Chapter-3

REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE

Studies on OCB:

Organizational citizenship behaviour, which is basically an attitude, refers to actions performed by employees who surpass the minimum role requirements expected by the organizations and promote the welfare of co-workers, workgroups, or the organization (Wit, 1991).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) is one of the measures of job attitudes. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour indirectly influences the performance of organization and is a popular concept in the field of Organizational Behaviour (Organ, 1988).

Organisational Citizenship Behaviours (OCB) are intentional actions undertaken by employees as their own initiative in order to help other employees and contribute to a widely understood organisational success. This concept is commonly called 'good soldier syndrome' (Turek, & Czaplińska, 2014).

Thus, OCB are personal and voluntary and at the same time, not covered by the organisational reward system (Appelbaum et al., 2004). One of the basic assumptions of the concept that nearly all the researchers agree with, is that OCB are not a homogeneous construct and comprise many dimensions of different categories of behaviours (Schmidt, 2014).

The employees who engage in organizational citizenship behavior may not always be the top performers but they are ones who always make effort to 'go the extra mile' or 'go above and beyond' the minimum performance required to do a job satisfactorily, that's why OCB can also be termed as positive extra-role behavior.

Five Dimensions of OCB:

In defining OCB, literatures in the past have identified two main approaches namely role and extra role behaviour. As rightly said by Castro, Armario, & Ruiz (2004) it is not easy to differentiate between "role" and "extra role" performances as managerial and employee perceptions of their subordinates' performances do not correspond and subject to the satisfaction of the subordinates in the workplace. Several researches point to the fact that there are five basic personality factors which affect most of the variance in personality (e.g. Costa & McCrae, 1992) and these dimensions are known as Big Five dimensions which are classified as conscientiousness, altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. These five

dimensions cover such organizational behaviours as helping co-workers, following company rules, not complaining, and actively participating in organizational affairs.

Altruism in simple words means helping or helpfulness (Organ, 1997). Altruism means helping other members of the organization in their tasks. For e.g. voluntarily helping new employees, helping co-workers who are overloaded, assisting workers who were absent, guiding employees to accomplish difficult tasks et al. Smith, Organ, & Near (1983) defined altruism as voluntary behaviours where an employee provides assistance to an individual with a particular problem to complete his or her task under unusual circumstances.

Podsakoff et al. (2000) has demonstrated that altruism was significantly related to performance evaluations and correspondingly, positive affectivity.

Conscientiousness is a discretionary behaviour that goes well beyond the minimum role requirement level of the organization, such as obeying rules and regulations, not taking extra breaks, working extra-long days (MacKenzie et al, 1993). Conscientiousness is a prototype of going well beyond minimally required levels of attendance, punctuality, and housekeeping, penchant towards conserving resources, and overall giving an impression of being a responsible citizen of the organization. If the employee is highly conscientious it implies that he is highly responsible and needs less supervision (Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 1997). Altruism and conscientiousness are the two major or over-arching dimensions of OCB (Borman et al., 2001). Conscientiousness is used to indicate that a particular individual is organized, self-disciplined, accountable and hardworking. It is interesting to note that Kidder, & McLean Parks (1993) posted the fact that males are more likely to engage in conscientious behaviour than females in view of the fact that males have preference for equity over equality.

Sportsmanship is defined as "a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining." (Organ, 1990). It refers to person's desire not to complain when experiencing the inevitable inconveniences and avoid abuses which are generated in exercising a professional activity. Sportsmanship refers to avoid grievances, complaints, appeals, accusations, or protest unnecessarily about the difficulties faced in the workplace, being positive and tolerant towards problems experienced in the workplace. This helps to conserve organizational energies for accomplishment of task and to a large extent relieves managers of unnecessary load or stress (Organ, & Ryan, 1995; Organ, 1990). Organ (1988) defined sportsmanship as the behaviour of warmly tolerating the irritations that are an unavoidable part of nearly every organizational setting. Podsakoff, & MacKenzie (1997)

publicized that good sportsmanship would enhance the morale of the employees at the workplace and consequently reduce employee turnover.

Courtesy refers to the gestures that help others to prevent interpersonal problems from occurring, such as giving prior notice of the work schedule to someone who is in need, consulting others before taking any actions that would affect them (Organ, 1990). Courtesy or gestures are demonstrated in the interest of preventing creations of problems for co-workers (Organ, 1997). Leaving the copier or printer in good condition for other workers' use is an example of courtesy at work (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). A courteous employee prevents managers from falling into the pattern of crisis management by making a sincere effort to avoid creating problems for co-workers (Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 1997). Courtesy includes behaviours, which focus on the deterrence of problems and taking the necessary and timely steps in order to lessen the effects of the problem in the future. In simple words, courtesy means the encouragement given by a member to other member/s of the organization when they are demotivated, demoralized and feel discouraged about their professional development. Again to reiterate, research has shown that employees who exhibit courtesy would reduce intergroup conflict and thereby abating the time spent on conflict management by superiors (Podsakoff et al., 2000). The main idea of courtesy is avoiding actions that unnecessarily make colleagues' work harder. It also includes giving them enough notice to get prepared when there is an addition to their existing work load.

Civic virtue refers to the constructive involvement in the political process of the organization and contribution to this process by freely and frankly expressing opinions, attending meetings, discussing with colleagues the issues concerning the organization, and reading organizational communications such as mails for the well-being of the organization. Civic virtue is behaviour on the part of an individual that indicates that employee dutifully participates in, is actively involved in, and is concerned about the life of the company (Podsakoff et al, 1990). Civic virtue represents a macro level interest in, or commitment to, to the organization. It shows willingness to participate actively in organization's events, monitor organization's environment for threats and opportunities, to work out the best alternative for the organization. These behaviours occur when employees reckon themselves with the organization and consider themselves to be part of the organization. (Podsakoff et al, 2000). Civic virtue is defined as subordinate participation in organization political life and supporting the administrative function of the organization (Deluga, 1998) and keeping appraised with the changes in the organization (Organ, 1988). This dimension of OCB is actually derived from Graham's findings which stated that employees

should have the responsibility to be a good citizen of the organization (Graham, 1991). These behaviours reflect an employees' recognition of being part of organization and accept the responsibilities which entail as a result of being citizen of the organization (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Other researchers have found that civic virtue enhances the quantity of performance and help to reduce customer complaints (Walz, & Niehoff, 1996).

Extended Dimensions of OCB:

Farh, Zhong, & Organ (2004) have discussed five extended dimensions of OCB viz. self-training, social welfare participation, protecting and saving company resources, keeping the workplace clean and interpersonal harmony.

Citizenship behaviours directed towards individuals (OCBI)

OCBI refers to the behaviours that immediately benefit specific individuals within an organisation and thereby, contribute indirectly to organisational effectiveness (Lee, & Allen, 2002; Williams, & Anderson, 1991). Podsakoff et al. (2000) labelled this dimension as helping behaviour and defined it as voluntarily helping co-workers with work-related problems.

Citizenship behaviours directed towards the organisation (OCBO)

The second dimension of OCB includes behaviours benefiting the organisation without actions aimed specifically toward any organisational member or members (e.g., adhering to informal rules, volunteering for committees). Podsakoff et al. (2000) labelled this organisational compliance as it involves an internalization of a company's rules and policies. Furthermore, Williams & Anderson (1991) defined it as behaviours that benefit the organisation in general. These behaviours include giving prior notice regarding an absence from work or informally adhering to rules designed to maintain order. It has been only since the early 1980s, with the seminal works by Smith, Organ, & Near (1983), Organ, (1988), and others that followed, that OCB has emerged as an exciting field of research.

Antecedents of OCB:

Based on the literature reviewed such as (Lok et.al. 2007; Jahangir et al., 2004; Meyer et.al., 1997; Hannam, & Jimmieson, 2002) etc. the following significant antecedents of OCB are identified.

Role perception: Role perception includes role conflict and role ambiguity both of which have been found to be significantly and negatively related to OCB. On the other hand, role clarity and role facilitation are positively related.

Individual disposition: Personality variables relating to workplace namely positive affectivity, negative affectivity, conscientiousness and agreeableness form the purview of individual disposition. Though personality variables related to personal traits such as extroversion, introversion or openness to change, do not find any place in the OCB literature but are considered to be significant in dealing with other employees or customers.

Fairness perceptions: Procedural justice and distributive justice are important components of fairness perception. Procedural justice refers to whether employees feel organizational decision making as bias free and on flip side distributive justice refers to proportionate reward scheme based on their training, tenure, responsibility or workload is followed in organization. Both are positively related to OCB.

Motivation: The research found that motives play important role in strengthening OCB. Management by encouraging employees to actively participate in decision making can help in coordinating efforts among team members. This subsequently will contribute to group effectiveness and efficiency. However motivation is considered as less significant as an antecedent of OCB when individual moves to higher position in an organization.

Leadership: Leadership appears to have a strong influence on an employee's willingness to engage in OCB. It is positively related to OCB. Leadership as one of the antecedents of OCB enhances team spirit, morale and cohesiveness of the employees, which in turn leads to organizational commitment. It also indirectly influences employee perception of fairness or justice in the workplace.

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Job satisfaction has been found to have positive relationship with job performance and OCB which in turn can help in reducing employees' absenteeism, turnover and psychological distress. Workers with high level of employees' job satisfaction are more likely to engage in OCB. Along with job satisfaction affective organizational commitment is also cited as an antecedent of OCB. Hannam, & Jimmieson (2006) argue that effective commitment is conceptualized as a strong belief towards acceptance of organizational goal and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Employee age: Researchers argued that younger employees coordinate their needs with organizational need more flexibly whereas, older employees tend to be more rigid in adjusting their needs with the organization. Therefore, younger and older employees may differ in their orientations towards self, others and work. These differences may lead to different salient motives for OCB among younger and older employees.

Consequences of OCB:

Organizational citizenship behaviour has been recognized as a key factor to organizational performance. In general, it has been argued that organization with higher degree of OCB leads to reduced absenteeism, reduced turnover, employees' satisfaction and employees' loyalty (Chughtai, & Zafar, 2006; Khalid, & Ali, 2005; Meyer et.al, 1997; Podaskoff, & Mackenzie, 1997) which subsequently leads to improved organizational performance. The existing literature on OCB dimensions and its impact on organizational performance can be criticized on the ground that different contributors have analyzed rather independently the impact of dimensions of OCB on organizational performance. The impact of OCB on organizational effectiveness / performance can be examined on the basis of parameters such as reduced absenteeism, reduced turnover, employees' satisfaction, employees' loyalty, employees' retention, customer loyalty and customer satisfaction. These dimensions are explained as under:

Reduced absenteeism: Various studies such as Chughtai, & Zafar (2006); Khalid, & Ali (2005); Meyer et.al. (1997); Podsakoff, & Mackenzie (1997) have found that organization with higher degree of OCB leads to reduced absenteeism. High propensity in OCB dimension viz: altruism, sportsmanship, civic virtue and conscientiousness improve organizational effectiveness through its impact on employee attendance whereby employees generally avoid unnecessary absence.

Reduced turnover: Chughtai & Zafar (2006); Khalid, & Ali (2005); Meyer et.al. (1997); Podsakoff, & Mackenzie (1997) argue that higher degree of OCB in the organization contributes to reduced turnover intention. The varied dimensions of OCB can reduce the variability and increase the stability of workgroup performance and enhances organizational performance and effectiveness.

Employees' retention: The studies conducted by Meyer et.al. (2007); Podsakoff, & Mackenzie (1997) reflect that dimensions of OCB namely altruism and sportsmanship improve organizational performance by enhancing organization's ability to attract and retain the best

people. This eventually leads to employee loyalty. Altruism and sportsmanship help in creating positive environment in the organization which enhances the morale and sense of belongingness to a working group thus, making the organization a more attractive place to work. Employees with high level of sportsmanship complain less about petty matters, have a willingness to take or learn new responsibilities and enhance the organization's ability to adapt to new changes in the environment. This subsequently develops a sense of loyalty and commitment to the organization among employees that may enhance organisational effectiveness.

Employees' satisfaction: Various studies such as Chughtai, & Zafar (2006); Khalid, & Ali, (2005) found that dimensions of OCB vis-à-vis altruism and conscientiousness may improve satisfaction of employees' working in the organization. When experienced employees exhibit altruism in their behaviour to help the less experienced employees about efficient ways of performing the job, it will enhance the quantity and quality of the less experienced employees performance whereas employees with conscientious behaviour require less supervision and allow the manager to delegate more responsibility to them (Meyer et.al. 1997; Podsakoff, & Mackenzie 1997).

Consumer satisfaction: Sivadas, & Baker (2000); Kersnik, (2001) stress upon consumer satisfaction as an important factor to improve organizational performance. The continuous quality improvement to provide sustained consumer satisfaction has become an important component of quality assessment. Employees who are satisfied with their performance will participate from heart resulting in superior and valuable services to customers. In return, customers will be satisfied with the quality of service they are receiving and perceive it to be excellent.

Consumer loyalty: Ruyter, & Bloemer (1999); Gallarza, & Saura (2004) identified that organizational effectiveness can further be examined through another consumer-based measure known as consumer allegiance (Chahal, 2008). Basically consumer allegiance and loyalty are the outcome of consumer satisfaction which subsequently helps to improve as well as to maintain the organization's image in the market. This is particularly relevant for private organizations. On the other hand, financial condition of the consumers camouflaged the satisfaction loyalty concept.

(In the proposed model the domain of OCB is divided into six antecedents (role clarity, leadership, motivational drives, organizational commitment, organizational justice and

individual traits) and five consequences (reduced turnover, reduced absenteeism, employee satisfaction and loyalty, consumer satisfaction and consumer loyalty)

This study argues that EI and self-efficacy enhance in-role performance and OCB. The relationship between EI and self-efficacy was emphasized by Gundlach et al. (2003), who contended that higher levels of EI boost individuals' awareness of how different emotional reactions can result from causal explanations of workplace outcomes. Consequently, EI can help people generate the causal attributions that are least damaging to their self-efficacy-beliefs by regulating the emotions, these attributions might produce. For this reason, EI should have an impact on self-efficacy through its influence on the causal reasoning processes and emotions involved in reacting to important workplace outcomes.

Burnout, another important concept examined here, is a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job, and it is defined by the three dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Van Emmerik et al., 2005). One of the most commonly cited negative consequences of burnout is a reduction in job performance (Halbesleben, & Bowler, 2005). This study contends that burnout mediates the relationship between EI, self-efficacy and performance. This is because burned-out (i.e. emotionally and physically exhausted) employees lack the capacity to invest time and effort in their work or to engage in work activities beyond the minimum required by their job description (Van Emmerik et al., 2005). Therefore, burnout will precede withdrawal of OCB.

The OCB as Contextual Performance is defined as "performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (Organ, 1997). This is a revised definition given by Organ, (1997) in which OCB explained as "non-task performance" that contribute to the maintenance and/or enhancement of the context of "task performance".

Looking at the results of past research, it is apparent that employees who are open to OCB are, in general, actively involved in their own work and almost always have little desire to resign and low unjustified absenteeism (Podsakoff et al. 2009). They also tend to score highly in performance evaluations. Podsakoff et. al. (2000) point out that, based on past research, OCB raises the productivity of colleagues and managers and increases ability to adapt to organisational changes.

Based on results of past research, employees' OCB have a positive effect on the workplace or organisation as a whole. Meta-analysis by Podsakoff et. al. (2009) shows a rather high coefficient of correlation between OCB and overall organisational performance.

Studies on OS:

More recent research has been guided by propositions about the adaptive demands of stress that drain energy (Glass, & Singer, 1972). In Cohen's (1980) version of this model, stressors create conditions of information overload because they force people to pay special attention. This results in cognitive fatigue and saps energy needed for task performance. Cohen (1980) reviewed several studies that support this model. They show that after experiencing stressors such as noise, electric shock, bureaucratic frustration and task load, people perform less effectively on tasks which reduces tolerance for frustration, clerical accuracy and the ability to avoid perceptual distractions. They also become less sensitive to others and show "a decrease in helping, a decrease in the recognition of individual differences and an increase in aggression".

These effects on interpersonal sensitivity are consistent with results of studies on aggression (Rule & Nesdale, 1976) and altruism (Aderman, 1972; Cunningham, Steinberg, & Grev, 1980; Isen, Clark, & Schwartz, 1976; Isen, & Levin, 1972; Rosenhan, Salovey, & Hargis, 1981), which indicate that negative emotions associated with stress incline people toward more aggressive and less altruistic behavior.

Consequently, our model presumes that subjective stress generates anxiety, hostility, and depression which, in turn, affect components of job performance such as tolerance for frustration, clerical accuracy, interpersonal sensitivity, and altruism.

Role conflict, ambiguity, and overload frequently have been studied as antecedents of occupational stress (e.g., Brief & Aldag, 1976; Ivanceyich, Matteson, & Preston, 1982; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Manning, Ismael, & Sherwood, 1981; Rosse, & Rosse, 1981). It assumes that there are specific events which are more likely than others to cause stress and that they vary from one job to another.

Our approach is consistent with studies in the psychosomatic literature (e.g., Holmes & Rahe, 1967) and the occupational stress literature (Gray-Toft & Anderson, 1981; Koch, Tung, Gmelch, & Swent, 1982) which assume stress can be attributed largely to the frequency with which stressful events occur to an individual and their intensity of stressfulness for the individual. There are important differences between causes of stressful event frequency and intensity. According to our model, stressful event frequency varies according to both external work conditions and individual characteristics. Stressful events are more frequent in some job

situations than others and people with certain characteristics are more likely than other people to behave in ways that increase or decrease the frequency with which such events occur.

Stressful event intensity, however, is not affected by external work conditions. People who find an event intensely stressful in some job situations are likely to find it equally stressful in other situations. Stressful event intensity is thought to reflect the operation of individual characteristics that dispose people to react more strongly to a broad range of stressors. Therefore, people who find some events intensely stressful are likely to find others intensely stressful too. This means a measure of the intensity of certain stressful events for an individual can predict subjective stress even though he or she might never actually experience those particular events.

Despite disagreement over several conceptual and definitional issues in stress research, there seems to be consensus on the importance of individual differences. Many individual characteristics might be correlates of stress (Beehr, & Newman, 1978), but we restrict attention here to job experience, Type A behavior pattern, and fear of negative evaluation.

Several studies have found negative relations between age or experience and occupational stress (Indik, Seashore, & Slesinger, 1964; Koch et al., 1982; Rosse, & Rosse, 1981; Sheridan, & Vredenburgh, 1978). There are at least two explanations for these relations (Indik et al., 1964). One is selective withdrawal, the idea that voluntary turnover is more probable among people who experience more stress, that certain characteristics dispose some people to experience more stress and that people are differentially likely to quit according to those characteristics. As a result, the people who remain with the organization longer are those with more stress-resistant traits. The other explanation is adaptation. It assumes that people eventually develop coping mechanisms to deal with stress. Because this takes time, senior organizational members should be more fully adapted and, therefore, should experience less stress.

Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demand, has become a prominent and pervading feature of the modern organizations. The researchers in the area of organizational psychology and management have used the term job stress to denote employees' mental state aroused by a job situation or a combination of job situations perceived as presenting excessive and divergent demands. Caplan et al. (1975) have accordingly defined occupational stress as 'any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual'.

Occupational stress, in particular, is the inability to cope with the pressures in a job (Rees, 1997). It is a mental and physical condition which affects an individual's productivity, effectiveness, personal health and quality of work (Comish, & Swindle, 1994). The ways in which stress manifests itself are generally referred to in terms of behavioural, physical or psychological outcomes. Occupational stress is defined as a disruption of the equilibrium of the cognitive-emotional-environmental system by external factors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Stress is conceptualised as a complex process that consists of three major components, namely a) sources of stress that are encountered in the work environment, b) perception and appraisal of a particular stressor by an employee and c) the emotional reactions that are evoked when a stressor is appraised as threatening (Lazarus, 1991; Spielberger, Vagg, & Wasala, 2003). The appraisal of a stressor as threatening leads to the emotional arousal of anxiety and the associated activation of the autonomic nervous system. If severe and persistent, the resulting physical and psychological strain may cause adverse behavioural consequences (Spielberger et al., 2003). According to Brooks & Piquero (1998); Pienaar, & Rothmann (2003), research supports the notion that occupational stress stems from two sources, namely job demands and a lack of job resources.

Regarding the relationship between occupational stress and work engagement, research has shown that even when exposed to high job demands and working long hours, some individuals do not show symptoms of disengagement. Instead, they seem to find pleasure in dealing with these stressors (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). According to Terry, Nielson & Perchard (1993), high levels of stress are associated with low levels of job satisfaction (which represents the pleasure component of work-related wellbeing). Fairbrother, & Warn (2003) confirm that occupational stress is negatively related to job satisfaction. Furthermore, it seems that job satisfaction has a protective effect on the relation between occupational stress and disengagement (Ramirez, Graham, Richards, Cull & Gregory, 1996; Visser, Smets, Oort, & deHaes, 2003). Visser et al. (2003) confirm that job satisfaction has a protective effect against the negative consequences of occupational stress. They suggest that when stress is high and satisfaction is low, the risk of low energy – a central aspect of low work engagement – increases considerably.

Occupational stress and Burnout are serious problems in current day organisations. To end this, organisations should actively promote positive psychological health and occupational wellbeing in order to harness the full potential of their workforce and increase organisational performance. Burnout (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001) and increased work Engagement (Avey,

Wernsing, & Luthans, 2008). It may, therefore, be vital for organisations to identify and develop these positive PsyCap factors, which might moderate the effect of Occupational stress on Burnout, as well as curb the initial experiences of Occupational stress and the subsequent development of Burnout in their employees. The presence of PsyCap may also lead to increased Engagement, which is also known to be associated with less Burnout.

Working stress identified as the stress results from the perception that the demands exceed one's capacity to cope at work. Sources of working stress regularly identified since the 1970s. Factors affecting stress at work include physical environment, complexity of individual and group tasks (Ivancevich, & Matteson 1980). Schuler 1982 described work stressors in organization as job qualities, staff relationships, organizational structure, physical qalities, career development, and role changes in the organization. On the other hand, Quick, & Quick (1984) stated that, categories of stressors are task demands, physical demands and interpersonal demands.

Work plays a powerful role in people's lives. It can either exert an important influence on their well-being which is an exciting experience for many individuals, and can also be a tremendous source of stress. Consequently, as work makes more and more demands on time and energy, individual increasingly exposed to both the positive and negative aspects of employment. The employee's relationship between work and mental or physical health may also contribute to career adjustment as well as the productivity and economic viability of the employer.

The significant influence of stress in the workplace has been increasingly recognized during the past two decades. Occupational stress has consistently been related to employee well-being (Gummer, 1996; Weinberg, & Creed, 2000; Zeidner, & Endler, 1996). Research has clearly documented the negative effects of occupational stress on productivity, absenteeism, worker turnover, and employee health and quality of life (Hotopf, & Wessely, 1997; Sauter & Murphy, 1995; Stahl, & Hauger, 1994). Empirical studies of the relation between occupational stress and psychological adjustment have increasingly emphasized the importance of coping strategies in reducing the negative effects of stress (Latack, 1992).

Previous research also addressed the relationship between EI and work-related variables such as stress perceptions in the workplace (Bar-on et al., 2000), satisfaction (Augusto et al., 2006a, b) or performance (Boyatzis, 2006; Lam, & Kirby, 2002; Lopes et al., 2006). In general, results show that EI predicts success in work, facilitating positive interpersonal relationships (Brackett, & Salovey, 2006; Ferna´ndez-Berrocal, & Extremera, 2006; Fitness, 2001; Flury, &

Ickes, 2001), increasing the ability to solve problems and find suitable strategies for dealing with stress (Gohm, & Clore 2002; Mikolajczak et al., 2006; Tsaousis, & Nikolaou, 2005).

Antecedents of Occupational Stress:

Drawing primarily from the work of Cooper & Marshall (1978), identification of major causes of stress in the workplace can be highlighted. In a study of the literature current at that time, Cooper and Marshall identified over 40 interacting factors which could be identified as sources of work stress. They grouped these into categories and proposed six major causes of stress at work, with this classification system also used in Glowinkowski, & Cooper (1986); Cooper, & Cartwright (1997); Cooper et al. (2001).

These six major categories are: 1. Factors intrinsic to the job 2. Role in the organisation 3. Relationships at work 4. Career development 5. Organisational structure and climate 6. Organisational interface with outside

Consequences of Occupational Stress:

The first major type of strain resulting from stressors is that of psychological strain (also referred to as psychological health). Harrison (1978) posed that strain referred to the deviation from normal responses and that psychological strain included responses such as job dissatisfaction, depression, lowered self-esteem and unsolved problems. Similarly, in their review of occupational stress, Downs, Driskill, & Wuthnow (1990) note that the experience of stress has been related to the psychological areas of depression, fatigue, low self-esteem, anger, apathy, irritability, guilt, moodiness, boredom, accidents, withdrawal and burnout. Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison (1998) also suggested that psychological strain included dissatisfaction, anxiety, dysphoria, complaints of insomnia and restlessness. Each of these resulting psychological strains is further supported in the literature (Beehr, 1998; Quick, Horn, & Quick, 1986; Spector, 1998).

The second major strain resulting from exposure to stressors is that of physical strain (also referred to as physical health). Physical or physiological strain is hypothesised to manifest in symptoms such as high blood pressure, changes in blood eosinophils, and elevated serum cholesterol (Harrison, 1978). Downs et al. (1990) outlined in their review that stress has been physically related to cardiovascular disease, hypertension, ulcers, asthma, and migraine headaches. Edwards, & colleagues (1998) note that physiological strains also included elevated blood pressure and compromised immune system functioning.

Finally, the third classification of strain is that of behavioural strain. Quick et al. (1986) suggest that behavioural changes are among the earliest and most easily recognised signs of increases in stress. Research has associated increased cigarette smoking, increased alcohol and recreational drug abuse, violence, stuttering, overeating, and frequent utilisation of health care services as symptoms of behavioural strain (Harrison, 1978; Quick et al., 1986; Edwards et al., 1998). An important point in this domain is emphasised by Beehr, (1998). He notes that not all behavioural responses to stressors should be categorised as strain responses, and that only those responses that are directly harmful to the individual are strain responses. For instance, changes in job performance may be directly helpful (or harmful) to the organisation, but by themselves, may not necessarily be harmful to the individual.

In 1999 Lazarus suggested that stress and emotions are interdependent – where there is stress there is also emotion.

Slaski, & Cartwright (2002) found that managers who scored higher in EI suffered less subjective stress, experienced better health and well-being and that this relationship affected management performance. Individuals with high levels of EI should be able to cope better with challenges and control their emotions more effectively than individuals with low levels of EI, which should in turn improve the physical and psychological health outcomes associated with stress (Nikolaou, & Tsaousis, 2002).

Several studies have found that trait EI was a significant moderator of the relationship between occupational stress and well-being (Ciarrochi, Deane, & Anderson, 2001; Mikolajczak, & Luminet, 2008; Mikolajczak, Menil, & Luminet, 2007). For example, Ciarrochi Deane, & Anderson (2001) found that stress was associated with greater reported depression, hopelessness and suicidal ideation among people who are high in emotional perception compared to others. On the other hand, Law, Wong, & Song (2004) argued that a person with high emotional intelligence should be able to recognize his or her emotions, to facilitate performance. As a result, this person should be happier as a whole in life. Self-efficacy has been found to play a moderating role in the study of stress and well-being (Bandura, 1997; Jex, & Bliese, 1999; Schwarzer; 1999).

For example, Jex, & Bliese (1999) found that self-efficacy moderates the relationship between certain stressors such as hours worked, work overload or task meaning, and some of their consequences such as satisfaction, physical symptoms, attempts to abandon the job and organizational commitment.

The moderating role of social support in the relationship between work-related stress and psychological well-being has been reported in several studies (Dunkley et al., 2000; Salami, 2007; Siu et al., 2002; Terry, Nielsen, & Perchard, 1993). Social support serves as a buffer by protecting persons from the potentially pathogenic influence of stressful events. It is expected that persons under occupational stress who have higher social support will have a lower distress, depression or better psychological well-being.

Negative affectivity is possibly the individual difference variable that has the most potential influence on self-report measures of occupational stressors, perceptions of strain and job satisfaction (Decker, & Borgen, 1993).

Studies on PANAS:

Extensive evidence demonstrates that two broad mood factors Positive Affect and Negative Affect; are the dominant dimensions in self-reported mood (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1984; Watson, & Tellegen, 1985). Although their names might suggest that they are opposite poles of the same dimension, Positive and Negative Affect are in fact highly distinctive dimensions that can be meaningfully represented as orthogonal (uncorrelated) factors. Both mood factors can be measured either as a state (i.e., transient fluctuations in mood) or as a trait (i.e., stable individual differences in general affective tone).

Negative Affect is a general factor of subjective distress, and subsumes a broad range of negative mood states, including fear, anxiety, hostility, scorn, and disgust. Mood states related to depression such as sadness and loneliness also have substantial loadings on this factor. At the trait level, NA is a broad and pervasive predisposition to experience negative emotions that has further influences on cognition, self-concept, and world view (Watson, & Clark, 1984). In contrast, PA is a dimension reflecting one's level of pleasurable engagement with the environment. High PA is composed of terms reflecting one's enthusiasm, high energy level, mental alertness, interest, joy and determination, whereas low PA is best denned by descriptors reflecting lethargy and fatigue.

Trait PA is a corresponding predisposition conducive to positive emotional experience; it reflects a generalized sense of well-being and competence and of effective interpersonal engagement.

Substantial research indicates that PA and NA, instead of representing opposite ends of a bipolar continuum, exist as two unipolar factors that are primarily independent of one another

(e.g., Burke, et al., 1993). Supportive of this independence, findings indicate that the two factors operate through different biological and behavioral mechanisms (Watson, 2000) and correlate with other variables in differing magnitudes (e.g., Watson, & Pennebaker, 1989).

Worth noting is that PA and NA are conceptually and empirically related to other personality factors including optimism and pessimism (e.g., Steed, 2002) and extroversion and neuroticism (Watson, 2000), but are not redundant with these other characteristics (e.g., Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1995). Also, PA and NA predict other job outcomes more strongly than do extroversion and neuroticism (e.g., job attitudes, Thoresen, Kaplan, Barsky, Warren, & de Chermont, 2003).

Over the years, NA and PA have been identified as prominent traits among the general personality traits (George, 1996; Hough, & Schneider, 1996). PA is a manifestation of a fundamental appetitive "approach" system, termed as the behavioral activation system (BAS) (Carver & White, 1994; Dillard, & Anderson, 2004). High PAs experience a good deal of positive feelings, such as joyfulness, exhilaration, and enthusiasm. Alternatively, low PAs are more likely to experience such feelings as sadness and lethargy (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). As a result, they tend to become somewhat disengaged from the world around them in a "non-pleasurable manner or style" (George, 1996). NA is the part of the behavioral inhibition system (BIS) (Dillard, & Anderson, 2004), which promotes survival by fostering avoidance type behaviors when the person encounters potentially threatening and aversive conditions (Gray, 1987). Thus, NA is the disposition to experience negative feelings. High NA is characterized by the experience of such negative feelings as anger, disgust, and contempt. Low NA is characterized by calmness and serenity (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).

Furthermore, according to the dispositional model, since NA and PA are considered independent traits (Diener, 1984; Watson, & Clark, 1984), an individual can be high on both NA and PA, low on both, or high on one and low on the other.

Following prior literature (e.g, Chiu, & Francesco, 2003), we define dispositional PA as a trait that reflects pervasive individual differences in positive emotionality and self-concept. PA measures the degree to which a person is predisposed to experience positive emotions and moods. Individuals high on PA tend to be cheerful, energetic and experience positive moods such as happiness across a wide variety of situations and over time (Barsade, & Gibson, 2007). NA, on the other hand, is defined as a trait that describes the tendency of an individual to experience a variety of negative moods and emotions across time and situations (Chiu, & Francesco, 2003). Individuals characterized by high NA tend to be distressed, upset, nervous

and have a negative view of self (e.g., feeling worthless). They tend to focus on shortcomings, disappointments and mistakes and are provoked by their own thoughts and behavior.

As individuals are naturally oriented towards well-being (Deci, & Ryan, 2017) and because entrepreneurship affords opportunities for growth, development and mental health (Shir, 2015; Shepherd, 2015), PA and NA (rather than temporary state affect) can be especially important as motivational triggers in the decision to enter (or not) into self-employment.

Negative affect has been found in multiple studies to be important facilitator of early motivational processes prior to goal pursuit (e.g., Alloy, & Abramson, 1979; Taylor & Gollwitzer, 1995). PA and NA have been conceptualized as independent of each other, which has been validated empirically (e.g., Diener, & Emmons, 1984; Watson et al., 1988). People can simultaneously experience various combinations of PA and NA and the constructs have different antecedents and consequences (Johnson, & Johnson, 2000).

Indeed, Kessler, & Staudinger (2009) found that age was associated with increased levels of low arousal positive affect, but that levels of high arousal positive affect were stable across adulthood. Overall, age differences in positive affect appear to be small and are primarily evident when studies contrast very young and very old adults. In contrast, older adults experience decreased low and high arousal negative affect compared to younger adults (Charles et al., 2001; Diener, Sandvik, & Larson, 1985; Kessler, & Staudinger, 2009). This decrease is most evident from young adulthood to middle-age, at which point age differences seem to stabilize (Carstensen et al., 2000; Charles et al., 2001) or slightly reverse (Griffin et al., 2006).

Such age differences in negative and positive affect suggest that older adults should exhibit higher positivity ratios than younger adults. Indeed, such a scenario fits with extant theory and empirical evidence suggesting that age is associated with improved emotion regulation (cf. Scheibe, & Carstensen, 2010). We expected, therefore, that older adults would, on average, have higher positivity ratios than younger adults and that such age differences would primarily reflect age differences in negative affect.

Positive and negative affects can direct individual's attention (through tuning processes) not only externally, toward the extent to which the context is supportive, but also internally, toward their own evaluation of creative abilities.

Our findings highlight the importance of individual's positive and negative affects in tuning their cognitions. Given research indicating that various interventions can influence affect and related outcomes (Baas et al., 2008), this study can stimulate the creation of more inclusive

theoretical frameworks and of more efficient practical interventions that can help increase creative performance.

Studies on SMET:

A study on SMET, reported decrease in occupational stress levels and baseline autonomic arousal in managers, showing significant reduction in sympathetic activity (Vempati, & Telles, 2000). Effectiveness of Self-Management of Excessive Tension programme on emotional well-being of managers was studied.. In this study, Emotional Quotient was used as an indicator for emotional well-being. SMET intervention contributed to the betterment of emotional well-being of the managers (Kumari, Nath, & Nagendra, 2007).

A study was made to assess the effect of Self-Management of Excessive Tension, on brain wave coherence. Results of a study showed that participation in a SMET program was associated with improvement in emotional stability and may have implications for 'Executive Efficiency'. On the whole, significant increase in cognitive flexibility, intelligence and emotional stability were attained by following SMET (Ganpat, & Nagendra, 2011).

A study examined the possibility of enhancing emotional competence (EC) along with emotional Intelligence (EI) through Self-management of excessive tension program. The participating executives reported improvement in efficiency at work. In addition they have experienced other benefits like reduction in blood pressure, sleep decreases in the consumption of the tranquilizers, clarity in thinking, and relaxed feeling in action (Kumari, Hankey, & Nagendra, 2013).

In another study, SMET intervention has again proved to contribute to significant enhancement of emotional competence level of the managers (Kumari, Nath, & Nagendra, 2007). A study evaluates the impact of a 5 day stress management programme - SMET for managers as measured by AcuGraph3 - 'Digital Meridian Imaging' system. The 5 days SMET intervention increased overall '*Prāṇic*' energy in the main acupuncture meridian channels. The program significantly improved overall *chi* (Chinese term) energy. *Chi* energy would increase, both in individual meridians and the overall (Meenakshy, Hankey, Nagendra, 2014).

A study was conducted to evaluate the effect of 5 days yoga based Self-Management of Excessive Tension on profile of mood states of managers. The negative moods were significantly reduced following SMET program. Whereas positive moods improved. The intense yoga based SMET program enhanced the profile of mood in managers (Acharya,

Pradhan, & Nagendra, 2014). SMET intervention with an insight of group dynamics & executive growth along with the practices proved to bring about a significant trend in scores which suggested that SMET as part of Yoga could be an effective tool for managing stress and hence enhancing managerial leadership (Maharana, Patra , Srinivasan, Nagendra,. 2014).

A study was made to examine the effect of Stress Management Programme, Self-Management of excessive Tension on the managers. It was observed that significant improvement in health and personality traits (increase in positive and decrease in negative traits) were recorded (Acharya, Pradhan, & Nagendra 2017). Effect of SMET Programme showed to improve the attention of top line managers in another study (Singh, & Nagendra, 2012).