



Individuals and Groups in Organizations

Bobbie Turniansky
and A. Paul Hare

Individuals in Groups and Organizations

Individuals in Groups and Organizations

Bobbie Turniansky
and A. Paul Hare



SAGE Publications
London • Thousand Oaks • New Delhi

© Bobbie Turniansky and A. Paul Hare 1998

First published 1998

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Publishers.



SAGE Publications Ltd
6 Bonhill Street
London EC2A 4PU

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
32, M-Block Market
Greater Kailash – I
New Delhi 110 048

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0 7619 5720 0
ISBN 0 7619 5721 9 (pbk)

Library of Congress catalog card number 98-061166

Typeset by Photoprint, Torquay, Devon
Printed in Great Britain by The Cromwell Press,
Trowbridge, Wiltshire

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Introduction</i>	1
1 People	6
Stress, Burnout and Coping	7
Emotional Labour	19
Between Two Worlds – Home and Work	23
People – Some Final Words	33
2 Gender	35
Work and Gender	36
Women and their Technology	49
Women and Stress	52
Sexual Issues in the Workplace	54
Gender – Some Final Words	56
3 Flexibility	58
Life Pattern Flexibility	59
Employment Flexibility	68
Functional Flexibility	70
Technological Flexibility	72
Flexibility in Time and Space	78
Flexibility – Some Final Words	85
4 Groups	87
Groups and What They Do	87
Group Development	93
Effective Groups	95
Organizational Forms	101
Groups – Some Final Words	111
5 Learning	112
What is Organizational Learning?	113
The Learning Process	115

Examples of Organizational Learning	134
The Challenge of Organizational Change	136
Organizational Culture	140
Learning – Some Final Words	144
6 Creativity	145
A Theoretical Perspective on Creativity	145
Creative Persons	148
Encouraging Creativity	150
Managing Creativity	152
Creative Organization	157
Creativity – Some Final Words	162
Some Final, Final Words	163
The First Loop	165
The Second Loop	167
<i>Internet Appendix</i>	169
<i>Bibliography</i>	174
<i>Index</i>	197

PREFACE

This book grew out of a collaboration between a psychologist and a sociologist, each of whom has taught organizational subjects for a number of years. When we reached the decision to write the book, we decided to approach the topic of individuals and groups in organizations from a slightly different direction from that which we usually see, because of the difficulties we have had with the majority of books already available. Most of the books on organizational behaviour are directed at business-school students. The examples they use are almost exclusively from 'business' organizations located in the USA. Strange as it may seem, organizational behaviour is also taught in psychology departments and schools of education and social work, as well as in countries other than the USA. Most books are also either 'academic' books for the university or 'how-to' books for the practitioner.

This book has a different emphasis. The primary audience is practitioners – a wide category under which we include managers, co-ordinators, consultants and (dare we say it) even workers. But since our emphasis is on the practitioner who is also interested in theory, in what has been said and done during the last few years in the organizational field, the book can also be used by students looking for current material about organizations. Although it has a practitioner focus, it is more academically than 'recipe' focused. Since we were also interested in breaking the 'American business' mould, we have tried to include examples and research from additional domains as varied as the Israeli kibbutz, Dutch schools and Hallmark Cards. We have attempted to provide a book in which school principals, human resources managers, work team members and college students from different places in the Western world can all find their place and feel comfortable.

If this *was* a 'how-to' recipe book, we could say that in it you will find entrées of reports of academic research both from the laboratory and the field, stirred in with information from daily newspapers and news magazines and peppered with a small bit of 'how to' advice. We feel that all of these pieces are important. The academic basis is of limited practical use if we do not know what is going on in the 'normal' world.

The book is set out in, what seems to us, a logical progression. The view we take is that employees are first and foremost people. They have wants, needs and complex life situations which they bring to work with them and which are influenced by that work. These people come in different 'types' which we usually call men and women. As much as we might like to think that there is no need to refer to this situation when discussing organizations, reality tells us otherwise, and so from looking at 'people' we move on to looking at 'gender'. From this point, our next large topic is flexibility and this chapter acts as a transition from the individual level to the group and organizational level. Here we look at personal flexibility in terms of careers and functions, technological flexibility, and spatial and temporal flexibility. We then move on to groups in organizations and examine some of the possibilities for team-based work organizations. Learning and creativity finish off the list of large topics that we present.

This is not a book which needs to be read in any particular order, although the order in which the topics are presented 'makes sense' to us. Within each chapter, it is also possible to select a certain topic which is of interest at a particular time. We hope that each of you will find what you are looking for.

This is the place where we also want to thank the other people involved in bringing the book to publication, and to remind everyone that any deficiencies are still our responsibility. There are the people who read and commented on it: June Hare, Julia Chaitin, Barabra Rosenstein and Herb Blumberg. And, of course, the people at Sage who have been so helpful: Rosemary Nixon, Hans Lock, Pascale Carrington, the copy-editor Neil Dowden and all the other people who have helped create this book.

On a more personal note, I (Bobbie) would like to thank you (Paul) for guiding me through the book-writing process. It was certainly an adventure! And Reuven, even though you never believed we would actually finish it, thank you for being so understanding about it.

INTRODUCTION

The typical text on organizations has chapters about motivating the individual worker, about the influence of small groups in enhancing or retarding productivity, on leadership and on change. The text usually serves as an introduction to the main features of social psychology for students in business schools or for organizational managers or consultants. Here, without ignoring the more traditional topics, we propose to provide an overview of research on individuals and groups in organizations by considering six topics of interest to persons who wish to maintain organizations, make them more effective, or implement change. The topics, ordered from a focus on the individual to that of the group and organization, are:

- 1 People
- 2 Gender
- 3 Flexibility
- 4 Groups
- 5 Learning
- 6 Creativity

Each of these topics has been written about in numerous books and articles. We're not going to claim that we're going to tell you everything about each one of them. What we *will* try to do is present some of the current work being done and put it into an understandable framework.

Interspersed with some theoretical notions and summaries of current research, we will include several cases to illustrate some of the units of analysis and relationships that are important for understanding the role of the individual in the group, the group in the organization and the organization in the environment.

Although more bits of theory will be introduced as we go along, we find it useful to have in mind five sets of ideas that are based on functional analysis. The first idea is that every social system, be it a work group or an organization, has four functions that must be maintained for the system to survive: economic (supply of resources); political (exercise of control in reaching the goal); legal (norms, roles); and values in its

culture (that give meaning to the exercise). We will refer to these functions respectively as resources (R), goal-attainment (G), integration (I) and meaning (M). (These concepts are fully developed in Effrat, 1968; Hare, 1992a; and Parsons, 1961.)

The second idea is that these functions exist in a cybernetic hierarchy with Meaning (having the most 'information') at the top and resources (with the most 'energy') at the bottom. The goal-attainment function is just above resources and the integrative function is above that.

The third idea is that the overall development and change in an organization or group usually goes through four phases: beginning with a definition of the values that will guide the activity and the goal to be achieved (meaning); then securing or making the resources necessary for the task (resources); next developing the roles and level of morale required by the participants (integration); and finally coordinating the activity, through leadership, to use the resources and the behaviour in roles to produce specific outcomes that are in line with the overall goal (goal-attainment). There is a fifth phase at the end of the life of the group or organization when the meaning of the activity needs to be reassessed for the individuals, when they must give up their roles and their control, and distribute the remaining resources.

The fourth idea is that, in addition to paying attention to the four internal problems, an organization as a unit in a society must relate to other organizations in the same sector and in other sectors, and also to the physical environment, which according to some calculations is rapidly being depleted.

The fifth idea is to recognize that the four system levels of biological, personality, social and cultural also form a cybernetic hierarchy. Additionally, environment is at the bottom of the hierarchy since it acts on the biological system. In recent years dealing with environmental problems has provided a significant challenge. We also divide the social system level into subsystems for a finer grain analysis, including the work group, organization and network of organizations within a nation. In addition we recognize the problems faced by multinational organizations as they operate in different national cultures and structures.

Within the same functional area, providing resources for example, we expect the amount of influence on individual behaviour by groups and organizations will be positively correlated with the system level. When different functions are involved, say, meaning versus resources, we expect that the amount of influence will be correlated with the position of the functional area in the cybernetic hierarchy (meaning = high, resources = low). For example, the classic Western Electric studies (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) revealed that the informal work group of women in the 'relay assembly test room' could raise productivity above the standard set by management, while the informal group of men in the 'bank wiring room' could lower productivity. In this case the

organization provided pay as a motivation for work (resources level), but the informal groups influenced the meaning of the work and also provided social support (integration level).

Some texts emphasize 'systems theory' in which they categorize various elements or activities as 'inputs', 'processes' and 'outputs' where the process supplies some 'value added' aspect to the input. The example usually given is when some raw material, say cotton balls, are run through a process (cotton gin), to produce an output (cotton ready for spinning and weaving). However, in groups and organizations, not all the inputs are physical raw materials. Further, with the typical raw material example, it is assumed that all four aspects of the system do not change while the process is going on. With a functional perspective we can sort out the inputs according to their functional category. An input at the top of the cybernetic hierarchy, in the values and goal of the system, can be expected to produce the greatest change (for example, the shift from a system based on cooperation to one that favours individual enterprise); next an input that requires changes in the individual roles or in the support that members give to each other (for example, the introduction of cross-training for members of a work group so that each individual needs to be able to play at least two roles); next a change in the control of the process (for example, introducing self-managed work groups); and finally, at the bottom, changes in technology (for example, computers) or raw materials (plastics).

Throughout the text we will be using these ideas drawn from functional analysis to classify issues such as aspects of gender segregation at work, perspectives on organizational reality, types of organizational flexibility, career contracts, support for technological change, patterns of career experiences, anchors and competencies, group attributes, functions within functions, types of groups, organizational cultures and organizational vision statements. We will also suggest how some aspects of organizations can be seen to form a cybernetic hierarchy or how they might fit in some way into the general scheme of things. If you are interested in some of the key words and ideas we look for when coding the various types of individual, group or organizational activity, then you may wish to look at Table I.1. If you have had enough theory for a while, you may prefer to skip the next few paragraphs.

Looking at the table, we can see that for each functional area there is a generalized medium of exchange (assets, power, influence and commitments). Exchanges may be made within a functional area, for example exchanging money for information, or from one area to another, for example exchanging commitment for power.

There is a value principle which guides action in each area. In the short term, resources are judged by their utility, goal-attainment by its effectiveness, integration by the extent to which it produces solidarity or role clarity, and meaning to the extent to which it upholds the integrity (or *gestalt*) of the organization and leads to a coherent vision.

Table I.1 *Media of exchange, value principles and evaluative standards for four functional problems*

<i>Functional problem</i>	<i>Resources</i>	<i>Goal-attainment</i>	<i>Integration</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
<i>Medium of exchange</i>	Assets (money, information, skills, materials)	Power	Influence (based on social capital)	Commitments
<i>Value principle</i>	Utility	Effectiveness	Solidarity, role, clarity	Coherent vision
<i>Coordinative standard</i>	Solvency	Success	Cohesiveness	Consensus

There is also a long-term standard of evaluation for how well activity in each area has been coordinated. Activity in the resources area is effective if the books show a positive balance or the shelves in the stockroom are neither bare nor overstocked. That is, the organization is solvent. The criterion for the goal-attainment area is success, for integration it is cohesiveness showing solidarity and role clarity, and for meaning, consensus about the culture and its values.

We use these key concepts to classify an activity of an organization (or individual or group) as belonging to one of the four functional areas. For example, an activity that has to do with facilities, such as raising money or securing raw materials, to be used for the general purposes of the organization, where the focus is on utility with a concern for solvency, would be classified as in the R or resources area. In contrast, an activity that is related to the values of the organization as set out in the vision statement as part of the organizational culture, that has to do with basic commitment to the organization, is concerned with coherence and is related to consensus, would be classified in the M or meaning area. In a similar way, other activities would be classified as being related to integration or goal-attainment functions.

Throughout the text we will provide more examples of the way the four functional categories can be used, for example to classify steps in reaching consensus. But we will not be using this classification at every opportunity both because there is not always sufficient information upon which to base a decision and because there are other factors that are important to organizational behaviour which are not captured by the model. One of the things which we must continually remember is that organizations, and what goes on in them, are very complex phenomena. Because of this complexity, from time to time we will introduce more concepts to elaborate the functional perspective. However there is still a gap between existing theories of organizations and the day-to-day activities they seek to explain. At some point we will stop theorizing and simply tell you what we see or what others have seen. If you wish to use the functional categories for analysis in some of your own work, more examples are given in Hare (1993).

One other idea which will show up now and then is that we create our reality and that what is important is our perception of it and the meaning we attach to it. Of course, we do not do this alone. We influence and are influenced by others in our social settings. We test our perceptions on others and try, sometimes actively, other times less so, to arrive at shared meanings.

PEOPLE

More and more employers are opening their eyes to the fact that employees are people too. They are complete human beings with needs, motivations, concerns, emotions and lives that cannot be shut off when they enter the workplace. The work organization is embedded within the total life sphere of the person and what happens within it both affects, and is affected by, that life sphere. The question of where the person stops and the employee begins is a complicated one. How much can the employee express his or her 'real self'?

An organizing theme for this chapter is identity. According to social identity theory (Abrams and Hogg, 1990; Tajfel and Turner, 1985) people classify themselves as members of social groups, a process known as self-categorization (Turner et al., 1987). Group membership results from perceptions or cognitions, not from interpersonal affections. Social categories provide members with a social identity that is both descriptive and prescriptive – a definition of who one is and a definition of appropriate behaviour for your kind of group member. The self-concept is the sum of an individual's beliefs or knowledge about his or her personal qualities, and social identity is the part of the self-concept that comes from group membership.

We have different 'selves'. Some of our behaviours, thoughts and feelings depend on what we are doing and who we are with (Markus and Wurf, 1987). We probably feel and act differently when we are at home and when we are at work. To deal with all of the varying information about ourselves, we organize it according to our various roles, activities and relationships (Carver and Scheier, 1981; Rogers, 1981). The extent of identification with each role varies and is influenced by factors such as shared goals (Turner, 1984). Situations act to 'switch on' different social identities (Turner, 1982) and the individual reacts to changes in situational cues by assuming different identities. Accessibility is the readiness with which a given stimulus will be identified with a given social identity and fit is the degree to which the stimulus matches the specifications of a given category. Both factors influence the likelihood that a given social identity will be switched on in a given situation (Turner et al., 1987).

A self-aspect summarizes what we believe we are like in a particular role or activity and people differ in self-complexity – the number and diversity of the self-aspects they develop for different roles, situations or relationships. People with few, relatively similar self-aspects are said to have low self-complexity while those with many independent self-aspects are described as high in self-complexity (Linville, 1985). High self-complexity seems to protect people from swings in self-esteem since a bad event (or a good one) is likely to have a direct effect on only a limited number of self-aspects. If people have many independent self-aspects, only a small part of their self-concept will be affected by such an event. Linville (1987) suggests that self-complexity can be increased by being involved in many roles and activities but also by seeing the various roles and activities as involving somewhat different selves.

A working person plays multiple roles and has multiple identities – both within and outside the workplace. As mentioned above, and as will be expanded below, this is probably a healthy phenomenon. However, at some stage people try to fit all of the different pieces of self-knowledge, the identities, into a coherent whole and are usually successful in doing so. But there are factors that can aid or hinder the balancing and integrating of those roles and these are some of the topics we look at in the following pages.

Stress, Burnout and Coping

As we will see in this chapter, the actions that organizations take do not remain in a vacuum. They have effects not only on the 'bottom-line' but also on the lives of their employees. The most common problem of everyday life may be stress and there is little disagreement that costs to individuals and organizations resulting from stress and its related illnesses are great (Matteson and Ivancevich, 1987). In the USA, the annual cost of stress-related absence and sickness, reduced productivity and associated health and compensation costs is estimated at more than \$150 billion a year (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). The estimate of all job accidents that are stress related ranges from 60 per cent to 80 per cent (Cartwright and Cooper, 1996)

Studies of organizational stress and burnout are often done on selected worker populations such as social workers (Bennett et al., 1993; Poulin and Walter, 1993), teachers (Capel, 1987), police officers (Beehr et al., 1995; Golembiewski and Kim, 1990; Hart et al., 1995), active union members (Nandram and Klandermans, 1993), nurses (Parasuraman and Hansen, 1987) and airline pilots (Little et al., 1990). Stress is not only a problem for workers but affects supervisors as well (Erera, 1991).

There are three main perspectives on stress (Ross and Altmaier, 1994): stress as the internal response of the individual (typified by the work of Selye, 1956); stress as the accumulation of difficulties in an individual's

environment (for example, the work on stressful life events done by Holmes and Rahe, 1967); and stress as the interaction of characteristics of the person and factors in the environment. It is the interaction approach that will concern us here since if we accept that stress is almost inevitable (or avoidable only at great societal cost), as assumed by the first two perspectives, then there is little that can be done in an organizational context to reduce it. As opposed to the first two perspectives that emphasize either internal process or external events, the view of stress as an interaction between the person and the environment is more useful to understanding what occurs in organizations.

Lazarus is the father of the transactional (interactional) model of stress or, as he called it, a cognitive-phenomenological theory (Lazarus, 1981; Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). In brief, the model defines stress as occurring when there is an imbalance between demands and resources. As opposed to some other stress models, stress is not seen only as the result of major events – there is also an emphasis on ‘daily hassles’, chronic external conditions, as stressors. This model views the influence process as bi-directional – people can influence environments and environments can influence people. The model is flexible and dynamic; things can change over time, the appraisal of demands and resources is not static.

In accordance with the transactional model, occupational stress can be defined as the ‘interaction of work conditions with characteristics of the worker such that the demands of work exceed the ability of the worker to cope with them’ (Ross and Altmaier, 1994: 12). Not all people will show stress reactions to the same situation. The person–environment relationship is mediated by three types of cognitive appraisal which will be described below. The appraisal process is not only perception; it is ‘... the process of categorizing an encounter, and its various facets, with respect to its significance for well-being’ (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984: 31).

The appraisal process follows a temporal sequence and begins with primary (initial) appraisal – the event is evaluated with respect to its significance to personal well-being. In this respect, the stimulus is determined to be benign, stressful or irrelevant (positive, negative or neutral). Secondary appraisal is a judgment about how damage can be minimized or gain maximized. It is about coping – what can be done about the stressful encounter, what resources are available. The process may be iterative and therefore the third appraisal is reappraisal, another appraisal cycle activated by new information. For example, is the coping attempt having the desired effect?

Theoretically, the model is very attractive. In reality, the process may be problematic. The first problem comes up with the secondary appraisal process. Both the range of alternatives that can be considered and the time available to consider them is questionable. In all probability, both are limited and a satisficing, rather than an optimizing path is taken

(Edwards, 1988). The reappraisal process also raises questions. In 'real life' the feedback process that allows the individual, or the organization, to assess the effectiveness of any response may be delayed and, as with many behaviours taken within a system, a 'bad' or maladaptive response may be continued if it is not realized that the effect may only occur after some time has passed (Senge, 1990).

For organizational psychologists and others interested in organizational issues, it is not enough to identify the stressors. We must also concentrate on the organizational (and extra-organizational) factors or variables that precede the stressors – that is, their organizational causes. Stressors in organizational settings should be looked at not just as independent variables but also as dependent variables. Questions should be asked about properties of organizations that have the consequence of creating stressors (Kahn and Byosiére, 1992).

As Kahn and Byosiére (1992) point out, there are many disagreements among stress researchers as to definitions but there is agreement on three aspects of stress that are important to study:

- 1 identification of objective sources of stress-indicative responses;
- 2 immediate cognitive or affective responses to them; and
- 3 long-term effect on psychological, physiological and behavioural functions.

In a study of Swedish workers, Alfredsson and Theorell (1983) found that men whose jobs were characterized by high psychological demand and low control (autonomy) were at twice the risk for myocardial infarction than men employed in other occupations. Continuing along these lines, a study done jointly in the USA and Sweden on the social and psychological aspects of work situations that are risk factors for coronary heart disease found that the primary work-related risk factor appears to be a lack of control over how skills are used and job demands are met (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). Using two concepts, skill discretion (or task variety – the breadth of skills workers can use on the job) and decision authority (or autonomy – workers' authority over decision making), Karasek and Theorell (1990) present a combined measure which they call decision latitude or control. It is important to emphasize that the control dimension is control over one's own activities and skill usage, not control over other people. By looking at the interactions between decision latitude and high or low psychological demands (defined as 'how hard you work', including deadlines, widgets/hour, mental load, role overload, stressors arising from personal conflicts, and so on), they arrive at a four-level classification of jobs. As shown in Figure 1.1 (Karasek and Theorell, 1990: 32), a combination of low psychological demand and high decision latitude results in low strain, while the opposite combination of high psychological demand and low latitude results in high strain. The other two possibilities result in

		Psychological demands	
		Low	High
Decision latitude (control)	High	Low strain (repair-man, architect)	Active (lawyer, teacher, physician)
	Low	Passive (watchman, custodian)	High strain (machine-paced jobs, waiter)

Figure 1.1 *Psychological demand/decision latitude model*

active jobs (high on both dimensions) and passive ones (low on both dimensions).

Schaubroeck and Merritt (1997) point out that although the decision latitude model has formed the underlying theoretical basis for most large-scale studies of job stress in the last 10 years, the research support for it has been mixed. They propose that the mixed results stem from at least one unmeasured variable – self-efficacy. The researchers maintain that the model assumes that most employees have a high level of self-efficacy, and suggest that for those with low self-efficacy control may even have adverse health consequences. As defined by Wood and Bandura (1989: 408), self-efficacy refers to ‘beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands’. It is self-efficacy that affects an individual’s ability and willingness to exercise control (Litt, 1988). Reviewing stress studies, Fisher (1984) suggested that for individuals with lower self-efficacy, lower control may reduce stressfulness since it would allow for situational attributions of failure rather than self-attributions. Research results predicting blood pressure bore out these predictions (Schaubroeck and Merritt, 1997).

The Case of New Technology

An area of special concern with relation to stress is technology. In modern organizations computer systems are fairly standard. In most cases they are no longer feared and are accepted as part of working life (see Chapter 3). But technology implementation does not stop with the first installation. The pace of change in computer hardware and software is rapid. This means that workers in many situations have to adjust to a state of permanent innovation. Looking at new technology from an interactional perspective, it is clear that some people will react positively to the challenge of constant innovation, while others will find it very stressful. In 1987, a heart attack suffered by a clerk when his workplace

introduced computers was recognized by the Israel National Insurance Institute as a work accident. The worker claimed that his heart attack was the consequence of severe stress and anxiety, a result of not knowing how he would cope with the new technology (*Jerusalem Post*, 1987).

There are three situational variables that can act as stressors in the case of new technology: lack of predictability, lack of control and lack of understanding. In addition to the issue of constant upgrading with its attendant need for learning and opportunities for failure, there are other possible sources of stress connected with information technologies. These include ergonomic factors leading to physical strain, computer 'crashes' and the resulting loss of work, the opportunity to make mistakes with far-reaching consequences due to the complexity and interconnectedness of the system, a feeling of loss of control when program directives that contradict the worker's pattern of thinking and reasoning must be followed and feelings of dependency on experts because of lack of technical knowledge. This is by no means an exhaustive list, just a sample. The effects of the technology on job and skill content are also potential sources of stress but, as will be shown in Chapter 3, there is very little determinism in the implementation of new technology. Effects are not pre-ordained. It is not the technology *per se* but the organizational culture and the way it is implemented that will have an effect on many outcomes including stress. Again, it must be remembered that the perception of stress is very individual and these factors may or may not influence a particular employee.

Stress Responses and Consequences

Stress responses are usually categorized as physiological, psychological or behavioural (although there are overlaps). In organizational research, the inclusion of physiological responses is much rarer than the other two categories. Kahn and Byosiére (1992) conclude that the psychological effects of work-related stressors are fairly well established as opposed to their implications for illness. But the psychological effects in and of themselves are very real, very painful and very costly and are not limited to work roles and work performance. The most common expression of stress is job dissatisfaction but it can also be manifested in aroused affective states (frustration, hostility) or passivity (boredom, helplessness, depression). On the behavioural side, there can be direct disruption of the work role as a result of accidents or use of drugs or alcohol, aggressive behaviour such as sabotage, stealing, flight or withdrawal (absenteeism, turnover), disruption of other life roles and self-damaging behaviour (smoking, drugs, alcohol). There is also evidence that the pressures of the job are not left behind and that there is 'spillover' into the home environment (Bacharach et al., 1991; Burke, 1986). The behavioural responses affect the person, the organization and the person's

extra-organizational life and relationships and, again, the costs can be very high.

The potential consequences of stress include not only the immediate experience of the stress and responses to it, but also longer-term consequences for organizational performance as a whole and the health of the individual. Tetrick (1992) found evidence that the perception of role stress influences perceptions of other aspects of the work environment. For example, perceived role stress was found to have a stronger impact on perceived work group supportiveness than the other way round. This is viewed as an attempt to maintain cognitive consistency among higher order perceptions, beliefs and needs. So in addition to physiological, psychological and behavioural responses to stress, perhaps we need to add perceptual responses as well.

There is some suggestion that reactions to job-related stress may differ for blue-collar and white-collar workers. Some differences between white-collar and blue-collar workers in the relationship between job insecurity and employee psychological adjustment were found by Kuhnert and Vance (1992). Blue-collar workers who were low in organizational commitment and low in job security experienced the greatest psychological adjustment problems, but no significant results were found for white-collar workers in the same organization.

As with many other areas of research on work experiences, most of the research on stress and health has been done on men (Chusmir et al., 1990). But, as will be seen in Chapter 2, managerial and professional women as a group can no longer be ignored – it is a group growing in importance and size. Along with the usual job stressors such as role overload, conflict and ambiguity common to both female and male managers, women in the workplace also face unique stressors, some of them resulting from overt and more subtle gender bias. As we will see, their situation gives ample opportunity for stress stemming from factors such as the glass ceiling, differential rewards, sexual harassment, and so on. The next part of this chapter on the integration of work and home also points out many chances for additional ‘women’s stressors’. Issues relating specifically to women and workplace stress will be looked at in the next chapter.

However, we do not want to give the impression that employees are passive vessels, filling themselves up with whatever stressors the environment throws their way. To some extent, individuals select occupations with stress levels suited to their temperament and coping abilities. Different occupations and different hierarchical levels in organizations will have characteristically different stressors. It is not chance that there are few people who fight oil-well fires. Anticipation of the stressors at a higher organizational level may lead to employees turning down promotions or actively seeking them. This is not to say that employees deserve what they get because they chose it. Often the stressors are not well understood or coping capabilities are over-