of their current realities. The first step in alleviating LH in human is assessing the nature of LH involved i.e. whether the LH is produced by attributions to internal-global-stable causes, internal-global-unstable causes, external-global-stable causes and so on. Once the type of LH involved is diagnosed, it can be alleviated through an appropriate attributional training programme or by exposing the individual to response-dependent success situations or both. The present LH scale will primarily help diagnose the nature of LH involved in a given case.

Some of the interventions for elevating LH are suggested by Abramson et al (1980). Briefly this includes:

a) Changing the estimated probability of the outcome, this is done by changing the environment in such a way as to reduce the likelihood of aversive outcome and increase the likelihood of desired outcomes.

b) Making the highly preferred outcomes less preferred by reducing the aversiveness of unavoidable outcome or the desirability of obtainable outcomes

c) Changing the expectation from uncontrollability to controllability when the outcomes are indeed obtainable if the individual does not know how to emit appropriate responses then he/she should be trained these skills.

d) Changing unrealistic attributions for failure to more realistic attributions such as external, specific and unstable - and changing unrealistic attribution for success to internal, global and stable factors.

Martinko and Gardner (1982) have elaborated some of these strategies besides suggesting some more. These are discussed below:

a) **Immunization**

Immunization strategies are pretreatment strategies designed to provide individuals with experiences that will reduce their susceptibility to LH. Those belonging to disadvantaged group such as women or new workers may be pretreated by designing jobs so that these individuals will experience reasonable levels of success early in their career. These strategies could be incorporated into training and/or orientation programmes.

b) **Discrimination Training**

These strategies are based on the assumption that people do not sufficiently assess environmental clues associated with their successes and failures. They often need periodic feedback to help identify important cues. Such training therefore focus on helping employees in recognizing differences between the prior and the present situation. Thus, the management for example, might point out the differences between prior and current promotional policies.
c) Attributional Training
   This has been suggested Abramson et al (1980) and has already been discussed.

d) Modelling

   Research by Devellis, Devellis and Me DCauley (1978) demonstrated that people can acquire LH by observing a model. Thus the reciprocal proposition that people can unlearn "organizationally induced helplessness (OIH) vicariously" appears reasonable. This method encourages organizations to develop programmes to make successful employees more visible and to reward success through strategies such as social recognition.

2.3.7 Latest Researches done on Learned Helplessness :-

i) In their paper on “Effects of Stress (Life Events) and Locus of Control on Depression” (2007) A. P. Singh and A. K. Singh have focused on ORS & Learned Helplessness. The study was conducted on 210 managerial personal from different private sector organizations in India. They used there psychometric instruments namely “Life Changes Experience Survey”, “Social Reaction Inventory” and “Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale”.

   The major findings of their study were as follows :

   Presents results suggest that the experience of stressful life events truly and substantially increases the risk of depression. On the basis of our findings we can conclude:
   - Depression is positively influenced by the job negative stress.
   - Depression is positively influenced by the personal negative stress.
   - Depression is positively influenced by the total negative.
   - External LOC managerial personnel feel more depression than internal LOC managerial personnel.
   - LOC plays significant role as a moderator in the relationship between stress (life events) and depression.
   - If any manager who have high negative job stress and also scores high on external LOC the probability of experiencing depression will be more.
   - The positive stress along with internal LOC reduces the probability of experiencing depression.
   - Stress due to negative life events has deteriorating effects on depression.
   - Stress due to positive life events reduces the probability of experiencing depression.

ii) In their paper on “Effects of Stress and Locus of Control on Depression among managerial personnel” (2007) Singh A. P., Mishra L. K. and Sharma S focused their study on stress, Learned Helplessness and depression among 210 managers working in different private sector organizations.
The major findings of their study were as follows:-

This study was conducted on 210 managerial personnel working in different private sector organizations. In the present study perceived occupational stress and locus of control had been treated as independent variables. Depression was a dependent variable in this study. For the measurement of perceived occupational stress Occupational Stress Index (Srivastava and Singh, 1981) is used. Locus of control was assessed with the help of Social Reaction Inventory (Rotter, 1966). For the measurement of depression Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) (Radloff, 1977) was used. The statistics employed are correlation, t-test, and the stepwise regression analysis. The results of correlation indicate that depression is significantly positively correlated with role ambiguity, role conflict and stress (total). Also locus of control is positively correlated with depression. The results of regression analysis (stepwise) indicate that maximum variance in depression is significantly explained by role conflict. Further, results show that there is significant mean difference in depression between high (Q3 group) and low (Q1 group) role ambiguity, role conflict and locus of control groups. In sum it can be concluded that occupational stress and locus of control play a significant role in determining depression among managerial.

iii) In their paper on “Stress and Health Relationship Among Middle Managers : Role of Locus of Control” (2007) Singh A. P., Mishra L. K. and A. K. Singh focused their study on stress, health and learned helplessness, among 210 middle level managers selected randomly from the private sector organizations of India.

The major findings of their study were as follows:

It is concluded that managers, who perceived their role as ambiguous, find it difficult to understand what strategies they use to deal with role ambiguity. So it does not make any difference whether they are externals or internals. Thus, locus of control does not moderate the relationship of role ambiguity and general health. Finally, results indicate that locus of control plays a moderating role in the relationship between stress and health to some extent.

In the next chapter we will focus on the research design and methodology utilized for the present study.