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Abstract: Many of the major theoretical models (ex; JDCS, JDR and ERI) that depict the stress process are described. It is proposed that while existing stress models (ex; JDCS, JDR and ERI) present fruitful frameworks for stress research, many existing models suffer from being either too narrow in scope and lacking a role for individual differences. A new approach that combines many of the features of existing stress models (ex; JDCS, JDR and ERI) is proposed, which includes strong roles for psychosocial stressors, individual differences, and subjective perceptions. Researcher combines many of the features of existing stress models (ex; JDCS, JDR and ERI) and proposed a new model that is matched with the existing COPSOQ-II structure (Kristensen et al., 2010). This acknowledges the important role played by psychosocial workplace stressors in the stress process, and tries to account for the role of important individual difference factors in the development of subjective experiences of stress and in influencing the possible health-related outcomes that result from subjective stressful perceptions. This framework aims to represent key aspects of the stress process.

1. The Changing Work Environment and its Effects

It is a common perception that working life is changing across the world and also in India, and these changes have led to new challenges and problems for organizations and employees. The majority of these changes mean that workers are under growing pressure to compete, adapt, and learn new skills in order to meet the demands of their work (Cox and Griffiths, 1995). These changes in the organizational nature of work may result in increasingly “stressful” working environments, which can be manifested in many forms. These include a lack of control at work, shorter holidays, longer hours, insufficient rewards, job insecurity, poor promotion prospects, increased time pressure, lack of support, poor feedback, isolation, harassment, role conflict, and work-life balance issues (Griffiths, 1998). All of the pressures listed above are known as “psychosocial stressors”, and these have been implicated as risk factors for many physical and psychological problems, including increased risks of heart disease, gastrointestinal problems, anxiety, depression, burnout, absence, fatigue, accidents, substance misuse, musculoskeletal disorders, work-family conflict and many other problems (Cox and Griffiths, 1995; Gianakos, 2002; HSE, 2007).

Stress is one of the most serious work hazards of the present times. The effect of work-related stress on employees is severe with 50-80% of all diseases having a stress related nature (Jamal and Badawi, 1993). Among the numerous problems employees face due to job stress, the most significant ones relate to job dissatisfaction, burnout, high absenteeism, high turnover, low organizational commitment, and low (marginal) job performance (Jamal 1984; Jamal 1985; Westman and Eden, 1996). Cardiovascular illness has been strongly implicated as a potential health outcome for those exposed to stressful work conditions (Karasek, 1979). A large body of literature also suggests that work stress is closely related to anxiety and depression (Wang and Patten, 2001; Tennant, 2001) suggests that depression is the most likely adverse psychological outcome of exposure to work stress. Gabriel (2000) found that increased stressors at work were significantly related to increased incidence of depression and anxiety.

2. Existing Theories and Models of Psychological Stress

There are many different models of workplace stress which are important in guiding research and practice, and these vary in popularity and empirical support. Various models dealing with the relationship between stress factors and the consequences of stress as health complaints and clinical disorders are: First, “Person- Environment fit model (French, 1973)”, which suggests that the match between a person and their work environment is a key in influencing their health. For healthy conditions,
it is necessary that employees’ attitudes, skills, abilities and resources match the demands of their job, and that work environments should meet workers’ needs, knowledge and skills potential. Second, Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) “job characteristics model” focuses on important aspects of job characteristics, such as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Third, the “demand-control model”, originally formulated by Karasek (1979) which has later been expanded to the “demand-control-support model” (Johnson, 1989) by adding the dimension of social support. This model assumes working situations to have negative psychological or physical consequences especially when high demands concur with limited decision latitude (and low social support at the workplace in the extended model). Fourth, the “effort-reward imbalance model” has been developed by Siegrist (1996). It postulates that the concurrence of highly efforts with low chances of reward has particularly negative effects such as poor health.

The ERI-model assumes that job strain is the result of an imbalance between effort and reward (in terms of salary, and security/career opportunities i.e. promotion prospects, job security and status consistency). Fifth, “the job demands-resources (JD-R) model” (Demerouti et al., 2001), which incorporates many possible working conditions and focuses on both negative and positive indicators of employee well being. The JD-R model can be applied to a wide range of occupations, and can be used to improve employee well being and performance. Intensified efforts have been made over the last years to develop and validate standardized instruments to assess psychological stress in the working environment based on these and other models (Nubling et al., 2006). A selection of key frameworks will be outlined below.

2.1 The Person-Environment Fit Model
Lewin (1951) observed that an individual’s personal characteristics interacted with their work environment to determine strain and consequent behaviour and health. This concept was developed into the Person-Environment fit model (French, 1973), which suggests that the match between a person and their work environment is key in influencing their health. For healthy conditions, it is necessary that employees’ attitudes, skills, abilities and resources match the demands of their job, and that work environments should meet workers’ needs, knowledge, and skills potential. Lack of fit in either of these domains can cause problems, and the greater the gap or misfit between the person and their environment, the greater the strain (Sonnenstag and Frese, 2003). These strains can relate to health related issues, lower productivity, and other work problems (French, Caplan and Harrison, 1982).

2.2 The Job Characteristics Model
Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) job characteristics model focuses on important aspects of job characteristics, such as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. These characteristics are proposed to lead to ‘critical psychological states’ of experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility and knowledge of outcomes. It is proposed that positive or negative work characteristics give rise to mental states which lead to corresponding behavioral outcomes, such as; motivation, satisfaction, absenteeism, etc.

2.3 The Job Demand-Control Model
Job Demand Control (JDC) model was given by a scholar of industrial sociology named Karasek in 1979. This model predicts that mental strain and job dissatisfaction are the combination of high job demands with low job control. The Job Demands-Control model (Karasek 1979) is currently perhaps the most influential model of stress in the workplace (Kompier, 2003) and the original model focuses on the two psychosocial job characteristics of job demands and job control. The latter factor is sometimes called decision latitude (Karasek, 1979) and is made up of the sub-factors of decision authority (control over work situation) and skill discretion (possibility of using learnt skills and competencies). Karasek’s (1979) research showed that those exposed to high levels of demand, as well as having low levels of job control (high-strain situation) were disproportionately more likely to show increased levels of depression, fatigue, and cardiovascular disease and mortality. However, the lowest levels of illness were in individuals with moderate or even high demands, if they also had high levels of job control (challenge
situation). Karasek (1979) thus proposed an interaction where high demands and low control would predict high strain, but that high control would buffer the negative effect of demands on outcomes. The basic premise of Karasek’s (1979) JDC model is that job demands and job control interact in such a way that they create different psychosocial work experiences for the individual, depending on the respective magnitudes of job demands and job control. Karasek (1979) classified these work experiences into four types of jobs, namely high-strain jobs (high demands and low control), active jobs (high demands and high control), low strain jobs (low demands and high control), and passive jobs (low demands and low control) (Karasek, 1979).

(Source: Nehal Hussain and Kanwal Khalid, 2011)

Fig 1: Karasek Job Demand Control (JDC) Model

According to the job demand-control model (DCM; Karasek, 1979, 1998), job strain is particularly caused by the combination of high job demands (particularly work overload and time pressure) and low job control—“the working individual’s potential control over his tasks and his conduct during the working day” (Karasek, 1979). Thus, one basic premise in the DCM is that employees who can decide themselves how to meet their job demands do not experience job strain (e.g. job-related anxiety, health complaints, exhaustion, and dissatisfaction). There is indeed empirical evidence showing that particularly the combination of high job demands and low job control is an important predictor of psychological strain and illness (Karasek, 1979). Job demands represent the psychological stressors in the work environment. These include factors such as: interruption rate, time pressures, conflicting demands, reaction time required, pace of work, proportion of work performed under pressure, amount of work, degree of concentration required, and the slowing down of work caused by the need to wait for others. Decision latitude refers to employees’ control over their tasks and how those tasks are executed. It consists of both skill discretion and decision authority. Skill discretion describes the degree to which the job involves a variety of tasks, low levels of repetitiveness, occasions for creativity and opportunities to learn new things and develop special abilities. Decision authority describes both the employee’s ability to make decisions about their own job, and their ability to influence their own work team and more general company policies.

2.4 The Job Demand-Control-Support (JDCS) Model

The JDC model has been expanded to include a support dimension and is referred to as the job demand-control-support model (JDCS model). The job demand-control-support model was initially proposed by Karasek (1979) and was further developed by him in collaboration with Theorell (1990), as well as with Johnson and Hall (1988, 1989). The JDCS model focuses on the interaction between the psychosocial work environmental characteristics of job demands, job control, and social support (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). At first, the model only included the demand and control dimension, the social support factor was later introduced in order to widen the original model. Job demands involve mental and physical work demands such as a high work pace, high level of responsibility, or not enough time to carry out the work required (Lundberg and Cooper, 2011). The control dimension refers to workers control and the actual decision authority, such as choosing one’s work pace and work tasks or influencing different work methods (Lundberg, 2011). The social support factor involves informational, emotional, and practical support from coworkers and managers within the workplace. Social support is considered social companionship and assistance with work tasks (De Jonge and Kompier, 1997). By combining the
different dimensions (low/high demands, low/high control, and low/high social support) the following work situations can be identified: active, passive, low strain, and high strain. All four of these situations indicate different levels of health risks.

![Job-Demand-Control-Support Model](https://example.com/job-demand-control-support-model.png)

**Fig. 2: Job-Demand-Control-Support Model retrieved from Karasek and Theorell (1990)**

The JDCS model suggests that an interaction of the work characteristics high demands, low control, and low support predict negative outcomes, such as stress and illness. Moreover, the interaction of high demands, high control, and high support predict positive outcomes at the workplace, such as active learning and motivation. According to the JDCS model, jobs with high demands, low control, and low social support are considered to be the most undesirable job situation that shows an increasing risk of ill health, which plays into the strain hypothesis (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). The active learning hypothesis, on the other hand, is characterized by high demands, high control, and high social support. This work situation provides workers with the possibility to actively learn and develop (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). The active learning hypothesis is also called the buffer hypothesis because job control and social support are challenged to buffer the negative effects of stress that are caused by the high demands (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). The JDCS model suggests that an interaction of the work characteristics high demands, low control, and low support predict negative outcomes, such as stress and illness. Moreover, the interaction of high demands, high control, and high support predict positive outcomes at the workplace, such as active learning and motivation.

Based on the JDCS model, Johnson and Hall (1988) anticipated that low support combined with high job strain conditions (i.e. high job demands and low job control) will have negative effects on mental health, as compared to either low support and low strain environment or high support and high strain environment. The results of their study showed that in active jobs that are characterized by high job demands and high job control, poor social support was related to job dissatisfaction. The job demand-control-support model is a psychosocial work-environment model designed to give theoretical support to the investigation of which work factors actually cause problems (Karasek and Theorell, 1990). The model has proved to be very successful in predicting ill health and is also used nowadays for predicting other common stress-related problems, such as physical pain, fatigue, depression, and incapacity (Gabriel Oxenstierna et al., 2008). The JDCS model is one of the most widely used models in occupational stress and is aimed to explain how work characteristics relate to employee health and stress outcomes.

### 2.4.1 Studies to Examine the JDCS Model

One of the first studies to examine the JDCS model was made by Johnson et al., (1989), who wanted to attempt to understand if the experience of job characteristics contributed to the development of cardiovascular disease. They examined the effects of the JDCS models strain situation; more specifically the effect of a high demands, low control, and low support situation in relation to cardiovascular disease. Johnson and his colleagues used a subsample consisting of 7,219 male blue-collar workers (production, distribution, and service) and white-collar office and professional workers. Participants were randomly assigned to the study from the national register of births 1976 and 1977 from the Swedish Central Bureau of Statistics. The findings of the study showed that people in a work situation exposed to a high strain situation had an increased progression for cardiovascular morbidity and mortality compared to people in work situations with low to medium strain (Johnson, 1989). People in a high strain situation displayed...
symptoms earlier and developed cardiovascular disease to a more severe extent than people in low strain situations.

Another study, in the United Kingdom by Wood et al., (2011) assessed 2,258 mental health workers and their association with job demands, control, and support to five measures of well-being: emotional exhaustion, depression, anxiety, intrinsic satisfaction, and personal accomplishment. The result from the study showed that control and support both had negative relations to anxiety, depression, and emotional exhaustion; while demands had a positive relation to the three. Control and support showed to have positive correlations to intrinsic satisfaction and personal accomplishment; while demands had a negative correlation to the two.

Research by Mark and Smith (2008) investigated work characteristics and individual differences in coping styles related to stress and job satisfaction. The study examined the connections between demands, control, and support, as well as effort and rewards, coping, and attribution style when trying to predict anxiety, depression, and job satisfaction. The study had a sample of 307 university employees and 120 participants from the general population in UK. The results of the two populations were then compared to each other. The results of Mark and Smith (2008) concerning the variables from the JDCS model job demands, control, and support showed that high demands were related to higher anxiety; while control (decision authority) and social support were related to lower anxiety. Job demands were correlated to higher depression while social support and control (skills discretion) were correlated to lower depression. Job demands were correlated to lower job satisfaction while high social support and control (decision authority) were correlated to higher job satisfaction (Mark and Smith, 2008).

Bakker et al., (2005), in their study among 1,000 employees of a large institute for higher education, found that the combination of high demands and low job resources significantly added to the prediction of burnout (exhaustion and cynicism). Specifically, they found that work overload; emotional demands, physical demands, and work-home interference did not result in high levels of burnout if employees experienced autonomy, received feedback, had social support, or had a high-quality relationship with their supervisor. Psychologically speaking, different processes may have been responsible for these interaction effects. Thus, autonomy may have helped in coping with job demands because employees could decide for themselves when and how to respond to their demands, whereas social support and a high-quality relationship with the supervisor may have buffered the impact of job demands on levels of burnout because employees received instrumental help and emotional support. In contrast, feedback may have helped because it provided employees with the information necessary to maintain their performance and to stay healthy.

2.5 The Effort-Reward Imbalance (ERI) Model
The Effort-Reward imbalance model (ERI: Siegrist, 1996) is a popular view of stress at work. The key concept of ERI is one of reciprocity, where effort at work should be compensated by suitable rewards, and a mismatch between these will lead to stressful experiences (Peter and Siegrist, 1999). Rewards are defined as money, esteem, career opportunities, and security. Effort is proposed to have two components: intrinsic effort, from the personal motivations of the individual, such as a need for control and over commitment (a tendency to make excessive efforts or be committed to unrealistic goals); and extrinsic motivations, or external pressures, such as workload (similar to the concept of job demands in the DCS model, Kompier, 2003). The effort-reward imbalance (ERI) model (Siegrist, 1996) emphasizes the reward, rather than the control structure of work. The ERI-model assumes that job strain is the result of an imbalance between effort (extrinsic job demands and intrinsic motivation to meet these demands) and reward (in terms of salary, esteem reward, and security/career opportunities-i.e. promotion prospects, job security and status consistency). The basic assumption is that a lack of reciprocity between effort and reward (i.e. high effort/low reward conditions) will lead to arousal and stress, which, in turn, may lead to cardiovascular risks and other strain reactions. Thus, having a demanding, but unstable job, achieving at a high level without being offered any promotion prospects, are examples of a stressful imbalance (De Jonge et al., 2000). The combination of high effort and low reward at work was indeed found to be a risk factor for cardiovascular health, subjective health, mild psychiatric disorders and burnout (Van Vegchel et al., 2005).
There is much support for the principles of the ERI model, including Siegrist, Peter, Junge, Cremer and Seidel (1990) and the Whitehall II studies (Bosma, Peter, Siegrist, and Marmot, 1998) which showed significantly elevated risks of heart disease in those exposed to high effort-low reward conditions, compared to low effort and/or high reward. Van Vegchel, de Jonge, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2002) also found strong effects for the reward components relating to self-esteem and job security on psychosomatic complaints and exhaustion, and de Jonge, Bosma, Peter, and Siegrist (2000) found that individuals with high efforts and low rewards were up to 21 times more likely to suffer emotional exhaustion than those with low efforts and high rewards.

2.6 The Job Demands-Resources Model

An interesting new approach that attempts to develop and expand upon existing research is the Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R: Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner and Schaufeli, 2001). The JD-R model takes cues from several of the approaches described above, and categorises psychosocial factors into the global categories of job demands and job resources to see how these may influence illness and organizational commitment (Llorens, Bakker, Schaufeli, and Salanova, 2006). Demands are said to be physical or social aspects of a job that require efforts and thus have physical and mental costs, and resources as workplace or organizational aspects that help with the achievement of work goals, reduce demands, or stimulate growth and development. Demanding and resource providing job conditions influence the key processes of health impairment and motivation. Burnout and work engagement are proposed to be opposing psychological states that lead to health effects (Llorens et al., 2006) e.g. organizational commitment may be damaged by burnout through the health impairment process, or boosted by engagement through the motivation process. The JD-R model can be applied to a wide range of occupations, and can be used to improve employee well being and performance.

Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job. Job resources may be located at the level of the organization at large (e.g. pay, career opportunities, job security), the interpersonal and social relations (e.g. supervisor and co-worker support, team climate), the organization of work (e.g. role clarity, participation in decision making), and at the level of the task (e.g. skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, performance feedback). Job resources may play either an intrinsic motivational role because they foster employees’ growth, learning and development, or they may play an extrinsic motivational role because they are instrumental in achieving work goals. Job resources play an extrinsic motivational role, because work environments that offer many resources foster the willingness to dedicate one’s efforts and abilities to the work task. In that case it is likely that the task will be completed successfully and that the work goal will be attained. For instance, supportive colleagues and proper feedback from one’s superior increase the likelihood of being successful in achieving one’s work goals. In either case, be it through the satisfaction of basic needs or through the achievement of work goals, the presence of job resources leads to engagement, whereas their absence evokes a cynical attitude towards work (Arnold B. Bakker and Evangelia Demerouti, 2010).

![Fig; 3: The Job Demands-Resources model](Source: Arnold B. Bakker and Evangelia Demerouti, 2010)

Job demands were primarily and positively related to exhaustion, whereas job resources were primarily and negatively related to disengagement from work. Accordingly, job demands are related to strain...
(including lack of energy and development of health problems) and job resources are related to motivation (including engagement with or disengagement from work, and commitment). Combining these processes in an additive sense leads us to the following propositions (Figure 4): when both job demands and resources are high, we expect employees to develop strain and motivation while when both are low we expect the absence of strain and motivation. Consequently, the high demands-low resources condition should result in high strain and low motivation while the low demands-high resources condition should have as a consequence low strain and high motivation (Arnold B. Bakker and Evangelia Demerouti, 2010).

![Figure 4: Predictions of the Job Demands-Resources model based on additive effects](source: Arnold B. Bakker and Evangelia Demerouti, 2010)

3. The Importance of Individual Differences
The sections above describe a range of important stress models that have been influential in the field of work stress research. It is clear that there are models of different types, for example those that mainly focus on job characteristics, such as the DCS models, and those include a role for subjective perceptions of stressors, such as the P-E fit models, and models such as the ERI that combine aspects of these features. There are the models that focus on the psychological processes that may occur in stressful interactions and finally there are models that try and combine aspects of all of the above models, such as the JD-R models. While these distinctions are useful for understanding the development of stress models, there is another feature of stress frameworks that is important. This feature is whether or not the framework takes account or includes a role for individual difference variables. While the possible influence of IDs is implicit in models that treat stressors as subjective (such as the ERI model and others) few models actually have an explicit role for individual difference factors integrated into them. The ERI model has the ID factor of intrinsic effort, but this factor is narrow and its influence on subjective perceptions is not specified. There are a large range of individual difference variables (IDs) that may be involved in the stress process. These include trait anxiety, NA, personality, self esteem, self efficacy, locus of control, coping style, hardiness, type A, attributional style, demographics, expectations, preferences, commitment, health related factors and abilities and skills (Payne, 1988; Parkes, 1994).

Cox and Ferguson (1991) state that ID factors are often seen to function in the stress process as either “components or mediators of stress appraisal” or as “moderators of the stress-outcome relationship”. Mediators are variables that transmit an effect (for example by affecting primary appraisal, Cox and Ferguson, 1991) but do not qualitatively change the effect (Baron and Kenny, 1986) and moderators are variables that change the direction or strength of a relationship between other variables (Cox and Ferguson, 1991) or determine when certain responses to stress will occur (for example affecting secondary appraisal and coping processes). Parkes (1994) argues that research into individual differences is necessary to clarify their effects in predicting stress, and to implement person and environment focused interventions. Briner, Harris and Daniels (2004) states that individual contexts and behaviour are vital to understand the causes of strain, stress and coping and that it may make no sense to consider stressful job characteristics as “out there” without subjective individual perceptions taken into account. Indeed Briner et al. (2004) propose that stressors are not even stressors if the individual does not perceive them
as such. In common words, a psychosocial stressor won’t transmit any stressful potential to lead to negative health outcomes, if the person does not perceive their work conditions to be stressful. Further, it is proposed that individual differences can not only moderate the relationship between environmental factors and perceived stress, but that they can also moderate the relationship between perceived stress and health outcomes.

4. Limitations of Existing Stress Models

The number of stress models described above, show different viewpoints and while the range of stress models in the workplace have historically been more popular but there are some limitations of them. Lazarus (1991) states that the P-E fit model represented an advance in thinking, but that the concept of fit between the person and environment is treated as static, with emphasis on stable relationships rather than the changing process of action and interaction in work contexts. Buunk et al., (1991) state that empirical support for the theory is limited. Job characteristics model is also well integrated with the Job Diagnostic Survey, however there is limited variety in the core job characteristics, with only a small number of key psychological states are considered.

The JDCS model does not take into account the role of individual differences (Warr, 1990). Research has shown that employees exposed to the same setting experience different stress levels because of their individual differences. While the JDCS model has good predictive validity at the macro level, it does not take account of individual differences in susceptibility to stressors, and can’t explain why the same levels of demand and control in two individuals may give rise to different behavioral or health outcomes (Perrewe and Zellars, 1999). Other criticisms of the JDCS model include its definition of demand as based primarily on workload and not other types of demand (Cox et al., 2000) and that the conceptualization of control is quite a narrow view of this multi-dimensional construct (Carayon, 1993). The JDCS model also assumes that high control is always a desirable state (and a positive moderator of negative demands) however it could be argued that some individuals may not see job control as desirable, and may find having control a stressor in itself, for example if they have a low sense of self efficacy.

The ERI-model (Siegrist, 1996) postulates salary, esteem reward, and status control as the most important job resources that may compensate for the impact of job demands on strain. It does not take account of autonomy in this model and can’t explain why salary and status control are more important job resources than task identity and a high quality relationship with one’s supervisor. The JD-R model specifies what kind of job and personal characteristics lead to what kind of psychological states and outcomes but does not tell us why this would be so. The fact that the model only provides limited insight into the psychological mechanisms involved might be considered an important limitation. The JD-R model suggests that the health impairment and motivational processes are independent, but it is quite possible that they represent two sides of the same coin. That is, when health and well-being deteriorate, motivation decreases, and vice versa.

5. A Suggested New Approach

Many of the major theoretical models that depict the stress process are described. It is proposed that while existing stress models present fruitful frameworks for stress research, many existing models suffer from being either too narrow in scope and lacking a role for individual differences. A new approach that combines many of the features of existing models is proposed, which includes strong roles for psychosocial stressors, individual differences, and subjective perceptions.

5.1 Proposed Model

On the basis of the issues presented above researcher proposed a new stress framework. Researcher combines many of the features of existing stress models (ex; JDCS, JDR and ERI) and proposed a new model that is matched with the existing COPSOQ-II structure (Kristensen et al., 2010) that was used and verified by earlier researchers in many countries. This acknowledges the important role played by psychosocial workplace stressors in the stress process, and tries to account for the role of important individual difference factors in the development of subjective experiences of stress and in influencing
the possible health-related outcomes that result from subjective stressful perceptions. This framework aims to represent key aspects of the stress process. Researchers attempt to provide this conceptual model that helps organize data and concepts that provide more coherence.

Fig: 5: Proposed model

This model is based on the existing stress models which include aspects from various theories and models and is thus broader and more comprehensive than the older classical models: DCS (Demand-Control-Support model, Karasek and Theorell 1990), ERI (Effort-Reward-Imbalance model, Siegrist 1996), Job Demands-Resources model and other theories and models. This model is ‘‘theory-based, but not attached to one specific theory, should include dimensions related to work tasks, the organization of work, interpersonal relations at work, cooperation, and leadership and should cover potential work stressors, as well as resources’’

This model proposes that psychosocial work-environment are all proposed to have main effect relationships on burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms, somatic stress symptoms, cognitive stress symptoms and job satisfaction. It is also proposed that individual differences
(personality trait-self efficacy) may moderate the relationship between psychosocial work-environment and its effects (health outcomes).

6. Summary and Conclusions
A brief summary of many of the key models relating to work-related stress was carried out, including a consideration of some of their pros and cons, and common features. It was suggested that many models have failed to include a role for the important effect of individual differences. On the basis of these issues a new model was proposed which attempts to combine features of existing models, including roles for psychosocial work environments and individual differences, and to represent the complexities of the stress process.

Overall this study will present a integrated model for describing the relationships between psychosocial work-environment, and its various effect (for ex; burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms, somatic stress symptoms, cognitive stress symptoms and job satisfaction). The purpose of this study is to discuss the causal relationships between psychosocial work-environment and its strain (effects). Moderating effects of personality trait (self efficacy) between variables will also find out.
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