CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

Choose a Job you love, and you will never have to work a day in your life.”

- Confucius

“It is the working man who is the happy man. It is the idel man who is the miserable man.”

- Benjamin Franklin

Quest for quality of life has been the characteristics of the entire history of human civilization. It has been the driving force behind all human endeavors. Interest in Quality of life is not a recent phenomenon (Chung, Killingworth & Nolan, 1997). The Greek philosophers were much taxed by notions of happiness and good life. Most people recognize the importance of active life and also try to enjoy their leisure time. But most of the people tend to see work as something that they just have to put up with or even something they don’t even expect to enjoy.

Work is an integral part of everyday life as it is an individual’s livelihood or career. In today’s modern world a large chunk of people’s life is spent at work. On an average, people spend around twelve hours per day in the work place which forms one third of their entire life. Hence work should yield satisfaction, give peace of mind, fulfillment of having done a task and having spent time purposefully, constructively, and fruitfully.
Working is a necessity for human beings since it is a critical activity for the preservation of personal health. Work can serve as an energizer for personal identity as it boosts the self-esteem of an individual when he does a meaningful work. It also develops a sense of identity, worth, and dignity. Achievement of a meaningful result assists an individual in growing and actualizing his full potential. It provides an opportunity to contribute to the improvement of his life conditions and of his community’s. When an individual is working he is exerting an effort in order to make something, to achieve something, or to produce a desired effect. For human beings, “to be able to do something” means to make it visible that “I”, as the subject, is active in the world, that “I” exist. Working is a meaningful way to prove one’s existence, and hopefully, that it is worth to be lived.

The terms Work and Job are normally used synonymously. But work is more comprehensive than job. Though work provides for basic subsistence needs and decent living conditions, this is not its only function. Work is a major activity for human beings. Work is considered a positive virtue and is described by such positive terms as industrious, diligent, persevering and willing to take initiative and devoted to one’s occupation. The work instinct of an individual is associated with the pleasure that provides the opportunity to achieve something, to surpass oneself, to exercise one’s imagination and intelligence, to become a better person, to know oneself, to meet other people, to help people, to feel competent and powerful, and to be effective.
Work is central in many cultures, although every culture has its own values and conceptions about it. Work is important and significant for a majority of people considering the time that individuals devote to work in their lives, the numerous functions which it accomplishes for them, and the fact that work is closely linked with other important aspects of daily life such as family, leisure, religion, and community life. The purpose of work that seems to emerge from several studies features six factors: social purpose, achievement-related pleasure, autonomy, recognition, moral correctness, and positive relationships. Recent developments in the world of work have led to a search to the moral correctness of social and organizational practices, with ethical and moral problems becoming a growing concern in the workplace.

Teaching is one of the most significant and noblest of all the work in the world. All other work in the society has their bases in teaching. As a profession it is the basis of the development of any country. Teachers are essential for the effective functioning of the nation. Teachers play an important role in constructing the personality of their students.

Teaching as a profession involves a complex work. The job of being a teacher is both demanding and challenging. Teachers draw upon physical, emotional and intellectual resources in order to be effective in the classroom. Like many professionals, teachers are also overwhelmed by multiple and complex challenges. In many parts of the world, teachers are rarely provided with the resources they need to meet the high demands and expectations
placed on them. The long hours at work include planning of lessons, supervision of student’s projects, evaluation of student’s work and conducting examinations which are coupled with pressures of their job environments eventually lead to debilitating health problems.

Since people at work commonly feel that work should be something that can be enjoyed. Every person at work attempts to make his work more enjoyable for himself and those around themselves. In this context, literature on making work more enjoyable is being discussed and hence the phrase, “Quality of Work Life”. Every individual feel that their work should give them satisfaction and motivate them to perceive their work. Teachers are no exception to it. This has give rise to attempts on improving the quality of work life of the teachers.

1.1 QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

In the post-modern era several factors which have evolved have led to an increase in concern for Quality of Work Life (QWL). Increase in education level and consequently job aspirations of employees, association of workers, significance of human resource management, widespread unrest in work place and knowledge and behavior of workers in the recent years have created a demand for research on the concept of Quality of work life.

The concept of Quality of Work Life is based on the assumption that a job is more than just a job. It is the core of a person’s life. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness
of organization and improved quality of life at work for employees. It is concerned with increasing employee management cooperatives to solve the problems of improving organizational performance and employee satisfaction.

Quality of work life has become a conceivable aspect of the work ethics and working conditions in recent days. Quality of work life is a principle of job enrichment and social technical enrichments and is a comprehensive effort to improve the quality of the work environment. It is designed to promote educational organization performance and teacher’s wellbeing which in turn depends on the management style, freedom to make decisions, pay and benefits, working conditions, safety and meaningful work.

A classic study by sociologist Elton Mayo, at Western Electric's Hawthorn plant in 1933 involved verifying the influence of environmental factors on plant workers' performance. The results of this study tempered the Taylorian performance rules applied until then. This initiated a beginning of a movement towards the policy of humanizing employees' work conditions. In the 1950s, the concept of QWL took root in the specific context of working conditions in the industrialized countries. The post-war economy triggered a spectacular growth in the service sector which, by the end of the 1960s, represented approximately 60% of all jobs in the United States. Despite this major change in the job market, most organizations persisted in
using an old-style Taylorian model in managing their companies; the result was that jobs became more dehumanized (Davis and Cherns, 1975).

In Sweden, the social-democratic policies of the government favored a shift towards work conditions that were more focused on workers' well-being. From the early 1960s, this approach was supported by Swedish unions, employers and the main political parties (Davis and Cherns, 1975). At the same time, the need to reorganize work was simultaneously felt in many of the Western European countries. But unlike in Sweden, the initiatives undertaken in the Netherlands, Denmark, France, Ireland, England and Norway were characterized by unorganized and isolated efforts (Cherns and Davis, 1975). On the other side of the Atlantic, pressure was becoming stronger to follow the trend initiated in Europe. Though certain isolated efforts like, sharing profits with their employees had been made to improve the working conditions for employees, it took several decades for the social sciences and humanities to take interest in work and in the relationship between workers' attitudes and behaviors, on one hand, and organization’s productivity, on the other hand.

The expression "Quality of Work Life" began to be used in the late 19th century. Irving Bluestone, who was employed by General Motors, used the expression "Quality of work life" for the first time in the late 1960s. It was the first set up in the United States that allowed workers to play an active role in decisions concerning their working conditions. Its goal was essentially to evaluate employee satisfaction in order to develop a series of
programs to increase worker productivity (Goode, 1989). According to many authors this represents the starting point for a number of researchers, employers, unions and employees who wished to define and monitor the common denominator that would enable them to reconcile the goals and aspirations of all parties involved in the working world. In addition to the context of job dehumanization, observed during the postwar period, the reasons mentioned by Lawler (1975) to explain researchers' sudden interest in QWL include, constantly increasing educational level of workers and budget problems in the United States that forced managers to reconsider their production methods.

The early 1970s was therefore a fertile period for research and attempts to clarify the meaning of QWL. The result of this boom was undoubtedly the International Conference on Quality of Work Life held from September 24-29, 1972 at Arden House, Harriman, New York. The major conclusions of this conference was to acknowledge the necessity of coordinating efforts by the researchers and organizations concerned in order to build up a solid theoretical corpus in the area of QWL research. In August 1973, The International Council for the Quality of Working Life was created, with a mandate to promote research and the exchange of information concerning mental health at work.

Despite the QWL summit, Lawler (1975) found, in retrospect, that no clear and widely accepted definition of QWL had yet been formulated. He attributed this fact to the wide range of interests of the groups that coexisted
within organizations. For example, some were primarily concerned with safe work stations whereas others focused on worker motivation with a view to increasing productivity. In the absence of a definition that would correspond to everyone's interests, Lawler (1975) suggested certain possibilities for consensus. First of all, it was deemed necessary to consider job satisfaction as an important part of QWL. Lawler claims that it is psychologically unacceptable to envisage a high QWL without needs for self-actualization being satisfied to some extent. On the other hand, he emphasizes the limits of the job satisfaction paradigm and finds that the two constructs are not the same. He first mentions that a certain degree of dissatisfaction is necessary to motivate workers to achieve their goals and motivate them to move further. Moreover, from an organizational point of view, if all workers reach a state of satisfaction, productivity is more likely to be harmed than improved. Finally, he points out that any definition of QWL must include measures of stress and tension likely to be present in the workplace, which are generally ignored by job satisfaction research. From a contemporary perspective, these initiatives may be viewed as an attempt to improve QWL.

1.1.1 Concept of Quality of Work Life

The term ‘Quality of Work Life’ (QWL) has different meanings to different people. Some consider it as democracy or codetermination with increased employee participation in the decision making process. For administrators, the term denotes improvement in the psychological aspects of work to improve productivity. Employees interpret QWL as more
equitable sharing of profits, job security and healthy and humane working conditions. Others view it as improving social relationships at workplace through autonomous workgroups. Some take a broader view of changing the entire organizational climate by humanizing work, individualizing organizations and changing the structural and managerial systems. It is also referred to as favorableness or unfavorableness of job environment for people working in it and the quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment.

**Robbins (1989)** defined Quality of work life as,

“A process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work”.

**Goodman defines,**

“Quality of work life is an attempt to restructure multiple dimensions of the organization and to institute a mechanism which introduces and sustains changes over time”.

According to **Powers (2004),**

“Quality of work life as a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment and high involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers”.
**Chan and Einstein (1990)** define Quality of work life as,

“The degree to which members of a work organization satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organization”.

**According to Luthans (1973),**

“Quality of work life is more concerned with overall climate of work. It is a concern about the impact of work on people as organizational effectiveness and an idea of participation in organizational problem solving and decision making”.

**Hersey and Blanchard (1984)** in their book, “Management of organizational behavior” defined quality of work life (QWL) as,

“The relationship between employees and the total working environment with human dimensions added to the usual technical and economic dimensions”.

**J. Bchard and J.Loy** defines quality of work life as,

“The degree to which member of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in the organization.”

According to **Harrison,**

“QWL is the degree to which work in an organization contributes to material and psychological well-being of its members”.
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According to the **American Society of Training and Development**, 

“QWL is a process of work organization which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organization’s environment, methods and outcomes”.

Quality of work life is also defined as,

“A process of joint decision making, collaboration and building mutual respect between management and employees”.

Broadly the definition of quality of work life involves four major parts: safe work environment, occupational health care, suitable working time and appropriate salary. A safe work environment provides the basis for the person to enjoy working. The employer and employee, aware of their risks and rights, could achieve a lot in their mutually beneficial dialogue.

Glacer feels, “Quality of work life requires an organizational climate and structures that really encourages, facilitates, rewards, questions, challenges or suggests ways to improve the existing operative modes”. It is seen that the essential components of quality of work life are basic extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions and the intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work itself. Individual power, employee participation in the management, fairness and equity, social support, use of one’s present skills, self development, a meaningful future at work, social relevance of the outcome may also have an effect on extra work activities.
The definitions of quality of work life and its characteristics make clear, the goal of improving the quality of work life lies in the organizational conditions that foster individual learning and development, that provide individuals with substantial influence and control over what they do and how they are to do it and that provide individuals with interesting and meaningful work that serves as a service as a source of a personal satisfaction and a means to valued personal rewards. Quality of work life improvements are defined as any activity which takes place at every level of an educational organization, which seeks greater institutional effectiveness through the enhancement of human dignity and growth… a process through which the administrators in the educational organization management, unions and teachers learn how to work together better to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve the twin and simultaneous goals of an improved quality of life at work for all teachers of the institution and greater effectiveness for both the institution and the teacher.

Apart from defining QWL, some scholars have operationalized the concept (Walton, 1973; Orpen 1981; Taylor, 1978). One of the first scholars to do so was Walton (1973), and emerging from his research was a number of determinants or components of QWL. Walton’s (1973) remains arguably the most comprehensive attempt to operationalize the concept, and attempts that have followed have mostly drawn from his endeavors and hence bear similarities. Orpen (1981) is an example of these authors who clearly adopted and extended Walton’s (1973) criteria for the QWL, and Taylor (1978) whose
investigations into the underlying structure of QWL revealed similarities to Walton’s categories.

Richard E. Walton explains quality of work life in terms of eight broad conditions of employee that constitute desirable quality of work life. He proposed the following criteria for measuring quality of work life:

- **Adequate and fair salary:** The committee on fair salaries defined fair pay as, “the pay which is above the minimum salary below the living age”.

- **Safe and healthy working conditions:** Most of the educational organizations provide safe and healthy working conditions due to humanitarian requirements and legal requirements.

- **Opportunity to use and develop human capacities:** The extents that the teacher can exercise more control over his her work, and the degree to which the teaching job embraces an entire meaningful task, but not a part of it. Further quality of work life provides for opportunities like autonomy in work and participation in planning in order to use human capabilities.

- **Opportunity for career growth:** Future opportunity for continued growth and security by expanding one’s capabilities, knowledge and qualifications contributes to Quality of work life. Opportunities for promotions are limited in case of teachers either due to educational barriers or due to limited openings at the higher level.
Social integration in the work force: Social integration in the work force can be established by creating freedom from prejudice, supporting primary work groups to have a sense of community and interpersonal openness, egalitarianism and upward mobility of teachers.

Constitutionalism in the work organization: Quality of work life provides constitutional protection to the teachers only to the level of desirability as it hampers work. It happens because the educational management’s action is challenged in every action and bureaucratic procedures that need to be followed at that level and is provided to employees on such matters as privacy, freedom to speak, and equity.

Work and quality of life: Quality of work life provides for the balanced relationship among work, non-work and family aspects of life. In other words family life and social life should not be strained by working hours including overtime work, work during inconvenient hours travel, transfers, and vacations.

Social relevance of work: Quality of work life is concerned about the establishment of social relevance to work in a socially beneficial manner. The self esteem would be high if the teacher’s work is useful to the society.
1.1.2 Indicators of Quality of Work Life

People’s quality of life is determined by their performance concerning four functional areas: physical and occupational functioning, psychological state, social interaction and somatic sensation (Schipper, Clinch, & Powell, 1990). From a conceptual perspective, Calman (1984) was the first to suggest that quality of work life is determined by the gap between the person’s expectations and actual achievements. The potential gap between expectation and achievement can shape individuals’ perceptions of their performance on the aforementioned functional areas. The definition implies that quality of work life includes objective indicators of professional achievement as well as indicators of the distance between the achievements and the person’s needs and expectations.

Studies by Walton, 1974; Mirvis and Lawler, 1984; Uma Sekaran, 1985; Deci and Ryan, 1985; Warr, 1987; Etuk, 1989; Thomas and Velthouse 1990; Jain, 1991; Baba and Jamal, 1991; Snelders, 1996; M. Joseph Sirge et al, 2001; Subrahmanian and Anjani N, 2010; Daljeet Kaur, 2010; P.Subburethina Bharathi, 2011; and Farideh Haghshenas Kashani, 2012; have attempted to identify the indicators of Quality of work life. Table No.1.1 shows the indicators of Quality of work life identified and studied by the researchers.
**Table No. 1.1: Table showing the researchers and the indicators of Quality of Work Life identified by them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Indicators of QWL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, et al., (1979)</td>
<td>basic extrinsic job factors (wages, hours and working conditions), intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work, individual Power, employee participation in management, fairness and equity, social support, use of one’s present skills, self development, a meaningful future at work, social relevance of the work or product, and effect on extra work activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warr and colleagues, (1979)</td>
<td>work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, higher order need strength, perceived intrinsic job characteristics, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, happiness, and self-rated anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirvis and Lawler, (1984)</td>
<td>Safe work environment, Equitable wages, Equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitish, (1984)</td>
<td>Organizational firm, hierarchy and staffing pattern, work group size, internal network and communication concern for quality, concern for people, ideals and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba and Jamal, (1991)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment and turn-over intentions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph M. Sirgy, et al., (2001)</td>
<td>Health and safety needs (protection from ill health and injury at work and outside work, and enhancement of good health), Economic and family needs (pay, job security, and other family needs), Social needs (collegiality at work and leisure time off work), Esteem needs (recognition and appreciation of work within the organization and outside the organization), Actualization needs (realization of one’s potential within the organization and as a professional), Knowledge needs (learning to enhance job and professional skills), and Aesthetic needs (creativity at work as well as personal creativity and general aesthetics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Key Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasl Saraji. G. and Dargahi H. (2006)</td>
<td>Fair Pay and Autonomy, Job security, Reward systems, Training and career advancements, opportunities, Participation in decision making, Interesting and satisfying work, Trust in senior management, Recognition of efforts, Health and safety standards at work, Balance between the time spent at work and the time spent with family and friends, Amount of work to be done, level of stress experienced at work, occupational health and safety at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesha Tabassum, (2011)</td>
<td>Adequate and fair compensation, flexible work schedule and job assignment, attention to job design, and employee relations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following eleven indicators were reported to be positively correlated to Quality of work life of teachers.

- **Job Security:** Job security is assurance that an employee has about the continuity of gainful employment for his or her work life. This concerns the perception of the teachers that the job will continue into future in stable manner and that there is realistic opportunity to career advancement. Teachers need to be free from fear and anxiety concerning health and safety, income and future employment. Job security means that teachers who decide to pursue permanent teaching employment have a reasonable chance in the hiring process. More than half of the teachers in Indian government, aided and unaided schools are employed on short-term contracts, resulting in job insecurity, the loss of potential holiday pay and an inability for some to satisfy their personal needs. The fear of losing job may create unnecessary stress
and fear in the mind of a teacher and hence a teacher may be unable to concentrate on his / her work. Job security affects the quality of work life.

Conditions in the work environment must be created by the employer to give all the teachers freedom from fear of losing their jobs. The system must create healthy working conditions with optimum financial security.

- **Equitable pay and rewards:** This indicates whether the teacher is compensated commensurately to their contribution to the value of the service and equitable pay programs. The key is to ensure fairness and consistency for similarly performing and contributing teachers.

- **Justice in the work place:** This reflects the perceptions of teachers that they are being treated fairly from management and co-teachers. Higher authorities and colleagues should not differentiate each others on the basis of caste, gender. Rules and regulations should be applied equally to all. Teachers should have equal opportunities for attending in-service training programmes, seminars, workshops and freedom to express their views about the administration of the institution. Educational organizations should emphasise on additional benefits such as prepared educational assistance and vision, increased opportunity for flexible work arrangements and job-sharing, training, and development of teachers. Seniority is generally taken as the basis for promotion of teachers.
- **Meaningful and Interesting Work:** This represents tasks at work that enable a teacher to upgrade his knowledge, skills and capabilities. It removes the monotony of teacher’s job and makes the teachers enthusiastic, satisfied, initiated, and interested in work. Teachers are able to identify the professional and institutional needs to their job and they give importance to administrative orders and they enjoy with their work that would help the society. A well accomplished challenging teacher’s job yields greater satisfaction than a monetary perk. It also boosts their self confidence.

- **Supervision:** The head master of the school must become a supervisor and more a helper available to provide assistance and support when these are required. Higher authorities should maintain good human inter relation and try to bring team spirit to teachers and encourage them to work. Heads of the institutions and higher authorities have to maintain good human inter-relation and try to bring team spirit in teachers and give objective feedback and career guidance to the teachers.

- **Control over Self, Work and Work Place:** It is the extent that the teacher can exercise control over his/ her work, and the degree to which the teaching job embraces an entire meaningful task. It provides for opportunities for autonomy in work and participation in planning in order to use human capabilities to enhance their quality of work life.
Teachers are able to build up conducive environment of work in their institution and they maintain self discipline and committed to rules and regulations of their work. They could efficiently utilize the resources of the institution to work successfully.

- **Decision Making Opportunities:** Teachers should manage themselves, be involved in the decision making process that affects their work and accept greater responsibility in the work of the educational organization. It is an opportunity regarded as the cognitive process resulting in the selection of a course of action among several alternatives. Heads of the institution should take decisions after considering the opinions of the teachers. Teachers should be free to adopt new methods of teaching and new techniques to evaluate students learning.

- **Opportunity for career growth:** Opportunities for promotions are limited in case of all categories of teachers either due to educational barriers or due to limited openings at the higher level. Future opportunity for continued career growth provides for quality of work life and opportunities for expanding one’s capabilities, knowledge and qualifications. Clear career paths help teachers to see opportunities within their educational organization.

- **Work Feedback and Knowledge of Results:** Adequate feedback that a teacher receives from different sections such as administrator,
supervisor, principal, colleagues, parents and the students work as a motivating factor. It increases work motivation and encourages teachers. Because motivation is increased, performance should improve, thus resulting in both a more humanized and more dynamic work. Negative effects such as turnover, absences, grievances and idle time also tend to be reduced. Thus both the teacher and society benefit. The teacher performs better, experiences greater job satisfaction and becomes more self-actualized, thus being able to participate in all life roles more effectively.

- **Work Authority:** Teachers need to know that they have individual choice over significant components of their work and that they can use personal knowledge and skills to best accomplish professional tasks. Teaching being highly creative, the teachers may need freedom to try out innovative methods of teaching and adequate opportunity for expressing their ideas and talents so that there is variety and novelty in the teaching learning process. Lack of flexibility may make teaching monotonous and affect the quality of teaching.

- **Recognition of Contributions:** Teachers who feel appreciated are more positive about themselves and their ability to contribute. Teachers with positive self-esteem are potentially best in their work place. Participative management, awarding, rewarding systems, congratulating the teachers for their achievement, job enrichment,
offering prestigious designations to the job, providing well furnished and decent work place, offering membership to associations are some means of providing recognition to teacher’s work.

In addition to these indicators QWL is viewed as a wide ranging concept which includes adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, provision for social integration in the work organization that enables an individual to develop and use all his capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, workers’ rights, recognition for achievement, meaningfulness and significance of work, workload / pressures and work, autonomy and control, enjoyment of work, creativity and innovation.

Quality of work life of teachers is influenced by a number of factors. The important factors that influence and decide the quality of work life are:

1. **Attitude:** The person who is entrusted with a teaching job needs to possess a favorable attitude towards acquiring sufficient knowledge, required skill and expertise, enough experience, enthusiasm, energy level, willingness in the educational organization, involvement in the job, inter personal relations, adaptability to changes in the situation, openness for innovative ideas, competitiveness, zeal, ability to work under pressure, leadership qualities and team spirit. This would contribute to the Quality of Work Life of teachers.
2. **Environment:** The teaching job requires the teacher to work in an environment which involves students who have varied tolerance level, performance, behavioral pattern and level of understanding. It may involve working with low performing students and slow learners. The teacher’s alertness, presence of mind, high level of patience, tactfulness, empathy and compassion and control over emotions is required.

3. **Opportunities:** Opportunities offering scope for learning, research, discovery, self-development, enhancement of skills, room for innovation, public recognition, exploration, celebrity-status and loads of fame are valued, are interesting and rewarding.

In order to have QWL, it is not enough to have a job that generates Job satisfaction. There are other factors involved, such as the physical conditions of the workplace, which contribute to a better QWL.

### 1.1.3 Models of Quality of Work Life

In conjunction with clarifying the theoretical questions relating to the subjective nature and holistic integration of the main factors in QWL, in the 1970s researchers gradually turned their attention to the potential influence of work on a person's other spheres of life (Loscocco and Roschelle, 1991).

The following five theoretical models were proposed:

a) The Integration Model

b) Spillover Effect Model
c) The Compensation Model

d) The Segmentation Model

e) The Accommodation Model.

\textit{a) The Integration Model}

As early as 1975, Seashore conceptualized QWL as being based on three levels of actors involved in the work environment, that is, the employee, the company and the community. This approach differs from the concept of QWL that had here to been reserved for employees at the bottom of the pyramid. According to this model, the domains constituting QWL differ from the perspective of the employee, the company and the community, which contributes to the confusion surrounding the construct (Sashkin & Burke, 1987).

Ten years later, the concern for integration initiated by Seashore (1975) resurfaced with a more holistic view of the role of the three structures involved. This integrative perspective considered QWL as a social movement with repercussions that extend beyond the strict organizational framework (Kiernan & Knutson, 1990). Moreover, it is noted by many authors that workers are becoming better educated and that they now consider work as a tool for personal growth and social support rather than merely a means of achieving financial independence (Kerce & Booth-Kewley, 1993). QWL therefore becomes an integral part of people’s overall quality of life. Kiernan and Knutson (1990) consider this model of QWL to
be the most contemporary and the most complex of all models developed to date.

**b) Spillover Effect Model**

This model is also known as the Transfer Model. According to this model, job satisfaction affects other areas of life and vice versa (Georges and Brief, 1990). Kavanagh and Halpern (1977), Schmitt and Bedian (1982) and Kornhauser (1965) observed that there is a positive correlation between work and areas of life outside work. However, Staines (1980) adds to this observation. Following an in-depth analysis of the research, he concludes that only certain spheres of work life are positively correlated with other spheres outside work. In support of this hypothesis, Rousseau (1978) claims that the transfer model does not apply to all kinds of jobs. Jobs with extreme characteristics (prolonged solitude, oppressive physical requirements, etc.) fit better with the compensation model.

Leiter and Durup (1996) add that the spillover effect between job satisfaction and personal life may be either direct or indirect. A direct effect can be observed when an objective condition of either one's working or personal life (change of workplace, arrival of a new baby, etc.) influences the other environment without the individual's subjective perception being involved. An indirect effect results from the individual's perception of an objective condition as creating either stress or satisfaction.
c) The Compensation Model

The compensation model assumes that when a person is not satisfied at work, he will try to correct this situation through stimulating activities outside work [Rousseau, (1978); Schmitt and Bedian, (1982); Schmitt and Mellon, (1980); Staines, (1980)]. Staines's (1980) analysis tends to confirm the compensation model in certain circumstances and shows that certain spheres of work life correlate negatively with areas outside work. For example, Staines points out that the workers who have physically demanding jobs generally tended to seek out non-tiring leisure activities so that they can recover better. The main criticism concerning the compensation model is that, taken to the limit, this model predicts an inverse relation between job satisfaction and satisfaction outside work (Martel & Dupuis, 2006), which the research in general does not tend to show.

d) The Segmentation Model

This model assumes that life at work and life outside work do not influence each other (Georges and Brief, 1990). Foucher et al. (2003) add that the state that characterizes a person who makes this kind of segmentation may be qualified as "psychological disengagement" in the face of the life or work domain is divested.

Martin and Schermerhon (1983) in their stressor-health path analysis model identified a similar relationship between job and life satisfaction. Martin and Schermerhon (1983) projected that a clear separation of job and
life dimensions creates balance, whereas a spillover of work-related feelings detrimentally affects life satisfaction. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) described the uniqueness of work and non work demands and opined that an active role is often required to maintain a separation between roles. The model developed by Martin and Schermerhon (1983) stressed the importance of boundary creation between these two roles in order to maintain equilibrium. Leakages can develop between role boundaries as responsibilities in one area spill over to others. When individuals are unable to maintain balanced and separate, role responsibilities between work and family, the likelihood for conflict between the two role areas increase. Research shows that spillover and stress can adversely affect mental health (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000).

e) The Accommodation Model

The accommodation model consists of voluntarily reducing one's investment in one sphere of activity in order to more adequately respond to the demands of another (Lambert, 1990). He mentions that this way of reconciling work life and life outside work is particularly common among mothers of young children. However, considering the importance recently given to "work life-family life" conciliation, this model will probably be suitable for more and more categories of workers, either men or women.

Loscocco and Roschelle (1991) mention that none of the other models are universally accepted. They emphasize that the most solid support
for the models comes from Schmitt and Bedian (1982), who confirm the existence of a relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. However, the results that Staines (1980) and Rousseau (1978) present qualify the adoption of any of the models and suggest that they should be applied based on the spheres and jobs studied.

Along the same lines, Elizur and Shye (1990) attempted to define the relationship between general quality of life (QOL) and QWL. In their efforts to clarify the situation, these researchers formulated a conceptual system in the shape of a cone, with quality of life at the base and QWL at the apex. Their results show that, in this model, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and perceived quality of work performance are located between the extremities of the cone. These results are interpreted as follows: quality of work performance is affected by both QOL and QWL. Thus, to evaluate the total impact of the role of work for an individual, it is important to also consider the work aspects likely to influence their life away from work. Consequently, any activity designed to increase QWL or general QOL may improve performance at work.

From the above-mentioned, it is evident that there are a number of models that relate to QWL. Therefore, for the purpose of this study emphasis will be placed on the spill-over model since the model does not only capture need satisfaction, per se, but also employees’ perceptions of organizational sources of need satisfaction stemming from the work environment, job requirements, and supervisory behavior.
1.1.4. Strategies for Improvement of Quality of Work Life

Quality of Work Life can be improved by adoption of various strategies by the organization and the individual teachers. The strategies for improvement in quality of work life include self managed work teams, job redesign and enrichment, effective leadership and supervisory behavior, career development, job security, administrative organizational justice.

1. **Self managed work teams**: These are also called autonomous work groups or integrated work groups or integrated work teams. These work teams could be formed with four to five teachers who plan, coordinate and control the activities of the team with the help of a team leader who is one among them. Each team performs all activities including selecting their members. Each team has the authority to make decisions and regulate the activities. The group as a whole is accountable for the success or failure. Salaries are fixed both on the basis of individual and group achievement.

2. **Job redesign and enrichment**: Narrow jobs can be combined into larger units of accomplishment. Jobs are redesigned with a view to enriching them to satisfy higher order human needs. It also must recognize that teachers need to be involved in designing the educational organizations they work in and that the design may have to take into account the teacher’s capacity to act in a certain way at a specific point in time. No design will last forever; the process of
redesign will need to take into account new educational technologies and growing individual capacities. Since Quality of work life designs are based on the teacher’s ability to make judgments about what is desirable in the workplace. Hence heads and teachers must maintain an open communication about the way the workplace is designed and managed. Discussions can focus on improving job security, safety, and other work conditions. The development of teaching profession and educational organizations enable teachers to develop their abilities and fulfill their needs in the schools.

3. **Effective leadership and supervisory behavior**: Effective leadership supervisory behaviour of the heads of the institutions play an important part in the professional growth of teachers. It is not only their responsibility to lead teachers, it is also important for supervisors to serve as mentors and coaches in an effort to enhance teacher performance and development. As a mentor, supervisors are looked upon as role models who are responsible for guiding teachers toward the achievement of their professional goals. Mentors or heads of institutions in most cases display more experience, skills, or knowledge than teachers that they are attempting to mentor. They should be responsible for teaching and directing teachers through encouragement and advice to enhance QWL.

4. **Career development**: Provision for career planning and communicating provides future opportunity for continued growth
and security by expanding the teacher’s capabilities, knowledge and qualities.

5. **Job security**: Teachers need to be free from fear and anxiety concerning health and safety, income and future employment. Since this tops the teacher’s list of priorities, it should be adequately taken care of in order to improve the QWL of teachers.

6. **Administrative or Organizational justice**: The principles of justice, fairness and equity should be taken care of in disciplinary procedures, grievance procedures, promotions, transfers, work assignments and provision of leave to ensure high QWL of teachers.

Klot, Mundick and Schuster suggested eleven major qualities of work life issues which may act as strategies for enhancing QWL of teachers. They are:

1. **Pay and stability of employment**: Good pay dominates most of the other factors in teacher satisfaction. Stability to a greater extent is to be provided for enhancing the facilities for human resource development and hence QWL of teachers.

2. **Reducing Occupational Stress**: Stress is a condition of strain on one’s emotions, thought processes and physical condition. Stress is caused due to irritability, hyper excitation or depression, unstable behavior and fatigue. Occupational Stress is determined by the nature of work,
working conditions, working hours, pause in the work schedule, individual abilities and nature and their match with the job requirements. Stress adversely affects teacher’s productivity. Causes of occupational stress need to be identified, prevented and tackled.

3. **Organizational Health programs:** Organizational health programs aim at teacher’s health problems means of maintaining and improving of their health. Effective implementation of these programs result in reduction in absenteeism, hospitalization, disability, and these results in excessive job yield. Organizational health programs should also cover relaxation techniques, physical exercise & diet control.

4. **Alternative work schedule:** Alternative work schedule including work from home, flexible working hours, and reduced work, may be introduced for the convenience and comfort of the teachers. The work schedule which offers flexible hours of work is preferred by the teachers.

5. **Participative educational management and control of work:** Teacher’s unions and teachers believe that teacher’s participation in educational management and decision making improves quality of work life. Teachers feel that they have control over self, use their skills and make a real contribution to the job if they are allowed to participate in creative and decision making process of the educational management.
6. **Recognition:** Participative management, awarding the rewarding systems, congratulating the teachers for their achievement, job enrichment, offering prestigious designations to the job, providing well furnished and decent work place, offering membership to associations, providing vehicles, offering vacation trips are some means to recognize the teachers. Recognizing the teachers as a human being and as a teacher increases the quality of work life.

7. **Congenial relationship:** Harmonious relations between the higher officials and teachers give the teacher a sense of social association and belongingness. This in turn leads to better quality of work life.

8. **Grievance procedure:** Teachers have a sense of fair treatment when the school gives them the opportunity to ventilate their grievances and represent their case briefly rather than setting the problems arbitrarily.

9. **Adequacy of resources:** Resources in the organisation should match with the stated objectives. This would ensure that the teachers will be able to attain the set objectives which may result in teacher’s satisfaction and higher quality of work life.

10. **Seniority and merit in promotions:** Seniority is generally taken as the basis for promotion in case of teachers. Merit is considered as the basis for advancement for managerial personnel whereas seniority cum-merit is preferred for promotion of teachers. Fair and just
promotional policies and activities ensure higher quality of work life of teachers.

11. Employment on permanent basis: Employment of teachers on casual, temporary, probationary basis gives them a sense of insecurity. On the other hand, employment on permanent basis gives them security and leads to higher quality of work life.

Implementation of these strategies ensures higher level of quality of work life of teachers. Improved quality of work life leads to improved performance. Performance should mean not only physical output but also the behavior of the teacher in helping colleagues in solving job related problems, accepting orders with enthusiasm, promoting a positive team spirit and accepting temporary unfavorable work conditions without complaints.

Advocates of quality of work life do not believe that the provision of a high quality of work life for members of the institution must be achieved at the expense of the productivity and effectiveness of the institution. In fact, the argument made in favor of enhancing the quality of work-life is quite the contrary. Quality of work life advocates believe that the factors leading to a poor quality of work life for the teachers of an institution are precisely the same factors that account for the declining productivity and effectiveness of many modern educational organizations.
Teacher’s Associations and Unions claim that they are responsible for the improvement in various facilities to teachers whereas the educational management takes credit for improved salaries, benefits and facilities. However Human Resource Management has specific issues in quality of work life besides normal salaries, fringe benefits etc, and should take lead in providing them so as to maintain higher order quality of work life.

1.1.5 Measurement of Quality of Work Life

The theoretical evolution of the construct of QWL has been subject to an ongoing conceptualization effort, ever since it first appeared. Attempts to develop a definition capable of giving rise to an operational strategy (evaluation method and measuring instrument.) that will make it possible to adequately measure the construct gave rise to theoretical models of Quality of Work Life. According to the definition of QWL presented by Boisvert (1977), QWL is a set of beneficial consequences of working life for the individual, the organization and society. This definition is the only one to take into consideration Seashore's (1975) observations concerning role efficiency. However, the first part of the definition - "a set of beneficial consequences of working life" - does not suggest either an underlying construct or an approach based on operational measures. The definition of Carlson (1980) takes absolutely organizational point of view and emphasizes the dynamism of QWL and describes it as a process experiencing constant change. Unfortunately, the superimposition of the concepts of goal and
process make it, to all intents and purposes, impossible to operationalize in a measuring instrument. Nadler and Lawler (1983), define QWL as a "way of thinking." Although this approach adequately integrates the three QWL constituents, its main weakness lies in attempting to define a complex subjective construct by means of an equally complex and subjective notion, i.e. way of thinking. Indeed, "way of thinking" is a construct just as difficult to operationalize as QWL. These comments are also valid for Kerce and Booth. Kewley's (1993) definition, which, although much shorter, essentially comprises the same points raised by Nadler and Lawler (1983) ten years earlier.

Sirgy et al. (2001) published a validation of a QWL questionnaire based on a definition that returns to the concept of satisfaction as an underlying theoretical model. This publication suggests that, even after 30 years after the concept first appeared, QWL was still being defined in terms of satisfaction.

As Nadler and Lawler (1983) point out, the difficulty of defining QWL. This represents a sizable obstacle to the further development of research in this field. Work on QWL faces the difficulty of creating a link between the state of theoretical knowledge of QWL and its application in research.
Lawler (1975) opines that any method for measuring QWL must concentrate on four characteristics:

1. First of all, it must be valid, that is, it must measure the important aspects of QWL.

2. It must also have sufficient face validity in the eyes of anyone likely to use it.

3. It must be objective and, consequently, verifiable, without any possibility of being manipulated.

4. It must be capable of distinguishing between individual differences within the same work environment.

Contrary to Lawler (1975), Seashore (1975) deplored the fact that the paradigm generally used until then to define QWL was based on the claim that the feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction determines the level of QWL. To support his opinion, he asserted that close to half of the variance in job satisfaction measures could be explained by a relatively limited number of environmental conditions. In addition, Seashore emphasized the absence of any time perspective in measuring the concept of satisfaction and its consequent insensitivity to changes within the organization, the job or the individual. He observed that objective and stable work conditions explained 40% of the variance in workers’ satisfaction and consequently a proportion of such behaviors as absenteeism, illness or other unproductive reactions. Another 50% were explicable by less stable individual differences related to
workers' demographic situation and personality. Due to the dynamic and unstable nature of satisfaction, a measurement tool of QWL must be able to take into account not only the past but also the future consequences of current work conditions.

Seashore (1975) added that job satisfaction is a constructionist sociable form of QWL both in research and in theory and that it must be considered as a cause and not a consequence of QWL. All these observations lead him to suggest a new paradigm to define QWL, "effectiveness in work roles." According to Seashore (1975), the concept of "effectiveness in work roles" can be defined as follows. Three separate aspects of the working world must be considered: those related to

1. The employer,
2. The employee and
3. The community.

From the employer's point of view, QWL is reflected in terms of performance: productivity, production cost, and product quality.

For the employee, aspects such as income, safety, and the intrinsic satisfaction created by work is considered.

From the community's perspective, QWL is one of the results of "effectiveness of job roles". For example, to what extent are the talents and competencies of each worker used. In Seashore's opinion, the underuse of such capacities represents a net loss for society.
Despite the apparent incompatibility of these points of view, it is found that they all share one common denominator: the costs resulting from a poor fit between the employee and the work place. For example, there is no doubt that a sick worker represents an additional cost for the employer and a burden on a society's social or health-care system.

Sheppard (1975) identifies the methodological issues that present an obstacle to the measurement of QWL. He denounces the use of batteries of tests, which he considers useless for measuring a concept as subjective as QWL. He also notes the tendency to replace measurements of subjective areas closely related to job satisfaction (for example, degree of autonomy) with objective and verifiable indicators such as salary or the possession of specific goods. He states that there cannot be any substitutes for the direct measurement of job satisfaction and that variation in income do not necessarily entail any change in satisfaction. In his opinion, the simplest way to assess job satisfaction is to measure its frequency with such questions as, "How much of the time are you satisfied with your job?". Sheppard evokes the principle of parsimony to justify his choice, affirming that the results of test batteries correlate strongly with a simple frequency question on job satisfaction.

Trist and Westley (1981) also radically oppose studies based on "pre-test, post-test" measures to assess the impact of QWL improvement programs. To justify their disagreement, they point out that subjects' criteria may change over the course of the program. Thus, in response to the
question "How satisfied are you with your work?" a subject might answer "Fairly" on the pre-test and "Not at all" 6 months later, at which point he might have realized how much his job could actually be improved, thereby invalidating the measurement obtained. Objective measurement criteria such as productivity, absenteeism rate or staff turnover remain the most reliable indices for determining the impact of such programs.

Trist and Westley's (1981) criticisms of the validity of the QWL measurement raise two important points: first of all, the use of the concept of satisfaction as a criterion for measuring QWL and, secondly, the problem related to the measurement of a dynamic construct. Like Lawler (1975) and Sheppard (1975), Trist and Westley (1981) note that the construct of satisfaction is regularly used to assess QWL. A brief examination of the definitions of satisfaction shows that it corresponds to a psychological state resulting from the difference between the situation in which a person finds himself or herself and the situation in which that person wishes to be (Boisvert, 1981; Locke, 1976; Quilty et al., 2003). Thus, the way satisfaction is measured, generally on a continuum, makes it totally inappropriate for measuring dynamic constructs such as QWL. In fact, according to Golembiewski, Billingsley and Yeager (1976), a dynamic construct like QWL is characterized by three kinds of possible changes: (1) "alpha" changes, which correspond to a change in a condition over time; (2) "beta" changes, which correspond to a change in a condition over time, but with a possible change in reference point as well; and (3) "gamma" changes, which
correspond to a change in condition over time, with a possible change in reference point and a change in the person's perspective and priorities. As Trist and Westley (1981) emphasize, a static construct like satisfaction (which can only measure "alpha" changes) is therefore inappropriate for evaluating a dynamic construct like QWL.

Kiernan and Knutson (1990) emphasized the subjective nature of QWL to the point of making it concept specific to each individual, just as Nadler and Lawler (1983) had feared. The individual malleability attributed to the concept condemns it to remain subject to interpretation and possibility of attaching a valid assessment method to it. Nevertheless, this theoretical approach has the advantage of taking account of the dynamic nature of QWL.

Though importance of QWL of teachers is obvious, the social and psychological conditions exert a strong influence on the levels of their job stress, and work culture. Quality of work life is apparently related to work culture and the stress experienced at work.

1.2 WORK CULTURE

The concept of culture has been long in use by a number of disciplines in a variety of settings. The concept has potentials which no other currently used concept in organizational behaviour seems to possess. Culture is the man–made part of the environment (Herskovits, 1995). It reflects the way of life of people, their traditions, heritage, and design for living. Culture
is the very air they breathe and spirit which permeates their life. It is the totality of beliefs, norms, and values which is related to the patterned regularity in people’s behaviour.

The word ‘culture’ is a derivation from the Latin word ‘Cultura’. In its intellectual and artistic sense culture is a metaphonic term analogous to the art of cultivating of the soil. It’s relative term ‘civilization’ is a derivation from the Latin word ‘Civis’ which means actual living conditions of the people. The term culture also means an indirect simple control over the concept of barbarism which originally was a description of such persons or group who were generally considered irrational aliens doing un-humanistic deeds for their own self-interests against the general interests of the people affecting peace and prosperity of the society.

Culture according to some (White, 1948), determines everything that people do, feel, and think. ‘Human behavior, therefore, is determined by culture’ (White, 1948). For others it is nothing but a bunch of independent variables (Segall, 1984), which might ‘include basic institutions, subsistence patterns, social organizations, languages, and social rules governing interpersonal relations’ (Segall, 1983). For still others, ‘culture has no ontological reality; it is neither a super organic reality external to organism, nor is it an idea in the minds of the organism. Culture is a logical construct, abstracted from human behavior, and as such it exists only in the mind of the investigator’ (Spiro, 1951).
Two perspectives on culture have been discerned: culture as a behavioral system and culture as an ideational system. It is through the flow of behavior that cultural forms find articulation’ (Geertz, 1973). The patterned regularities in the behaviors of a group of people reflect the presence of certain norms and values which are the cardinal components of culture. In contrast, Rohner (1984) defines culture as ‘the totality of equivalent and complementary learned meanings maintained by a human population or identifiable segments of a population, and transmitted from one generation to the next’. The ‘learned meanings’ are of course drawn from the behaviors of a people, and are yet distinct from both the people and their behaviors. They reflect the ‘sum of rules’ observed by people for guiding their behaviors. The behaviors may be seemingly different and yet may be governed by the same set of rules.

Culture prepares an individual to think of new ways of life and do proper social, economic and moral actions in the society and helps to develop a work culture. It is culture which helps a person to develop work habits. A member can interact in the society with other members, intelligently, morally and diligently and can do work according to the needs of the society.

The idea of revival of old values and work culture is necessary. The warding off of the materialistic values generated by mechanization which emerged due to industrialization is also necessary. Mechanization made man materialistic; self-centered and greedy which resulted in the fall of old social
values. It has made man mad for hedonistic gains, consequently resulting in loss of common interest aimed at social love and affection. So modern concept of cultural revival is an effort to ward off the effects industrialization has given to boost modernization, urbanization and acculturation. So revival of culture which covers work habits also, is necessary for peaceful living in the society. According to Thomas Carlyle, Samuel Tylor Coleridge (1830) and Mathew Arnold, revival of culture is an attempt to save the human beings from greed and immorality. Revival of culture is also aimed at (a) enrichment of folk life, (b) renewal of old values and traditions, (c) appraising and educating the youngster about old culture and civilization.

Aspects of culture always entail a form of work culture. If an individual does not develop good work habits he or she cannot progress. Progress depends on particular kind of work habits culture inculcates in individuals; whether the work culture habits are based on dignity of labor morality; honesty, sharing and humility or on self-interest. Teachers work force was contributes significantly to the development of future human resource of the nation.

Hofstede categorized cultural layers to classify people according to the habits of their environment: 1. National level, based on a country. 2. Local level (regional), and / or ethnic, and or religion, and or language. 3. Difference sex level (gender). 4. Generation level, such as parents with
young children. 5. Social levels, associated with education, and occupation or profession. 6. Levels of the organization or company.

Culture may embody the totality of behaviors and interactive relationship within the context of work. It influences the way an individual works, his beliefs, norms, and values which regulates his behaviour and actions at work. These contribute to the work culture of an individual. Work culture entails new ideas, urge for creativity, aestheticity, performance as per requirement of the job or pay packets. Whether the work culture ethics is maintained by the worker which involves sincerity to the job for which he is paid, whether the employer is also sincere and, looks to the interests of the workers is depicted by their work culture.

1.2.1 Concept and Meaning of Work Culture

Work culture means work related activities and the meanings attached to such activities in the framework of norms and values regarding work. These activities, norms, and values are generally contextualized in an organization.

The concept of work culture has been, defined by different theorists.

Pettigrew (1979) defines,

“Work culture is the system of personally and collectively accepted meanings of work, operating for a given group at a given time’.
According to **Peters and Waterman (1982)**,

“Work culture is a system of ‘shared values’, which results in high performance in organizations”.

**Singh (1985)** defines,

“Work culture is the prevalent and common patterns of feeling and behavior in an organization”.

**Sinha (1990)** labels work culture as,

“The totality of the various levels of interacting forces around the focal concern of work”.

Work culture means work related activities in the framework of norms and values regarding work. Robbin explained that the work culture practically contains the pattern of values, attitudes, behaviours, intentions and results of the work, including instruments, work systems, technology and the language used. Work Culture is closely linked to the values and the environment that lead to the meaning and philosophy of life, which would influence the attitudes and behaviour at work. Work Culture is the result of life experiences, habits, and the selection process (accept or reject), the norms that exist in a social interaction and work environment.

An organization has its boundaries, goals and objectives, technology, managerial practices, material and human resources as well as constraints. Its teachers have skills, knowledge, needs and expectations. These two sets
of factors—organizational and organism—interact, and over time establish roles, norms, and values pertaining to work. It is this totality of the various levels of interacting factors around the focal concern for work which is labeled as work culture. In other words, organizational culture generally overlaps with work culture. However, the two are conceptually different, at least within a short time span, for a non work culture is likely to render an organization non-viable and defunct over a longer period of time.

It may also be argued that as a part of a large organization individual may develop and retain their own little work cultures within the organizational culture that they share. One can take this line of argument into the opposite direction and contend that work culture of an individual is a sub-cultural system which reflects a specific configuration of the larger culture which surrounds a work organization.

In short, work culture signifies work related activities, the cognitions, the affect, and the values attached to them in terms of the normative structure within a setting. There are different levels and types of settings pertaining to work and work related activities. Of them, organization is by far the most visible and well-defined entity. Hence, work culture of individual may be examined at four levels within an educational organization. The four levels are:

1. Educational organization goals and objectives and the way they are perceived and reacted to by the employees.
2. Educational technology of an institution, its structure, work forms, and financial position.

3. Social groups, norms, values, power structure, and role relations.

4. Work behaviours and other work related activities.

Work cultures vary from society to society. Old cultures and civilizations of India, China, Greece and Persia laid down a strong foundation of work culture. These cultures were more humanistic due to good work traditions.

The Japanese Labor Ministry (1980) reported that the Japanese are found to work harder than others. Japanese manufacturing workers worked an average of 2,146 hours annually compared to the 1,934 by the Americans, 1,957 by the British, 1,799 by the French, and 1,728 by the West Germans. In comparison, Indians, according to one estimate, work only 1,456 hours annually (Tandon, 1989). Only 24 percent of the manufacturing industries in Japan have adopted the five day week compared to the 85 percent in western countries. The net weekly working hours in Japan in 1981 was 41.3 compared to 36.3 in USA, 36.4 in UK, 32.8 in West Germany, and 34 in France. Interestingly Japan recorded a rise from 1974 while others suffered a loss in the net weekly working hours (Japanese Working Life Profile, 1984). The Japanese workers were found to avail of only nine and half days as annual vacation, although the allowed length is a minimum of
ten to twenty days per annum. Compared to the west European rate of absenteeism of 10 percent or more, the Japanese rate is 1 to 2 percent. The turnover rate in Japan is about half that of the US and one-fourth of Australia (Hanami, 1983). They are the ones who still cherish the work ethic. It is found that the tradition of physical labor, Buddhistic austerity, and character cultivation have prepared the Japanese to dedicate themselves completely to their work. The Meiji Restoration (1968) helped import western institutions as well as the Protestant ethic. Due to their precarious resource situation, the Japanese had to work hard in order to survive. What was required for survival has become a kind of habit and the Japanese have developed a strong commitment to work.

Motoyoshi (Misumi, 1983) agreed with that the Japanese people find life worth living their work. However, the values attached to manual work are certainly weaker than those related to intellectual work. In contrast to American workers, the older Japanese are greater ‘workaholics’ (European Community Report, 1979). However, the Japanese do not start their life as workaholics. They study with concentrated effort in high school but enjoy life in college (called a leisure land). By the age of 20, the Japanese are comparable to any American in their work commitment. However, the importance of work starts increasing as the Japanese join an organization, and reach the age of 40 (Misumi, 1983). At this age they are much more committed to work than their American counterparts. These findings, however, are controverted by the annual survey of the Japan Productivity
Centre. The Centre reported a declining work ethic and an increasing lack of responsibility amongst the younger generation of salaried employees. The Tokugawa work ethic does not seem to be as perfect as many authors report. Misumi (1983) summarized the findings of the surveys of the Japan Productivity Centre (1969-77)

It may be fair to say that the sense of belongingness to specific enterprises is on the wane and workers in modern days are becoming increasingly inclined to change jobs readily if they can find a better place to work, that their desire to advance to higher positions within the company has weakened, and that they prefer to live lives suited to their taste rather than work like a slave. The latest trend is from the image of diligence associated with the Japanese people. The American, British, and other west European workers are in fact taking a lead in setting this trend. They as showing less willingness to tolerate the harshness of the society which coerced people to undertake unpleasant jobs. The enterprises are striving to make work less unpleasant by introducing automation, guest workers, schemes of job enrichment, and now shifting to a four-day week. Many employees seek early retirement. Younger ones defer their entry into the workforce. They stay longer in education and do not like to take up a permanent job immediately after completing their education. Many of them are quite selective in their preference. Some totally opt out of regular jobs and want to do whatever pleases them. They form communes and groups and claim to do societal useful though unpaid work. The main concern with them is to
self-actualize live in harmony with the environment, and refrain from the rat race for material affluence.

In short, the traditional concept of work seems to have lost its centrality in the life of the people in the west, other activities, which are equally useful to society or are enjoyable, are performed with high motivation. The concept of work is probably undergoing a radical transformation. The study also revealed that work is only second to family in life role importance: 39.5 per cent considered family as the most important and 26.5 per cent placed work as most important in five life roles. The trend is now towards expanding the concept of work and integrating the various life roles in a more meaningful way.

In India the approach to work has been somewhat different. Unlike The Bible, Shri Bhagavadgita preached that: Both renunciation and practice of work lend to the highest bliss; of these two. Practice of work is better than Renunciation of work. The British managers believed in Kiplking’s (1920) model of man and therefore took Indian subordinates as ‘half devil and half child’. The Indian workers are by and large rural. They bring to their organizations the cultural norms and values in their most raw from. However, in the teaching profession, there has been a greater penetration of social habits and cultural values into the fabric of educational organizations.

McClelland (1975) commented that Indians perform work as a ‘favor’ to others. Work is believed to exhaust a person by draining out his energy
which he believes to be precious and limited. Hence he tends to conserve his energy which he can expend only in return for favor or tangible gain. Ganesh (1982) made an equally strong statement when he said that work as ‘a concept and a culture has not been internalized in Indian organizations’. He went on to elaborate his contention by pointing out that there is a very little concern for (a) quality of product and services; (b) timeliness; (c) costs; (d) people who work around; (e) employees’ future; and (f) organizational process.

An analysis of a work culture would inevitably lead to the tracing of its roots into the following contextual sources:

1. The socio-cultural values and systematic features of the surrounding milieu.

2. The body of knowledge regarding work and work forms, technological advancements, and the resultant trends and issues in the realm of work. The focal point is the concept of work the way it has evolved and is viewed today.

Work culture of a teacher is the common sense that a teacher brings to work. The work culture of a teacher consists of the attitude towards work, beliefs about work, common expectations of work, and the perception of the way things have always being done at work. Many elements of work culture are uncommon and assumed.
Teacher’s work culture is represented by the behaviour and actions of individual teacher who is part of an educational organization and the meanings that individual teachers attach to their actions related to work. It includes their values, visions, norms, language, systems, symbols, believes and habits in relation to their teaching job. It is the pattern of behaviours, assumptions for perceiving, thinking and feeling. The work culture affects the way teachers interact with their students, colleagues, higher authorities and the community members.

Teacher’s work culture is a set of mental assumptions of the teacher which guide their interpretations and actions about their work by defining appropriate behaviours for various situations. In the age of knowledge, the work culture of a teacher is driven by the need to access information in order to transmit knowledge. Work is focused on the transmission of knowledge. The work culture of a teacher is developed over a period of time in response to the needs of the work place and the inputs that are available to get the work done. Teacher’s Work culture is made up of the beliefs and expectations of the teachers.

The teacher’s work culture provides the inputs for bringing out the capabilities and possibilities of work life. It substantially defines the teacher’s vision of personal and professional purposes and ends. It directs the pattern of interaction of the teachers with their colleagues authorities and stake holders. The teacher’s work culture is expressed in the values that
embody their core ideology about work. Work culture decides the role of the teacher within the institution.

Teacher’s work culture is socially and culturally moulded. It is also observed that all individual teachers do not have similar work culture. Psychologically it is true that all teachers have individual differences. They differ due to their heterogeneous nature. Climatic conditions, orthodoxy and dogmatic beliefs, and caste hierarchy affect the work conditions and work culture. Every individual teacher possesses his / her own unique culture and co-exists with different characteristics in the team of teachers in an educational organization. The urge for work and the sincerity to work and interest the teacher takes at work differ from individual to individual and organization to organization and form their work culture.

Individual teacher’s work culture needs to be in alignment with organizational culture and values. Research shows that organizations with teachers possessing a strong work culture are highly benefited. Teachers with strong work culture:

- achieve their vision and goals effectively,
- possess high work motivation and loyalty,
- posses increased team cohesiveness among their team
- promote consistancy and encourage co-ordination and control in their work
This enables the teachers to perform more efficiently leading to effective educational organizations. The advancements in educational technology requisites implementation of ideas to be an important part of a teacher’s work culture.

Work Culture of a teacher forms the back bone of any educational organization and has a huge influence on its structure. Work Culture involves a willingness to take on challenging aims and forms an asset that one could sense when walking into an organization, when interacting to the staff, and find bunch of persons act together as a unit. Agencies like employer, bureaucrats, community are found to regulate work culture.

1.2.2 Organizational aspects contributing to strong Work Culture of teachers

Teacher effectiveness depends on creating a strong work culture in which teacher thrives.

The following aspects of an educational organisation contribute to strong work culture of a teacher:

- **Diversity:** A diverse staff will help provide a strong work culture for their work. Hiring teachers of different ethnicities, ages, gender, abilities and personalities will ensure a vibrant and interesting workforce.
Safety: A safe place to work is essential for workplace. Teachers should be provided with written safety guidelines, which must be followed to ensure the well being of all.

Creativity: A healthy workplace is one in which creativity flows. Teachers should be encouraged to brainstorm, plan and present ideas that are new and focused on propelling their work upward; Explore different ways of doing things to avoid stagnancy and spark imaginations; Hold frequent meetings in which the floor for everyone to contribute thoughts is open.

Structured: A workplace must be structured in order to be productive. A healthy structure provides a framework while not stifling the ideas and aspirations of the teaching staff. A structure that will allow teachers to lean upon it while they ascend to new heights in their work should be built.

Flexible: Teacher’s are flexible in themselves and they will make the workplace a pleasant one to inhabit. Teachers should be allowed some flexibility in setting their work hours. Willingness to bend to the needs and desires of staff members will gain their trust and loyalty and create a healthy work culture.

Wellness Focus: A healthy work culture has teachers who are given every opportunity to take care of their physical and mental health. Perhaps, the best way to do this is with quality health care benefits.
The work cultures prevailing in the educational institution plays a
great role in deciding the teachers work culture and thus the status of the
institution as well. The educational institution must possess a work culture in
which every teacher should be provided a feel of being a part of the
educational organization and therefore will be more involved, more excited
and more loyal to the educational organization.

The work culture of a teacher is influenced by the work environment
and organizational work culture. The characteristics of work culture were
identified in the literature on quality and the new management paradigm by
Lawrence M. Miller and Jennifer Howard. In their discussion they have
identified the following major paradigm shifts that demonstrate the swift
change in thinking and behaviour of work environment which are known to
influence the work culture of the teachers:

- **Control Management to Commitment Management**:

  The culture of the educational organization is changing. Earlier
  performance was measured simply and reward and punishment administered
to provide control. The head of the institution controlled and determined
reward and punishment. Today, however, the critical performance was
thinking about better ways to get the job done, initiating actions to improve,
and creating new methods of teaching. Teachers are not so easily
‘controlled.’ They require innovative thinking and autonomy. Heads of the
institutions must give control to those who have their hands on the work.
Eliminating fear and unnecessary control increases commitment, creativity and other flexible factors. Heads of the institution create commitment by sharing vision and values, involving teachers in decision making, facilitating knowledge of students and performance, and helping to improve the process.

❖ Task Focus to Process and Students Focus:

In the past, heads of the institutions were responsible for defining teacher’s responsibility in terms of specific tasks. In today’s work environment, the “right” task definition changes quite frequently as educational methods are continuously improving. In order to optimize quality, teachers must understand who their students are, their requirements and they must be involved in efforts to improve their process to meet student’s needs. A quality educational organization is a student focused organization. A student-focused organization defines work in terms of responsibility for the complete process that serves the needs of the stakeholders. The teacher’s job is conditioned by his understanding of the needs of his students and society or community.

❖ Command to Consensus Decision Making:

Command to consensus decision-making has been the dominant decision making model for most of the mankind’s existence. Command to consensus decision produced the conformity and uniformity that led to success in highly repetitive work. Things have changed. Rather than centralized command to consensus decision making, commitment,
involvement and ownership, leads to creativity and acceptance of responsibility. The degree of system integration or interdependence between educational organizations and human resource dictates a consultative or consensus decision process.

- **Individual Work to Teamwork:**

  In the past, administrators assigned tasks to individuals and then rewarded or punished them. This worked well as long as the tasks were simple and independent. Today, tasks are increasingly complex and interdependent requiring greater teamwork. Teamwork requires decision making by the teachers and among teachers. Today, in many team-based educational organizations, teachers are making their own decisions about the tasks that have to be completed and also about the members who would be performing them. They may take turns by rotating tasks, or they may choose to specialize in tasks. Now the heads of the institution and the administrators help the teams make these decisions well and assures that the educational process is functioning well.

- **Right Way to Continuous Improvement:**

  Educational Technology products and services, requirements, and work processes changed slowly in the past. These change overnight today. By the time the “right way” is discovered, a new way emerges. In the past, the administrator was the authority on the right way to act. Now the administrator is liberated from this dehumanizing assumption. It is assumed
now that the ‘right way’ is constantly moving forward. The new ‘best way’ may come from the junior most teachers who have their hands on the process. Administrators today are not judged by knowing the right way, but by helping to facilitate continuous improvement. Continuous improvement is only possible if every individual at every level and in every function is involved and accepts responsibility for improving performance to stakeholders.

❖ Unstated Values to Shared and Stated Values:

In the past, the heads of the educational institutions and administrators were not accountable to those below and did not need to reveal their principles. They were only answerable to a higher authority. But now, quality educational organizations have clearly stated values that define desired behaviours, ethics and goals. When values are clearly stated and shared, they serve as a unifying force directing energy towards productive efforts. If educational organization values teamwork, heads of the institutions are expected to model teamwork. If an organization values continuous learning, heads are expected to model continuous learning.

These shifts have a strong impact on the work culture of the present day teacher. The work culture of the individual teacher is also influenced by the social system that in turn has the greatest impact on teamwork, motivation, creativity, and risk taking. The social system includes the reward structure, the symbols of power, the relationship between teachers and
among groups, the privileges, the skills and styles, the politics, the power structure, the shaping of the norms and values, and the “human side of enterprise” as defined by McGregor. Unfortunately, the social system is always in a state of flux due to pressure from ever-changing influences from the external physical and technological environments.

If the work culture of the individual teacher has to result in continuous improvement it must be redesigned so as to be consistent with the vision and values of the institution. There are six areas which must be addressed in order to change and transform the culture of an individual of quality driven educational organization.

- Environment (work)
- Service
- Methods
- Teacher characteristics
- Educational organization structure and
- Quality educational management mindset

A survey has found that teachers report their schools to be environments where there is substantial agreement on goals and priorities, where teachers support one another to become more successful at their work, where staff development is organized in a way that respects and includes teacher concerns, and where positive aspects of teacher are evaluated.
1.2.3 Components of Teacher's Work Culture

The work culture of an individual teacher is routine of his history, traditions, values and vision of work. Recently research has been conducted to study Work Culture. Studies by Sue Campbell and Clark, 2001; Sandeep and A. P. Singh, 2009; Bhupen K. Srivastava and Mamta panda, 2011; Ebrahim Salehi Omran et al, 2012 have attempted to identify the components of Work Culture. Table No.1.2 shows the components of Work Culture identified and studied by the researchers.

**Table No. 1. 2: Table showing the researchers and the components of Work Culture identified by them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Components of WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wendy J. Casper et al (2006)</td>
<td>Social inclusion, equal work opportunities, equal access to be new skills, equal respect for non work life, and equal work expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima Mathur et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Internal locus of control, future orientation in planning, participation in decision-making, and obligation towards others in the work context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark and Sue Campbell (2001)</td>
<td>Flexibility of working hours, (flexibility of the work itself, and supportive supervision), and work-family balance in the context of selected characteristics that can put individuals at risk for work-family imbalance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The review of studies related to Work Culture both in India and in other countries have revealed the components to be correlated with teachers work culture. Figure no. 1.1 shows the components of work culture within the educational organization.

**Figure No. 1.1:** Figure showing the components of teachers work culture within the educational institution.
The components of teacher’s work culture within the educational institution are as follows:

- **Team Work and Adjustability:** Team or group work is prevalent in many fields throughout the world. Educational institutions increasingly use teams to make important decisions. The importance of teams within an institution is an important variable in the performance of an educational organization as a whole. Work teams can identify high quality solutions to emerging educational problems, can give synchronous communication to improve school performance and they can decrease costs by maximizing flexibility and responsiveness to student demands. The potential benefit of using teams has most likely lead to the prevalence of team use in many educational organizations.

- **Proactiveness and Work Load:** The most valuable teachers are the ones who are proactive. By definition, this means they control situations by causing things to happen rather than waiting to respond after things happen. People who are proactive don’t sit around waiting for answers to appear; they stand up, put one foot in front of the other, and find the answers. They don’t wait for someone to hand them an instruction manual and a box of tools; they’re resourceful. Proactive people are constantly moving forward, looking to the future, and making things happen. They’re actively engaged and are not passively observing. Being proactive is a way of thinking and acting.
Proactive teachers are rarely caught by surprise because they anticipate problems and events, understand how things work; look for patterns; recognize the regular routines, daily practices and natural cycles that exist in their teaching. At the same time they, do not allow themselves to become satisfied. They use their imagination when anticipating future outcomes. They don’t simply expect the past to always be an accurate predictor for the future; instead they use their creativity and logic. They come up with multiple scenarios for how events could unfold. Proactive teachers foresee potential obstacles and exert their power to find ways to overcome them before those obstacles turn into concrete roadblocks. They plan for the future and they are not idle observers, but are active participants. In short being proactive means taking timely, effective action.

- **Obligation:** Teachers have the power to change the world. They can affect students' lives through the gift of knowledge, evaluating students' progress, and caring about and encouraging the student both in and out of the classroom. The following are the duties and obligations of a teacher:

  The teacher's top priority is to present the curriculum to students. Teachers have to possess in-depth knowledge and experience in the subject matter being presented. Teachers are also responsible for testing students on the curriculum and grading the students' knowledge of the course material. They need to manage the classroom, keep
control of the students and administer proper forms of discipline when disruptive situations arise. Teachers have to create lesson plans to help them and guide the students through each class. Lesson plans include required material and ideas for presenting the topics in fun or memorable ways. These plans are also proof that they are presenting the curriculum as required by state departments of education and school boards.

Teachers support students by participating in after-school activities whenever possible. This shows that the teacher cares about all aspects of the student's life, creating trust and respect. Teachers also form partnerships with parents, who must monitor homework assignments and encourage younger students to read daily. Teachers are obligated to solve problems faced by students. Teachers have obligations to work together with administration to solve major problems by being part of school site governing councils.

**Transformational Leadership:** Transformational leadership is a type of work culture that leads to positive changes in those who follow. Transformational leaders are generally energetic, enthusiastic and passionate. Not only are these leaders concerned and involved in the process; they are also focused on helping every member of the group succeed as well. Transformational leaders not only challenge the status quo; they also encourage creativity among colleagues. The leader
encourages followers to explore new ways of doing things and new opportunities to learn.

Transformational leadership involves offering support and encouragement to individual followers. In order to foster supportive relationships, transformational leaders keep lines of communication open so that followers feel free to share ideas and so that leaders can offer direct recognition of each follower’s unique contributions. Teachers who are transformational leaders have a clear vision that they are able to articulate to their colleagues. These leaders are also able to help followers experience the same passion and motivation to fulfill these goals. The transformational leaders serve as a role model for co-teachers. Since colleagues trust and respect the leader, they emulate the transformational leader and internalize his or her ideals.

- **Role clarity:** Role clarity is defined as having sufficient information about the responsibilities and objectives of one’s job and having knowledge of the behaviors considered appropriate to reach these goals. Ideally, the process of defining each teacher’s role should proceed such that each teacher is clear about his or her role. Unfortunately, this is often not the case and teachers experience a lack of role clarity or, as it are commonly called, role ambiguity. According to Breaugh and Colihan (1994), teachers are often unclear about how to do their jobs, when certain tasks should be performed and the criteria by which their performance will be judged. In some cases, it is
simply difficult to provide a teacher with a crystal-clear picture of his or her role. For example, when a job is relatively new, it is still “evolving” within the organization. Furthermore, an individual teacher has tremendous flexibility regarding how to get the job done. This is particularly true of highly complex job of teachers. Role ambiguity is simply due to poor communication between either head master or colleagues and among members of work groups.

Nurturing these components of work actually would contribute to building a strong work culture in teachers. Individual work culture should foster creativity, provide excellent motivation to the individual to put in his best performance in an enthusiastic creation of a charged up environment. The work culture of the faculty has a great role in improving the status of the educational institution as well as the individuals. Work culture where in the individual teachers of the organization are more involved, more exited, and more loyal to the organization, feels part and takes part in decision making and implementation of the plans, in turn improves the individual performance as well as overall performance of the institution.

It is necessary for the present teacher not to forget that he / she is the successor of past Indian teacher, and enjoys similar status, and as such, similar obligations to the society. It is therefore, most important, for the contemporary Indian teacher not to fall prey to inaction and not doing their work sincerely. Simple living, high thinking and also doing the assigned
teaching, duties sincerely should be the motto of teacher’s life. Gender differences and demographic conditions also play a vital role in work culture of the personnel of a country. It is, therefore, necessary to study work culture which is influencing the teaching work force of the country and to find out ways and means for developing a healthy work culture of teachers for the progress and prosperity of the nation.

The work culture being a complex construct in teachers, consisting of different attitudes, perceptions, values and beliefs, with their work stress may influence their quality of work life.

1.3 JOB STRESS

Today’s life is full of challenges. In everyday life people come across many situations some of them act as a source of inspiration for us and some causes challenges. Any challenge that exceeds the coping abilities of the individual causes stress. Teachers are no exception to this.

Stress in our society is not something that is invisible. Stress is a common phenomenon of everyday life. All of us experience stress to some degree in one or another form through our lives. Stress is inevitable in modern life. As organizations become more complex the potential for and amount of stress is increasing. It is an inescapable consequence of socio economic complexity and to some extent its stimulating cause as well.
According to Vanwyk (in Olivier & Venter, 2003), stress is derived from the Latin word "strictus" that translates into taut, meaning stiffly strung. Oliver and Venter (2003) rely on the definition of Dr. Hans Seyle, who defined stress in physiological terms, as a non-specific or generalized bodily response. This response results when any demand is made on the body, whether it is an environmental condition to survive or a demand that we make on ourselves in order to accomplish a personal goal.

Stress is defined as “a state of tension that arises from an actual or perceived demand that calls for an adjustment or adaptive behavior” (Olson, McCubbin, Barnes, Muxen, Larsen & Wilson, 1989).

Cox (1978) defined stress in terms of (1) the external environmental stimulus characteristics (2) individual’s emotional states (3) an interaction variable emphasizing the relationship between individuals and their environment. When stress was first studied in the 1950s, the term was used to denote both the causes and the experienced effects of pressures. More recently, however, the word stressor has been used for the stimulus that provokes a stress response. Currently, the disagreement among researchers concerns the definition of stress in humans and their argument is based on the following question: Is stress primarily an external response that can be measured by changes in glandular secretions, skin reactions, and other physical functions, or is it an internal interpretation of, or reaction to, a stressor; or is it both (O’ Driscoll & Beehr, 2000). People need to find ways
of using stress in a productive way, reducing dysfunctional stress and dealing effectively with it.

Urbanization, industrialization and increase in the scale of operations in the society are causing increasing stress. Every man, woman, employed, unemployed is facing stress in his/her work. In this context job stress has become increasingly common.

Fimian, M.J. (1986) in his study indicated that continued job stress can drastically lower job satisfaction and performance and can also damage the individual's personal life. The term "burnout" is often used to describe the effects of continual stress. Teacher's commonly face problems related to loss of control, isolation, dissatisfaction with salary, role overload, role ambiguity and lack of administrative support. Logically, a teacher's mental health can be expected to affect class room performance and interactions with students and others as well. Teacher’s job stress could lead to burnout.

1.3.1 Meaning and Definition of Job Stress

Teacher stress has been viewed as an interactive process which occurs between teachers and their teaching environment which leads to excessive demands being placed on them and resulting in physiological and psychological distress (Forlin & Hattie, 1996).
Job stress or Work place stress can be defined as,

“an emotional state that people experience in situations where they perceive an imbalance between the demands placed on them and their ability to meet these demands.”

**Beehr and Newman (1978)** defined Job Stress as,

“A condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from normal functioning.”

**National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH, 1999)** has more specifically defined work related stress as,

“The harmful physical and emotional responses that occur when the requirements of the job do not match the capabilities, resource needs of the workers.”

Work related stress is also defined as,

“The emotional, cognitive, behavioral and physiological reaction to aversive and noxious aspects of work, work environments and work organizations. It is a state characterized by high levels of arousal and distress and often by feelings of not coping.”
The Health and Safety Executive (HSE, 1995) defined work related stress as,

“The reaction people have to excessive demands or pressure, arising when people try to cope the tasks, responsibilities or others types of pressures connected with their jobs, but find difficulty, strain or worry in doing so.”

Job stress is the result of the interaction between a person and the work environment. For the person it is the awareness of not being able to cope with the demands of his work environment, with an associated negative emotional response. Job Stressors are events or circumstances that lead to the feeling that physical or psychological demands of their job are about to exceed his / her ability to cope. Job Stressors can be of several types. Stressors can be inherent in the job because of factors that make that occupation what it is – for example, the mixture of pressures in teaching work may be with the transparent work and sometimes dealing with emotionally repugnant material. Stressors can rise because the way the job is organized. This may include physical factors (noise, cold, etc..) as well as psychological factors (such as inadequate time) that affect the body’s balance. Stressors can also arise out of the excessive work demands such as unrealistic deadlines, and can arise out of personal factors such as health status, interpersonal relationship and ability to cope with difficult situations etc.
Job stressors tend to vary from job to job and from organization to organization. According to Schaubroeck and Ganster (1991) these Job stressors can be easily divided into three classifications:

1. Job stressors that is common to a wide variety of jobs. This group includes issues regarding stakeholder demands, time constructs, and ineffective training.

2. Job stressors that is common to a wide variety of organizations. This group includes issues related to the absence of support from organizational superior, non-competitive wage structures, poor jobs descriptions and in effective organisational motivational strategies of the organization.

3. Job factors related to the interdepartmental activities within an organization. This group includes issues such as poor co-operation and organizational quality. Occupationally related stressors also tend to evolve from changes occurring in organizational environment, organizational staffing and job task.

There have been many attempts to reach an adequate definition of job stress by a number of theorists and researchers. There is a growing consensus on the definitions of stress as a negative psychological state with cognitive and emotional components, and its effects on the health. As any other job, teaching too can be stressful to teachers. The problem of teacher’s job stress is a serious one, and it is evidently important to view it from a
multivariate perspective. Teacher’s job stress is an experience of unpleasant emotions by the teacher, resulting from aspects of the teacher’s job, which are perceived by him or her as threat to psychological and physical well being.

According to Boyle et al. (1995), teacher stress may also be defined as,

“a response of negative affect resulting from aspects of the teacher’s job and mediated by the perception that the demands made upon the teacher constitute a threat to her / his well being.”

Teacher stress is negative response of pressures exerted by multiple factors. These factors may be organizational, physiological or behavioral. These pressures are mediated by cognitive appraisal of teachers.

Teacher’s job stress is an interactional phenomenon which demands an emphasis on all the individual and organizational aspects and dimensions of the teacher.

Given the role of cognitive appraisal, stress reactions can be determined by individuals’ perception. Based on the classical theories of stress (Lazarus, 1984), Beehr and Newman (1978) proposed three perspectives for viewing occupational stress: the personal characteristics which are thought to cause or contribute to stress; the environmental characteristics which are the causal agents of stress; the interaction between
the individual and the environment together with the stress generated by this interaction.

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1979) describe stress as, a response syndrome of negative affect (such as anger and depression), usually accompanied by psychological changes resulting from aspects of teacher’s job and mediated by the perception that the demands made upon the teacher constitute a threat to his or her self esteem or well being. Laughlin (1984) explained that, this definition reveals that the issue of teacher stress is one of the complex interactions of factors, whose results may be the negative feelings that are associated with stress. A vital assumption inherent in the above definition is that an important contributory factor in the experience of stress in teachers is not only the aspects of the job, but also elements of the individual teacher emphasizing the individual subjective perception of work experience.

Teacher’s Job stress is a complex phenomenon and a subjective experience. It is often linked or equated with challenge but the two are very different. A challenge motivates and energizes and one feels relaxed, satisfied and happy when it is met. Job stress on the other hand arises when job demands are not met, relaxation turns into exhaustion and sense of satisfaction converts into feeling of tension. It also adds up to emotional, behavioral, and physiological disturbances. Job stress could be pathological and lead to development of a wide variety of symptoms and disorder that may affect an individual’s health and functioning.
A certain level of stress is unavoidable and up to an acceptable level, stress can serve as a stimulus to enhance performance and productivity at work. However, when the level of stress is such that an individual is incapable of satisfactorily dealing with it, then the effect on performance may be negative.

In line with Beehr and Newman and Cox’s three perspectives of occupational stress, Dunham (1984) identified three major approaches to understanding the nature of stress in teaching.

1. **Engineering Model’ of stress**: It is based on the *stimulus oriented theories of stress*, looks at the pressures exerted on teachers in schools. This model presents stress as the load or demand placed upon a person which exceeds the limits of the individuals’ capacity to adapt to it. In this model, teachers, are perceived as subjects who operate in such situations which may give rise to demands beyond their adaptive limits.

2. **Physiological Model’ of stress**: It is based on the *response oriented theories of stress* and focuses on the teacher’s reactions and coping resources which teachers use in their attempts to cope with stress. Teachers are again perceived as subjects to whom pressures are applied and as a consequence response is aroused.

3. **Interactional / Transactional Model’ of stress**: It conceptualizes stress as the product of a complete transaction between individual
needs / resources and environmental demands and constraints. This model is based on the *interactional theories of stress*. This model perceives stress as interactive and situational. It recognizes that on the one hand, teaching as a profession and some schools in particular may exert pressures on teachers; while on the other, individual teachers react in different ways and bring a variety of adaptive resources to help them to cope with those pressures.

Keeping in view the phenomenon of teacher stress, it is opined that engineering and physiological models are insufficient, because no single factor, personal or environmental can cause stress in teachers.

### 1.3.2 Theoretical Models of Job Stress

In reviewing recent stress theory, House (1974) has identified and integrated five classes of variables into a proposed comprehensive paradigm of stress research: (1) objective social conditions conductive to stress; (2) individual perceptions of stress; (3) individual responses (physiological, affective and behavioural) to perceived stress; (4) more enduring outcomes of perceived stress and responses thereto; and (5) individual and situational conditioning variables that influence (or specify) the relationship among the first four sets of factors.

There may be potentially stressful circumstances (stressors) within the work environment some predominantly ‘objective’ and quantifiable (e.g., Heavy work load) and some rather more qualitative (e.g.,
unsympathetic or inaccessible superiors). However, not all people are found to experience a job situation as stressful, nor would a given individual experience all job situations as equally stressful. Rather, stress occurs when the abilities of the person are incongruent with the demands of the job environment, or where clear obstacles exist to fulfilling strong needs or values. In such a situation there is a bad ‘fit’ between the individual and his environment. The following theoretical models of job stress explain this phenomenon:

**The Person Environment Fit Model**

One of the earlier and most well cited models is the Person – Environment Fit model. This approach can be traced back to Kurt Levin (1947) and his notion of Interactional Psychology. Levin believed that human behavior is a function of an interaction between characteristics of the situation. One aspect of this interaction relevant to occupational stress is the degree to which there is a fit between the person and the situation. According to this theory, an employee perceives work environment as stressful when there is a lack of fit between him and his work environment. Occupational stress or strain results from interaction of an employee and his or her work place; in other words, the degree of fit between a worker and his or her job determines the existence of job stress. Two types of interaction, or degrees of fit, are explored when assessing occupational stress: 1) the relationship between outcomes provided by the job and the needs, motives, or preferences of the individual, and 2) the relationship between the
demands and requirements of the job and the skills and abilities of the worker. Application of the Person- Environment Fit theory to the study of occupational stress has spurred the creation of numerous, related measures of job characteristics, individual traits, and job satisfaction (Schaubroeck and Ganster, 1991).

Karasek’s Demands- Control Model

According to Karasek’s model, workplace stress is a function of how demanding a person’s job is and how much control (discretion, authority or decision latitude etc.) the person has over his own responsibilities. This creates four kinds of jobs: passive, active, low strain and high strain.

Crossing the dimensions of strain and latitude give four stress categories for jobs, as follows:

Figure No 1.2: Figure showing four stress categories of Job.
P – High Strain Jobs (Low Latitude, High Strain): Authorities / Producers are more likely to augment their strain levels by taking more on without seeking additional latitude, partly because of their appreciation of challenge and their desire to enjoy individual mastery experiences, and partly because they take an individual approach to responsibility ascription, which may cause them to overlook opportunities to ask for more latitude. Authorities / Producers enjoy levels of strain that people with other dominant styles would find excessive. Of all the styles, they are most likely to thrive in high strain jobs.

A – Passive Jobs (Low Latitude, Low Strain): As long as the passivity of a job stems from successfully forestalling disruptions, then that passivity is likely to be highly satisfying to an administrator. Passivity that stems from the job being either irrelevant or unimportant will not be satisfying. The administrative style seeks to manage disruptions by putting processes into place that cope with all contingencies and buffer the vital variables of the organization, preventing them from disruption. When latitude is reduced by following a procedure, and when that procedure causes things to proceed smoothly with low levels of strain, an Administrator will take that as evidence of success. The goal state of Administration will be reached, and maintaining that peace will be a pleasure.

E – Active Jobs (High Latitude, High Strain): Active jobs are not seen as stressful in Karasek’s typology, because employees have many protective measures available to them to reduce the strain. Of all the PAEI styles, it is
E that most naturally thrives in active situations. E is characterized by great ambition and almost no fear surrounding disruptions of the status quo. Strain is thus a continual consequence of E type work. E also needs great flexibility and latitude both to stir up problems and seek out solutions. The active mode most nearly matches the mode in which E naturally works.

I – Low Strain Jobs (High Latitude, Low Strain): The combination of high levels of latitude with low levels of strain indicates that social processes are very significant in the low strain job. Employees will have a lot of authority relative to their strain levels, and thus will presumably participate more in the definition and management of tasks than in other, more stressful working environments.

Job demands represent the psychological stressors in the work environment. These include factors such as: interruption rate, time pressures, conflicting demands, reaction time required, pace of work, proportion of work performed under pressure, amount of work, degree of concentration required, and the slowing down of work caused by the need to wait for others. Decision latitude refers to employees’ control over their tasks and how those tasks are executed. It consists of both skill discretion and decision authority. Skill discretion describes the degree to which the job involves a variety of tasks, low levels of repetitiveness, occasions for creativity and opportunities to learn new things and develop special abilities. Decision authority describes both the employee’s ability to make decisions about their
own job, and their ability to influence their own work team and more general company policies.

Research based on Karasek’s Demand Control Model has found the lowest level of psychological well-being (that is the most stressed employees) exists among those workers experiencing high demands, low control, and low support (Schaubroeck and Ganster, 1991). Karasek’s demand-control model of occupational stress has had a large influence on the job design and occupational health literature, in part because it is quite spare, practical and testable (Jones & Bright, 2001).

➢ **Effort-Reward Imbalance Model**

The Effort-Reward Imbalance (ERI) Model, originally formulated by Siegrist and colleagues (Siegrist, 1996; Siegrist, Siegrist, & Weber, 1986), has received considerable attention in occupational health research merely due to its predictive power for adverse health and well-being outcomes (cf van. Vegchel, de Jonge, Bosma, & Schaufeli, 2005). The ERI Model has its origin in medical sociology and emphasizes both the effort and the reward structure of work (Marmot, Siegrist, & Theorell, 2006).
According to the ERI Model, work-related benefits depend upon a reciprocal relationship between efforts and rewards at work. Efforts represent job demands and/or obligations that are imposed on the teachers, such as time pressure and working overtime. Occupational rewards distributed by the employer (and by society at large) consist of money, esteem, and job security/career opportunities. More specifically, the ERI Model claims that work characterized by both high efforts and low rewards represents a reciprocity deficit between high ‘costs’ and low ‘gains’, which could elicit negative emotions in exposed employees. The accompanying feelings may cause sustained strain reactions. So, working hard without receiving adequate appreciation or being treated fairly are examples of a stressful imbalance. Another assumption of the ERI Model concerns individual differences in the experience of effort-reward imbalance. It is
assumed that employees characterized by a motivational pattern of excessive job-related commitment and a high need for approval (i.e., over commitment) will respond with more strain reactions to an effort-reward imbalance, in comparison with less overcommitted people. As there is some evidence of intrapersonal stability of over commitment over time (cf. Siegrist, 1996), it can be considered a risk factor in its own, even when effort-reward imbalance is absent. However, the ERI Model posits that strongest adverse health and well-being effects take place if work and personal conditions act simultaneously (cf. Siegrist et al., 2004).

Efforts represent job demands and obligations imposed on the teachers, whereas rewards are conceptualized as three distinct categories, namely financial reward, esteem and security/career opportunities. Thus, a teacher not receiving adequate appreciation for her or his efforts at the work place, potentially experiences stress as reflected in ERI. Thus, overcommitted teachers tend to repeatedly exaggerate their efforts at work while at the same time overtaxing their resources. This consequently diminishes their potential to recover from job demands which eventually results in exhaustion and poor health.

➢  **Beehr and Newman’s Facet Model**

Beehr and Newman (1978) proposed a model of the work stress process. According to this approach, Job stress can be broken down into a number of facets:
1. Personal facet refers to stable characteristics that employees bring with them to the workplace e.g., demographic characteristics and personality.

2. Environmental facet refers to those stimuli which are present in the environment and employees must confront with the characteristics of work performed (such as complexity) and nature of job related interpersonal relations.

3. Process facet that refers to the interaction of characteristics of the situation. This is the point where a person perceives work environment as stressful or not. After the environment is perceived as stressful, there may be a variety of consequences for both the individual and the organization as well.

4. Time facet which exhibit that the process of individual’s perception of stressor in the environment is embedded with temporal context.

➢ *Lazarus’s Transaction Model*

This model proposes that stress is a relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as relevant to his or well being and in which the person’s resources are taxed or exceeded (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Lazarus’s model identified stressful conditions and how the stressors are cognitively appraised by the individual (Are the stressors viewed as threatening? Do the stressors produce negative responses?). It also takes into account individual’s coping resources. For
example, workers differ in the number of duties and deadlines they can successfully juggle at one time. Some might be overwhelmed by four concurrent tasks whereas others can balance ten. The capabilities and resources an individual draws from determine the perceived amount of stress. Workplace stress is a part of interaction and reflects a wider process of interaction between the person and his work environment.

➢ *Fimian’s Teacher Stress Model*

Famian’s Teacher Stress Model (Famian, 1984) explains the teacher stress in a ten factor theory. Five factors explain the source of stress and five factors explain the manifestations of stress, and these ten factors comprise stress in teachers. According to Fimian, the occupational stress experienced by teachers is actually a multiple factor construct, and these factors are significantly related to one another. In both the literature and common usage of the term “work stress”, it is apparent that certain things cause stress and that this stress, when it does occur, becomes evident in terms of any number of psychological, behavioral and other types of “symptoms”. It should thus be possible to identify one group of events that act as source of stress and another of events that act as manifestations of stress. Moreover, the teacher stress is related to a number of work, job, and organizational variables in terms of both predicted directions and magnitudes.
Teacher stress is related more to environmental events, and the teacher’s perception of these events, than it is to personal or professional variables such as teacher’s gender, age, educational level, number of students, and number of years teaching. Fimian (1982) also explained that frequency with which stressful incidents occur and the strength of their occurrence varies from teacher to teacher. A multitude of factors including situational demands, appraisal to that situation, cause stress.

The factors described in teacher stress model are Time Management, Work related stressors, Professional distress, Discipline and motivations, cardiovascular manifestations, Gastronomical manifestations, and Behavioral manifestations.

Time management refers to the problems in managing time demands and difficulties faced by teacher to manage it. It has consistently been identified as a major source of stress in numerous studies (e.g., Dewe, 1986; 1984). It refers to the general level of demands made on teachers within very short period of time and teachers find it difficult to manage.

Work related stressors refer to work overload and time pressure, e.g., too much work to do, fast pace of work, big class size etc. indeed, the variety of demands made on a teacher in a typical school day, often with tight deadlines attached to them; make this aspect of teaching a major area of stress (Austin 1981; Sutherland and Cooper, 1991). Professional distress is comprised of those sources related to some professional variables as lack of
progress and promotion opportunities, inadequate salary, lack of recognition etc. many studies have explained poor working conditions in the sense of prestige, salary, and respect for their status and opportunities for progress (Eskridge, 1984; Wanberg, 1984). Discipline and motivation has been the main source of stress in emerged in many studies on sources of teacher stress. Pupil’s attitude towards school, teacher and studies, and their lack of motivation have been identified as major source of stress has also been discussed in many studies (e.g., Dunham, 1984; Galloway et al., 1982; Laslett and Smith, 1984).

The next factor, Professional Investment refers to lack of control over decision, lack of improvement opportunities etc. War (1992) describes low job discretion as the most important single characteristics in terms of causing stress at work. Karasek (1979) hypothesized that high job demands were not necessarily harmful in themselves but when accompanied by low decision latitude would result in psychological strain.

According to teacher stress model, stress in teachers has been found to have a variety of manifestations. These manifestations can be at emotional, physical and behavioral levels. Many studies have investigated the association between the various sources of occupational stress and the resulting manifestations of stress that is psychological, physiological and behavioral. The long term effects of these stressors have also been documented (cooper and Payne, 1988; Milstein and Golaszewski, 1985). Individuals, who are unable to cope effectively with environmental demands
that they perceive to be threatening, soon begin to show distress through manifestations of stress.

### 1.3.3 Prevalence of Teacher’s Job Stress

During the last 25 years there has been increasing professional and public interest in issues related to occupational stress and health. During the late 1960s this interest began to focus on those employed within the service sector, particularly on those involved in education, health and welfare. Teachers have been popular target for such research, and from the late 1970s onwards there have been studies concerned with teacher stress (Dunham, 1984; Hargreaves, 1978).

Over recent years, the problem of teacher stress has received increasing recognition (Borg and Falzon, 1993; Fontana and Abouserie, 1993). The research findings on teacher’s job stress has indicated that most teachers experience some stress from time to time, and that some teachers (somewhere between 20 to 25%) experience a great deal of stress fairly frequently (Boyle et.al., 1995; Cockburn, 1996; Travers and Cooper, 1996).

Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1978, 1979) concluded that teachers perceived their job as very extremely stressful. The results of research studies also showed that the level of self-reported stress was related to workplace and not to the biographical characteristics of teachers. Winkinson (1988) suggested that teaching is a profession where practitioners are

Survey data indicates that teaching is one of the ‘high stress’ professions (Travers & Cooper, 1996; Dunham & Varma, 1998; Kyriacou, 2000). Questionnaires asking teachers to rate their experience of stress at work typically indicate that about a quarter of school teachers regard teaching as a ‘very or extremely stressful’ job. One of the most interesting studies reported is that of Huberman (1993). His study was based on 160 interviews with high school teachers in Switzerland. What made his study so interesting was that he compared the ways in which teachers of differing lengths of experience viewed their working life and thereby identified some key stages and associated worries and frustrations that teachers typically seemed to experience as their careers developed. The study found that most teachers seem to encounter a period of self-doubt, disenchantment and reassessment, in which their concerns are either resolved with them continuing with their career as a teacher or their decision to leave. Huberman reports that amongst the most common motives cited for leaving teaching were fatigue, nervous tension, frustration, wear and tear, difficulties in adapting to pupils, personal fragility and routine. The notion of ‘wear and tear’ here is also evocative of studies which have indicated that prolonged stress can lead to teacher burnout. Surveys indicate that teachers report experiencing stress at work more than the majority of the other profession. Large number of studies reported on teacher stress does indeed suggest that
teaching is one of the most stressful professions. Studies show that teacher stress has undoubtedly become a major interest to educationist and researchers. Nevertheless, it is well recognized that a number of factors make teacher’s job stressful.

1.3.4 Signs and Symptoms of Teacher's Job Stress

Responses to Job stress can vary, both between individuals and over time. Some people may primarily experience physical symptoms whereas others may experience psychological disturbance (Education Commission Advisory Committee, 1992). Brown and Ralph (1992) listed most common signs of teacher’s job stress as related to:

1. Performance at work
   - frequently feeling like staying off work, inability to manage time well, inability to meet deadlines, inability to concentrate, having a heavy workload, inability to delegate, feelings of inadequacy related to performance at work, job dissatisfaction, taking work home more frequently, and low level of productivity.

2. Relationships with colleagues
   - increased feelings of irritation or aggression, becoming increasingly introverted, inability to relate to colleagues, unwillingness to cooperate,
frequent irrational conflicts at work, cynical, inappropriate humor, demotivation, withdrawing from supportive relationships, lying, role ambiguity and role conflict.

3. **The behavioral and emotional indicators**: They include loss of appetite, reduced self esteem, increased use of bad habits, insomnia, bad dreams or nightmares, being unduly fussy, feelings of alienation, loss of confidence, too busy to relax, frequent colds, influenza or other infections, vague aches or pains, accident prone, persistent negative thoughts, and palpitations.

According to Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) the symptoms of stress may be physical like peptic ulcers, cardiovascular diseases etc., psychological such as depression, anxiety etc., or behavioral such as deterioration in work performance and interpersonal relationships etc. Similarly, Dunham (1984) mentioned tension headaches and general irritability and bad temper as the most frequently indicated stress responses which emerged repeatedly in research studies. In a study Dunham (1984) interviewed English teachers and the stress responses reported were: disenchantment, exhaustion, unhappiness and comfort eating. He has grouped stress reactions into four main categories: behavioral, mental, emotional and physical.

Kyriacou and Prat (1985) described the most frequently mentioned symptoms in teachers as: being unable to relax or switch off after work; feeling very tense; being emotionally and emotionally drained at the end of
the school day; and sleeplessness. Winkinson (1988) reported risibility, frustration, tension and anxiety as the main symptoms of stress at work among teachers. Simpson (1976) found that most frequently reported reactions to work-induced pressures were feelings of exhaustion, tension headaches, reduction of contacts with other people outside school hours and disturbed sleep. These responses are a result of various sources of teacher stress.

1.3.5 Sources of Teacher's Job Stress

The array of sources of work stress in teachers is highly diverse and ranges from very distal to the very proximal sources of stress extend from the most immediate contexts people’s lives to the outermost boundaries of societies and cultures. A stress touches on one end the microenvironments of individual’s and on the other end, the large-scale social organization. These sources can be seen as including some of the central features of society itself, its values systems, the stratified ordering of its populations, the organization of its institutions and the rapidly and extent of changes in these elements.

Sources of Job stress or stressors can be classified as:

a) **Personal sources**: They lie within the person and his family. These may be related to one’s biological or psychological systems. There are many sources of stress within the family. Each member of a family has an impact on other family members. They affect each other with their specific
behaviors, needs and personality traits. The factors within the family that leads to stress may be parents’ conflicting relationship, separation of parents or death of one or both parents, family systems (joint or nuclear), poor interaction, communication and less social support.

b) **Source related to society:** They may affect a person directly or indirectly. Among these sources warlike situation, terrorism, immoral values, corruption, unemployment, and poor economic conditions.

c) **Sources of stress at workplace:** They emerge from job’s demands, jobs’ nature, and as well as, physical and psychological work environments. Frequently cited causes of stress at workplace are organizational change, inadequate communications, more work, time pressures, shifting work, lack of control, uncertainties, poor work environment, inadequate equipment, conflicting demands of work and home, poor relationships with supervisor and colleagues, lack of support, role conflicts and role ambiguities. Whatever the causes of stress at workplace may be, researchers agree that both the job and the person play a role in situations of work-related stress. So it is important to obtain an objective understanding of both the demands of the job and the vulnerability of the person. Sources of stress can also be identified in the direct experiences of teachers. Eventful experiences involving undesirable, unscheduled or involuntary change, and continuing experiences, involving persistent problems within social rules, can be powerful conditions for stress. Factors may be the cognitive style, appraisal
of opposing motivational forces, state of conflict, degree of stress coping ability of individual and other demographic variables.

Brenner and Bartell (1984) built on the conceptual model of teacher stress proposed by Kyricou & Sutcliffe (1978). They maintain that teacher stress results from the combined effects of the teacher and school characteristics, potential stressors in the school environment, actual stressors, overall personality characteristics and coping reactions/symptoms and health status, personality characteristics and coping mechanisms as well as, non-work related (life events) stressors. Eckert and Williams (1972) found that routine duties, long hours, poor facilities, friction among faculty members, and administrative red tape were the prevalent sources of stress. Hodge and Marker (1978) identified workplace related sources of stress as relationships with colleagues, administrative staff, clerical staff and students complex communication needs, inattentive students and lack of discipline in the students. Melendez and DeGuaman (1983) found that the three sources of stress of highest concern were faculty apathy, student apathy and overload. Some studies have identified numerous sources of stress intrinsic to the task and role overload and associated demands on time (Bridges, 1992; Dewe, 1986; Manthei & Solman, 1988), disruptive pupils (Manthei et al., 1996), inadequate administrative support (Adair, Manthei, & Tuck, 1989), lack of social recognition of value of teaching as a vocation (Galloway et al., 1982) and inadequate resources for teaching (Manthei & Solman, 1988).
A comprehensive survey by Borge, Riding, and Falzon (1991) suggested pupil misbehavior, time difficulties, and poor relationships as distinct dimensions of teacher stress. Another study (Bolye et al., 1995) concluded that there are multiple sources of teacher stress and these sources are correlated. Workload and student misbehavior are the two major contributors to teacher stress. In another study, Tuck et al. (1999) reported that disruptive students, inadequate remuneration and task overload were sources of moderate stress in school teachers.

A number of causes seem to recur in most of the reported studies. These appear to fall into the following five major categories:

- Pupil behaviors: e.g., indiscipline, disobedience, misbehavior, poor motivation, and poor attitudes to work.
- Work load and time pressure: e.g., having too much work to do, meeting deadlines.
- Working conditions: e.g., poor or inadequate equipment/facilities, large classes.
- Relationships with colleagues: e.g., conflict with, and lack of support from colleagues and management.
- School ethos: e.g., lack of agreement on standards (Kyricou, 1997).

Otto (1982) using a wide range of schools and teachers has indicated stressors in the area of the work role such as workload, class size, administrative demands; role conflict and ambiguity such as conflicting
demands by management, school-community conflict, teacher’s role as counselor etc.; lack of recognition; poor physical environment and resources such as noise, geographic isolation; lack of control and decision making power such as bureaucratic structure; poor communication and the emotional demands of teaching such as its complexity, high quality teaching performance, dealing with students of different backgrounds, culture and gender.

Punch and Tuetteeman (1990) found job-related stress factors that were related to stress as perceived lack of efficacy/achievement, inadequate access to facilities, lack of collegial support, excessive societal expectations, lack of influence, student misbehavior and lack of praise / recognition. Brown and Raiph (1992) reported the most common sources of teacher stress as structural change, classroom discipline, heavy workloads, lack of resources and poor school management. Cooper and Kelly (1993) studied a wide range of educators from primary teachers to principals of higher education institutions and two main sources emerged as prediction of occupational stress and job dissatisfaction: ‘work overload’ and ‘handling relationship’ with staff. Moreover, several studies have focused on the association between teacher stress and personality factors (Pierce & Molloy, 1991; Borg, Riding, & Falzon, 1991).

Studies are found to explain the work stress sources in a number of factors present in the workplace. Some studies show factors of stress related to organizational structure, some focus on nature of job and teacher’s role,
and other focus the interpersonal relationship of teachers as emerging the source of stress.

**d) Extra organizational source of stress:** The source that interfaces between life outside and life inside the educational organization that might put pressure on the individuals are called extra organizational source of stress. This category includes the factors like financial difficulties and conflict of personal beliefs with those of the company.

According to Wolff a person’s total life situations with its sorrows, joys, success and frustrations could lead to great amount of stress. There are mainly six major sources of Job stress viz., factors intrinsic to the job, role in the organization, career development, relationship at work, organizational structure and climate, home/work interface.

**(i) Factors Intrinsic to the Job**

‘Intrinsic’ factors refer to those aspects which are integral parts of the job, which form the fundamental characteristic of the job that affects other aspects of the job and the individual’s working life. Across variety of occupations such sources of stress intrinsic to the job include: 1) Poor physical working conditions 2) Non-teaching related work 3) Job overload 4) Job under load and 5) Person job fit.

a) **Poor Physical Working Conditions:** Poor physical working conditions can enhance stress at work, Kornhauser (1965) found that poor mental
health was directly related to unpleasant work conditions, the necessity to work fast and to expand a lot of physical effort and to excessive and inconvenient work.

b) **Non-teaching related work:** Numerous occupational studies have found that Non-teaching related work is a common occupational stressor, as well as effecting neuro-physical rhythms, such a blood pressure, metabolic rate, blood sugar levels, mental efficiency and work motivation.

c) **Job Overload:** This is probably one of the most obvious occupational stressors. French and Calpan (1973) have differentiated over load in terms of quantitative and qualitative over load. Quantitative refers to having too much to do’, while qualitative means work that is too difficult. They summarize this by suggesting that both quantitative and qualitative produce at least nine different symptoms of psychological and physical strain: job dissatisfaction, job tension, lower self esteem, threat, embarrassment, high cholesterol levels, increased heart rate, skin resistance and more smoking.

d) **Job Under load:** Job under load associated with repetitive, routine, boring and under stimulating work has been associated with ill health (Co., 1980). Boredom and disinterest in the job may reduce employee’s response to emergency situations.
e) **Person Job fit:** There will of course be a whole host of different variables with the job itself could specifically affect any single individual in a specific job. According to Me Michael (1978), P-E Fit (Person-Environment Fit) can be defined as an interaction between an individual’s psychological characteristics and objective environmental work conditions. Consequently P.E. Fit can be attained by subtracting, the amount/degree of a particular job factor (eg. Work load) preferred by a person from the actual amount in that same person’s job environment. Stress can occur and result in problems and anxiety, depression, job dissatisfaction and physiological maladies if there is a Person Environment misfit.

Lewin (1951) and Murrey (1938) emphasize the motivational basis of relationship between the person and the environment. A motivational theory typically identifies goals or states which the individual strives to attain. The goals include requirements for the individual’s continued subsistence as well as objectives, which the individual has learned, to valve through socialization. The attainment of goals is generally associated with the maintenance or the enhancement of the well-being of the individual. To the extent that the goals are not attained, the well being of the individual is limited or impaired.

(ii) **Role in the organization**

Another major source of stress is associated with a person’s role at work. An individual who occupies any job is effectively playing a ‘part in a
play’. There is a series of expectations that other people have about the nature of a job and the sort of behaviour that is expected from whoever occupies it. A person’s role at work has been isolated as a main source of occupational stress. Involving role ambiguity (that is lack of clarity) about one’s job and role conflict (that is conflicting job demands), as well as responsibility for people and conflicts stemming from organizational boundaries. These organizational stressors stemming from role ambiguity and role conflict can result in such stress related illness as coronary heart disease.

1. Role ambiguity: Role ambiguity exists when an individual has inadequate information about his work role, that is, there is lack of clarity about the work objectives associated with the role about work colleague’s expectation of work role and about the scope and responsibilities of the job.

2. Role conflict: Role conflict exists when an individual in a particular work role is torn by conflicting job demands or doing he/she really does not want to do or does not think are part of the job specification. Kahn et al (1964) found that men who suffered more role conflict had lower job satisfaction and higher job related tension.

3. Responsibility: Another important potential stressor associated with one’s organizational role is ‘responsibility for people’. One can differentiate here between ‘responsibilities for things’ (equipments.
budgets etc). Waedwell et al, (1964) found that responsibility for people was significantly more likely to lead to coronary heart disease than responsibility for things. Increased responsibility for people frequently means that one has to spend more time interacting with others, attending meetings, working alone and in consequence, a more time in trying to meet deadline pressure and schedules.

(iii) Career development

The next group of environmental stressors is related to career development. This refers to the impact of over-promotion, under-promotion, status incongruence, lack of job security and thwarted ambition. It was found that women suffered significantly more than men on a range of organizational stressors, but the most damaging to their health and job satisfaction were the ones associated with career development and allied stressors.

(iv) Relationship at work

A major source of stress at work is linked to the nature of relationship with one’s authorities, subordinates and colleagues. A number of behavioral scientists (Argyris. 1964, Cooper, 1973) have suggested that good relationship between members of a work group is a central factor in individual and organizational health. According to French and Caplan (1972), poor relationships in the other members of an organization may be
precipitated by role ambiguity in the organization which in turn may produce psychological strain in the form of job satisfaction.

The relationship at work includes mainly the following categories:

1. **Relationship with the superior:** It is one’s relationship with one’s superior that seems to be a recurrent in most jobs. Buck (1972) denotes that considerate behaviour of superiors appears to have contributed significantly inversely to feelings of job pressure.

2. **Relationship with colleagues:** Relationship with co-worker is another factor of work related stress. Stress can be caused not only by the pressure of relationship, but also by its opposite, lack of adequate social support to difficult situations (Lazarus, 1966).

(v) **Organizational Structure and climate**

A potential source of stress is simply being in the ‘organization’, and the threat to an individual’s freedom, autonomy and identity. This poses problems such as little or no participation in the decision making process, no sense of belonging, lack of effective consultation, poor communications, restrictions on behaviour, and office politics.

The organization provides a backcloth in front of which the individuals must work. In doing so, its characteristics will pervade almost all aspects of daily working life. Korcs and Quinm (1974) and French and Caplan (1972) found that greater participation of workers in the organization
led to higher productivity, improved performance, lower staff turnover and lower levels of physical and mental illness.

(vi) **Home / Work Pressure**

Another danger of the current economic situation is the effect that work pressures (such as fear of job loss, blocked ambitions, work overload and so on) have on the families of the teachers. However, when there is a career crisis (or stress from job insecurity as many teachers are now facing), the tensions the individuals bring with them into the family affect the wife and home environment in a way that may not meet their expectations.
1.4 NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Quest for quality of life has been the characteristics of the entire history of human civilization. It has been the driving force behind all human endeavors. Interest in Quality of life is not a recent phenomenon (Chung, Killingworth & Nolan, 1997). Work is an integral part of everyday life as it is an individual’s livelihood or career. On an average, people spend around twelve hours per day in the work place which is one third of their entire life. Hence work should yield satisfaction, give peace of mind, fulfillment of having done a task and having spent time fruitfully, constructively and purposefully. As Erich Fromm pointed out, work is an effective means to deal with the angst of death and void. He wrote: “The principle can be formulated thus: I am because I effect.”

Work is a major activity for human beings. The work instinct of an individual is associated with the pleasure that provides the opportunity to achieve something, to surpass oneself, to exercise one’s imagination and intelligence, to become a better person, to know oneself, to meet other people, to help people, to feel competent and powerful, and to be effective.

Teaching is one of the most significant and noblest of all the work in the world. All other work in the society have their bases in teaching. Teaching as a profession involves a complex work. The job of being a teacher is both demanding and challenging. Teachers draw upon physical,
emotional and intellectual resources in order to meet the challenges and be effective in the classroom.

Since Psychologists believe that work should be morally desirable so that people enjoy it and hence everybody concerned with the world of work should be taking more active and vigorous steps to make work more likeable for those who have to do it. In the post-modern era the task of making work more likeable has increasingly been discussed within the points of reference supplied by the phrase, Quality of Work Life (Orpen, 1981). Even if it is a small step towards the life time goal, at the end of the day work should give satisfaction and eagerness to the teachers to look forward to the next day.

Life is apparently related to the nature and culture of work of the individual. It has been noticed that Work culture has changed drastically in the recent years. The traditional concept that work is to fulfill human basic needs are also phasing out. The basic needs have continued to diversify and change according to the evolution of the work system and standards of living of a work force. This opportunity for individuals to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs, namely the need to survive with security, interact with others, have a sense of personal usefulness, be recognized for achievement have an opportunity to improve one’s skills and knowledge is fulfilled in various levels of the quality of work life.

In the present technological and globalized world teachers experience job stress today than never before. Work culture of an individual in an
organization and the stress they experience in their job in turn may significantly affect their quality of work life. Hence there is a need to study the Quality of Work Life of teachers and influence of the Work Culture and Job Stress on their Quality of work Life.

The review of related literature has revealed that there are no attempts to study the influence of work culture and job stress on quality of work life of secondary school teachers in Indian settings. Hence this investigation is a modest venture in this direction.