

While acknowledging the definitional difficulties surrounding terms like happiness and unhappiness, and the preference at times to use the term well-being, Warr (Warr & Clapperton, 2010) suggests that happiness should be considered not just in terms of its energising and tranquil forms, but also in terms of whether it is being used in a contextual (work) sense or even a facet (work component) sense. Similarly, when individual differences are considered in terms of how they trigger positive beliefs, these authors point to how such beliefs aid individuals, create positive appraisals, develop resources for managing demanding encounters, and shift the focus towards those aspects of the work environment that help create the context for positive opportunities. (Cooper) which, when focused at the individual level, suggests a complex cycle connected by four processes: the appraisal process (interpreting events); the choice process (the choice of a coping response); the performance process (the coping phase); and the outcome process (the consequences for the individual; Shupe & McGrath, 2000). While Warr (2007) and Warr and Clapperton (2010) point out the way different personality traits influence happiness, and how happiness also depends on the different sorts of comparisons individuals make about themselves in relation to others, they also raise the issue of whether individuals have a consistency in their levels of happiness---a baseline? Shupe and McGrath go on to outline the complexity of these interconnected process and the implications this complexity has for researchers in terms of measurement and interpretation. Another approach is offered by Nelson and Simmons (2003, 2004) and Simmons and Nelson (2007), who integrate into their holistic stress model the positive qualities of eustress and propose that the appraisal of any encounter can produce positive or negative meanings. Within primary appraisal, three components are distinguished: goal relevance describes the extent to which an encounter refers to issues about which the person cares. 'Psychological stress refers to a relationship with the environment that the person appraises as significant for his or her well being and in which the demands tax or exceed available coping resources' (Lazarus and Folkman 1986, p. 63). Lazarus recognized that individuals use three kinds of appraisal to analyze situations namely: Primary appraisal, Secondary appraisal and Reappraisal. Since its first presentation as a comprehensive theory (Lazarus 1966), the Lazarus stress theory has undergone several essential revisions (cf. This definition points to two processes as central mediators within the person-environment transaction: cognitive appraisal and coping. Goal congruence defines the extent to which an episode proceeds in accordance with personal goals. Lazarus's research (in Brannon & Feist, 1997) revealed that the ability of people to think and evaluate future events makes them more vulnerable in ways that animals are not. A stressful appraisal would indicate the individual sees the situation as harmful or threatening. This type of interpretation is likely to generate an emotion or what Lazarus refers to as -harm? Type of ego- involvement designates aspects of personal commitment such as self- esteem, moral values, ego-ideal, or ego-identity. Three secondary appraisal components are distinguished: blame or credit results from an individual's appraisal of who is responsible for a certain event. Thus the effect that stress has on the individual is based on that individual's feelings of vulnerability and ability to cope. Primary Appraisal concerns the first encounter with the stressful event. Several social and personal constructs have been proposed, such as social support (Schwarzer and Leppin 1991), sense of coherence (Antonovsky 1979), hardiness (Kobasa 1979), self-efficacy (Bandura 1977), or optimism (Scheier and Carver 1992). The recently offered conservation of

resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll 1989, Hobfoll et al. 1996) assumes that stress occurs in any of three contexts: when people experience loss of resources, when resources are threatened, or when people invest their resources without subsequent gain. whereas self-efficacy and optimism are single protective factors, hardiness and sense of coherence represent tripartite approaches. Four categories of resources are proposed: object resources (i.e., physical objects such as home, clothing, or access to transportation), condition resources (e.g., employment, personal relationships), personal resources (e.g., skills or self-efficacy), and energy resources (means that facilitate the attainment of other resources, for example, money, credit, or knowledge). Similarly, sense of coherence consists of believing that the world is meaningful, predictable, and basically benevolent. Randall and Elizebeth (1994) define occupational stress as the interaction of the work conditions with the characteristics of the worker, such that the demands of work exceed the ability of the worker to cope with them: Using network technology, Electronic Performance Monitoring (EPM) systems provide managers with access to their employee's computer terminals and telephone, allowing managers to determine at any moment throughout the day, the pace at which employees are working, time taken and so on. Thus the study by John R. Aiello, Karthryn, J. Kolla (1995), which examined how productivity and stress are affected by EPM, showed that EPM is linked with increased stress and therefore decreased productivity.

STRESS – INTERPRETATIONS OF RESEARCHERS The term stress in Engineering implies an inherent capacity to withstand stress. Research Psychologist Sandi Mann of University of Sal ford (1998) stated that employees who are under increasing pressure to appear enthusiastic, interested, cheerful, and friendly at all times in their work place are highly A Theoretical Framework of Stress Management – Contemporary Approaches, Models and Theories places. Psychological Stress: The Lazarus Theory Two concepts are central to any psychological stress theory: appraisal, i.e., individuals' evaluation of the significance of what is happening for their well-being, and coping, i.e., individuals' efforts in thought and action to manage specific demands (Lazarus 1993). In the latest version (see Lazarus 1991), stress is regarded as a relational concept, i.e., stress is not defined as a specific kind of external stimulation nor a specific pattern of physiological, behavioral, or subjective reactions. Cox and Griffiths (1995) informs that the concepts of engineering and physiological approaches are weakened, because these theories tell us that people respond to the threat slowly and do not clarify the certain effects of emotional or situational factors on performance and welfare.

2.3.4.4.2.4.3.4.4.4.5.5