

The Relationship between Rapid Change and Monotony

By Peter C. Martin

QAS515, Human Factors in Quality Assurance

California State University, Dominguez Hills

For: Professor James Clauson

April 2, 2006

The study of occupational stress though relatively new is traceable back to the pioneering work of Walter Cannon a physiologist in 1914, for the study of work relationships between emotions and physiological responses. However, actual scientific investigation of stress is only 50 years old starting with the work of Hans Selye 1956 who is denoted as the father of Stress. (Jex, 1998) The monetary costs of stress are estimated in the United Kingdom to be 360 million days annually at a cost of 7-9 billion pounds and in the United States 550 million lost days annually 54% because of stress, with health care expenditures nearly 50% greater for workers that report high levels of stress. (Nelson, 2002) Workplace stress is common issue as we hear references to it each day, sometimes in a newsworthy manner such as an employee shooting co-workers; but more often in the context of deadlines, high workloads, insufficient resources and most predominantly change. Stress refers to any state experienced by an individual characterized by arousal and displeasure. A stressor is an environmental factor experienced by individuals that increase the likely hood of them feeling stress Stress has only negative outcomes for the individual concerned because the individual feels he or she will not be able to cope in the long term and therefore finds it necessary to deal with it in a defensive and maladaptive manner. Strain represents the category of adverse responses to stress.

Life's events result in change, one of many known workplace stressors, like mental fatigue, anxiety, depression, and monotony. Change the most common of the stressors inevitably affects everyone through their daily life. Changes in work responsibilities, working hours, conditions, and in players within a work unit an unavoidable reality in organizations are identified as a stress-provoking dynamic as well as conflict they are interrelated. Work has factors intrinsic to the job, too much or too little work, time pressures deadlines, having to make to many decisions, fatigue from physical strains of the work environment, excessive travel, long hours, expense of making mistakes, and changes at work. It can be stated that change is one of the few constants in life, but what about the rate of change and its relationship with other stressors. There has been some research into the relationships between stressors revealing a direct relationship and that there effects are cumulative.

The questions of, does a rapid rate of change that is never fully evaluated or designed prior to implementation induce the stressor monotony, and what is the relationship between change and the development of other stressors, are examined through a case study of technical writers in the procedures development department, who are highly trained and experienced in procedure development, most have been prior departmental managers and quality assurance professionals both within and outside the company the company , advanced degrees and certification are the norm of the group rather than the exception.

The situation we will examine developed overtime through this series of events at headquarters of a highly regulated biopharmaceutical company. Initially there was the announcement of the pending retirement of the current Senior Director, this man was honest, extremely supportive of his staff, well known for declaring his position and team direction, and trusted by his staff then followed a two month period of uncertainty while

an interim Senior Director was named and a permanent replacement was found. A replacement was found and scheduled to start in two months after the previous Senior Director's retirement.

This resulted in a supposedly stable month with no changes as declared by the Interim Director; however this was not the case as soon as assumed the position he changed the document development process without regard to LOP or SOP. The new Senior Director arrived a month later and on his first day announced there where major changes in the works but provided no outline of said changes or any plan for implementation. He met with half the staff, never reviewed the current structure or met the remainder of the staff and immediately instituted a special task group to perform tasks for him consistent of the staff that he previously worked with in the field. This was followed by a large natural disaster and this Senior Director required all staff regardless of training and psychological make up to volunteer to work in the relief effort, without regard for the fact that the regular business was to be maintained. A month later when all staff had returned to their normal duties, he restructured the department by adding an additional layer of managers to perform the tasks that where being done by Senior Quality Engineers, reallocated resources to four teams replacing the original two, instituted a separated group to maintain and assure the quality of documents produced, dissolved the team that was currently developing a new process for document development and expanding the scope of the department, moving this task to the new manager team non of whom had ever written any documents we produced. These changes where implemented by stating "This is what we are doing" at a staff meeting, there was no clear implementation date or plan, no LOP or SOP revision schedule, no designed process flow, no discussion related to repeat actions only the announcement that he likes a fluid organization, which after one year of no finalized process flows has been determined to mean constant changes and adjustments after implementation with no defined process flows, LOP or SOP revisions, only implementation of a Tayloristic management style. This pattern of change, modify, change, reorganize, redirect activities has continued daily for over one year with no anticipated stabilization.

On the surface it appears that the situation represents process improvement using Deming's PDSA however the elements of in depth Planning and Studying apparently are missing from or not utilized fully by this management groups their actions require them to constantly Do and React to the situations they have created. This is concluded by the fact that in a years time they have yet to produce a single stable process flow for document development and by the staff's still daily question of how are we doing this today?

One example if this do/react situation can be found in the number of template versions; the document development process utilizes a template to ensure Qualification protocols all have the same format, issued for staff use since February of this year along with instructions that all protocols are to be in the most current template before submission to the review and approval process. As of this writing there have been three official templates, which required the writers to migrate the document to a new template with each template release. The changes associated with these revisions where non-value added minor changes in verbiage resulting from department management

dissatisfaction with the wording. This type of activity tends to eliminate the process improvement argument and supports the lack of planning and study prior to implementation of an action.

Before delving into the stressors induced by the situation and their interrelationships, it is necessary to define stress and pressure. Pressure in the form of a deadline to complete a project is a motivational benefit not stress, providing the individual has the resources for meeting the demands placed on them. Pressure can develop into stress, when stress is defined as a response to a situation in which the individuals are unable to meet the demands placed on them resulting in a negative outcome. This definition of stress recognizes that the sources of stress are multiple and not limited to a particular situation. It views stress as not a function of being under pressure occupationally but as a function of the whole life situation. It includes factors intrinsic to the job such as org structure, climate, role ambiguity conflict, opportunities for career development and progression, and the home interface. This definition also recognizes environmental agents that disturb structure and function, while accounting for individuals psychological, physiological, and behavioral attempts to adjust to both the internal and external pressures. This brings the concept of stress to a simple balancing equation where if abilities equal demands the result is no stress however an increase in demand not countered by an equal increase in ability will yield stress for the individual. Our case focus is on the intrinsic stressors related to job function and performance.

At this point we can turn our attention to the stressors and their interrelationships generated by this situation and determine their affects as they relating to stress and the staff, however we must maintain the concept of stress loading and the individual's capacity to accept and handle stress, while maintaining job performance. This situation induced a number of stressors specifically role ambiguity, numerous changes, ineffective communication, loss of trust, loss of perceived control, monotony, boredom, and mental fatigue.

The induction of the stressor role ambiguity was a result of departmental restructuring, which introduced a new layer of managers to perform functions contained in the senior quality engineer job description. This particular stressor can manifest itself in numerous forms, thusly the three dimensional scale developed by Breugh and Colihan (Jex, 1998) renders itself of particular use in evaluation of this event. Utilizing this scale it is possible to see how the change affected the senior engineer staff and subsequently the remaining staff the first scale dimension is work method ambiguity or "I know how to get my work done." The restructuring disrupted the usual work flow resulting in all staff not knowing exactly how to accomplish assigned tasks because their usual source of information was superseded by the implementation of the new managers, who were not experienced in the existing work flow and not prepared to institute a new work flow pattern. The result was an interruption of procedure development while a new system was prepared. The second scale dimension is scheduling ambiguity or "I know when I should be doing a particular aspect of my job." Since the pervious official workflow and support system was literally destroyed by the

restructuring events the staff was left with no guidance except for their own intrinsic motivation to accomplish their tasks.

The third and final scale dimension is performance criteria ambiguity or "I know what my supervisor considers satisfactory work performance." Neither the new supervisors nor the management staff could not describe effectively what was considered a quality procedure; the staff was left with no direction or ability to measure if their work was meeting the acceptability standard. When asked what the standards were, management staff replied that "they would know a quality procedure when they saw it but as of yet they had not seen one" as a consequence of this statement the staff received incompatible requests where their work was accepted by one group and rejected by another leading the staff to eventually develop from role overload. The ensuing environment was one of numerous changes to develop and establish a new workflow with the new hierarchy and extreme intra-role conflict due to the sudden change in the hierarchical structure and inter-role conflict where the management staff responded differently to the same question resulting in the induction of two additional stressors namely ineffective communication and loss of trust in management's ability to lead.

The stressor of perceived control loss is measured in two parts job autonomy and participative decision making, in this situation was actually a loss of control for the technical writers stemming from a loss of autonomy and ability to discuss freely the issues related to performing their daily tasks. (Jex, 1998) Prior to the restructuring the technical writers enjoyed a high degree of job autonomy to decide how they would perform their tasks, who and when they would counsel regarding a decision that had multiple solutions after the restructuring they lost a significant portion of that autonomy as a result of the new supervisors micromanagement style. This micromanagement style required the staff to inform the supervisor when they were communicating with a member of another group either within or exterior of the department, additionally scheduled document reviews were imposed to guarantee quality and production schedules as well as being forced to share electronic files. The only remaining job autonomy for the technical writers was their start and stop times a significant change from their previous environment. Relating to the issue of participative decision making the writers previously enjoyed a system through the senior quality engineers of participating in major decisions that affected their assigned tasks, specifically they determined and maintained procedural development templates and responded to subsidiary inquiries related to released procedures, their involvement after the restructuring was markedly reduced as a result of the hierarchy change. (Jex, 1999) Participation in decision-making equates to control while removal of the participation equates to a loss of control and results in lower self-esteem. The environment induced by the actions initiating this stressor was one of confusion, mistrust of management more changes considerable rework due to the prescribed reviews by supervisors who never performed the tasks their staff were performing. Stressor effects on the staff by this time were monumental; they were becoming demoralized, immune to extrinsic motivation, tired and unsure of the stability of their positions basic work was somehow accomplished to keep the subsidiaries functioning and compliant with regulations. Many of the staff experienced a numbness caused from a lack of job

enriching stimulation, by now changes over which the staff had no control became the routine and announced on a daily basis. This provided the basis for the introduction of the last three stressors monotony, boredom, and mental fatigue.

The stressors of monotony, boredom, and mental fatigue are a progressive set beginning with monotony, which has been described as “an environment in which there is either no change or change occurs in a repetitive and highly predictive fashion over which the individual has little or no control.” (Kroemer, 2003) Determining factors related to the development of boredom and monotony are training and uniformity in work conditions is especially conducive to the development of boredom, the 1914 (Wyatt, 1929) study showed, the higher the training level the higher resulting level of monotony and boredom experienced resulting from a lack of stimuli. These people belong in design functions, which would supply the required stimuli and challenge to avoid boredom. Humans require stimulation to perk their interest rather than uniformity in working procedure which is conducive to boredom, however when the stimulation becomes predictable and uncontrolled humans tend to feel monotony which leads to boredom also considered an emotional state, the eventuality is mental fatigue where staff simply no longer expresses and interest in performing the task at hand, if the environmental condition that induced the boredom is allowed to continue and the staff experiences continuous exposure adaptation evolves making the work tolerable but never enjoyed. The effect of these stressors on the staff was the same as that documented in the 1914 study namely communication between employees increase as the degree of boredom increases the employees comment that it helps pass the time and you do not get as bored. Based on the study from 1914 (Wyatt, 1929) which compared IQ with monotony and boredom, the degree of monotony and boredom experienced by this staff of highly educated and trained writers would be high leading rapidly to mental fatigue then adaptation.

In summary this situation has provided an environment of continuous change, resulting from the implementation of a new hierarchical structure without consideration of the effects of the change resulting in role ambiguity, a total loss of participative decision making where decisions were made with no input from the staff who were responsible for carrying out the changes, a loss of job autonomy for the writers and the development of an environment where change occurs in such a rapid and highly predictive manner ultimately leading to monotony, boredom and mental fatigue with employees adapting to the work but never enjoying it.

The resolution to this situation lies in taking appropriate counter measures the new focus of our discussions which we will examine as we did the stressors and their interrelationships. Since change is unavoidable it is best instituted using a change management approach such as Deming's Plan Do Study Act, which requires planning the change by studying the current process, examining its inputs and outputs, understanding the customer expectations, identifying problems, testing theories of the causes then developing solutions and action plans. (Kroemer, 2003) The do stage implements the plan on a small scale like a pilot production process, evaluate the process and produce sample data. The study stage evaluates if the change is working

as expected, to determine if any additional changes are needed as is often the case for the first solution.

The study stage provides the time and environment to evaluate for corrections or modifications and to plan the implementation of these corrections during the next do stage, when the desired change is obtained the necessary LOP and SOP can be developed and the change communicated, explained and implemented department wide, in this way the staff is permitted involvement in development of the change and its implementation. People mutter and groan when a policy or process change is announced not as result of the change but because it was announced and imposed on them. People do not really resist change they actually resist being changed (Kohn, 1993). The provision of a change shown to be necessary and functional by this system provides the staff with knowledge to accept the change thusly reducing the stress associated with the change to that of a passing acute change recognized as a merely a blip on the stress radar, being buffered by staff capacity not affecting the stress equation.

The change resulting from the loss of a team member was a normal and expected change. It was announced long before the actual date and the staff was allowed to enjoy participation in the retirement activities for him so that the impact of the change was absorbed by the staff, however the change by the interim director were made as an example of his power over the group. It was observed by the staff for a few days then disregarded as a non event related to stress and scored as the director's management style for which there is no ergonomic counter measure available however it contributed to the existing lack of confidence in the directors. The issue of ineffective communication by the director's has not ergonomic counter measure either except for the confrontation of the director's with the issue which has been done by the staff on three occasions with no apparent change or desire to change on the part of the directors. The effective counter measure to resolve the issue in part is the adoption of the PDSA cycle for change, since it requires communication for effective results and if followed resolves to some extent the lack of trust issue because the actions are visible to everyone.

The counter measures for a perceived lack of control are like the stressor divided into two parts those for participative decision making and job autonomy. The resolution for the lack of participative decision making is to increase the staff involvement in decision making, this increase involvement cannot be illusionary or a manipulative tool, it must be real, of importance to the people involved, relevant to the organization and a legitimate part of there work. The increase participation must be continued to effectively remove the affects of the stressor, the method of participation can be via any number of avenues such as process improvement teams, supervisory discussion related to decisions with the team with the supervisor providing the teams input to the management staff, and actual involvement of all staff via discussion meeting related to process changes. Related to the stressor of job autonomy it must be realized and considered that job responsibilities and autonomy are related although not perfectly,

and that variation in autonomy for the same job can vary between departments within the same company based on the departmental structure.

However before one removes the autonomy from a position the application of the same PDSA cycle should be applied, to avoid making changes that are not in the best interest of the organization, staff as highly educated, experienced and with a high degree of intrinsic motivation as this one should be allowed a fairly high degree of autonomy.

Countermeasures for role/job ambiguity rest in part with the application of the PDSA cycle for it is through this cycle that the role and job clarity required will be accomplished. The cycle will require the development of job and workflow documents that will clarify the work method ambiguity as well as the scheduling ambiguity, providing the staff a road map as to how to get their work done and when they should be performing certain tasks associated with their work. The resolution to performance criteria ambiguity, inter and intra role conflict lies with the management staff, they must clearly define the performance criteria and the position tasks and responsibilities. The supervisors need to have adequate experience and job knowledge to serve as coaches, resolve conflicts that arise from conflicting and incompatible requests, ensure that upper management, or they do not commit role overload, demanding more of an employee than they can accomplish in a given amount of time, of any staff member. Role conflict and ambiguity must be dealt with by procedures to clarify the duties and performance of each individual. It has been suggested that individuals who experience this should be able to confront their superiors or contravene those making the excessive demands via a feedback loop to allow an outlet for the stress. (Kakabadse, 1992)

The counter measures for monotony, boredom, and mental fatigue remarkably are the same as the actions to build an intrinsic motivational environment that provides stimulation and challenges for the staff. In this environment the manager watches for problems that need resolution and assists the people in providing resolution, attentively listens to the concerns and try to imagine how the situations look from the staff point of view, provide large amounts of information feedback to allow people to know what is acceptable and what needs improvement and open discussion related to what needs to be changed. Attention to the three fundamental factors known as the three C's, collaboration defining the context of work, content of the tasks and choice by the people about what and how they perform a task, by a manager committed to the creation of this type of environment. Collaboration by a well functioning group on complex tasks requiring some degree of ingenuity usually results in a more creative and acceptable solution that anyone person, the team tends to be more excited about their work, a result of the exchange of talent, and resources required by the cooperation, and the emotional support provided by the social group. The level of enthusiasm is typically increased in the environment where people experience a sense of belonging, seeing themselves as part of a community, as compared to being left to their own devices. A strong note of caution is appropriate here this environment does not occur easily it requires significant effort and organization commitment to make this happen. Content must provide interest for the people performing the task it has been said "If you want people motivated to do a good job, give them a good job to do." (Kohn, 1999)

This means in its easiest form that whenever possible let the people perform the job they find the most interesting, allowing them to sample a number of positions within the company to keep things interesting and until a good fit is found or restructuring jobs so that they are more interesting to a larger number of people. This can be achieved by providing attention to job content, changing work designs to avoid monotony, increasing the level of responsibility, meaningfulness and feedback are built into the jobs, and the formula also includes ensuring the worker has some knowledge of the task result, experiences responsibility for the results, and sees the results as valuable. The final C, choice, is related to the fact that people are more enthusiastic about the work when they are free to make decisions related to performing the tasks. The highest level of motivation is obtained when people participate in the decision-making process, goals can be set by others but it is necessary for the staff to hear "This is what we need to do how best can we get the task done." Under choice the first thoughts occurring in management's mind when a problem arises should be to involve the staff in the resolution, since nothing justifies excluding the staff from active and responsible participation in decisions affecting their career. (Kohn, 1999) Choice and collaboration must exist hand in hand since a team will not function effectively when denied the real authority over what and how they do. Studies that quantified the extent of choice affected productivity or job satisfaction revealed a positive effect on both regardless of the work the people performed, with the effect being stronger in the real world than in the laboratory environment, while not all choice programs were successful the typical reason for failure was not enough participation, too few employees were included, the program did not last long enough, the decisions the employees made were insignificant, or the employees' recommendations were ignored by upper management. The employees will refuse to participate in a choice program when they sense a ploy by management to make them feel involved, or that management will not take their suggestions seriously.

In summation of the proposed counter measures a fully implemented PDSA process improvement program will resolve many of the issues related to change implementation and resulting in the stressors induced by this situation. The new managers have an opportunity to implement participative decision making through their staff meetings by allowing discussion of issues related to process development and continuous improvement, stress related to performance ambiguity can be reduced by supplying the staff with the review criteria for approving the procedures, in this way the workers can assure that they have met the required standard reducing rework and increasing the value and meaningfulness of the work to the worker. The collaborative job content and choice environment can be increased through the managers deliberately assigning a cross-functional team to complex tasks, where each team member provides their special knowledge and skills to the team with each performing the tasks they enjoy. Should the managers take the final step of letting the team decide how to achieve the final goal the complete set of finished procedures they could restore the autonomy for that team and they can override the management style of the directors and prove the validity of this new approach. This action by the managers is the effective

final counter measure, which directly relates to the senior management staff and their management style.

It has been mentioned in this paper that the management approach was Tayloristic; implementation of the remaining counter measures is totally dependent on changing this management approach.

A short examination of this approach is appropriate, since it is central to the cause and effect of the situation. In a Tayloristic management approach, it is management who makes all the decisions and decides what the staff will do, when and how they will do it and the employees merely perform the work as directed. This particular approach was usable in the early nineteenth century, when the staff had a much lower level of education than today. In our situation the staff is highly educated and trained to perform the tasks without high levels of management intervention indicated by this management approach. The appropriate counter measure has already been discussed under Choice also referred to as participative management. This approach resolves a number of the other issues demonstrated in this situation, by providing the staff a voice in decisions, autonomy over how and when work is completed provided the production schedule is met, and the customer needs is satisfied, and by its nature it removes job ambiguity.

The predicted results if these counter measures were implemented are a significant reduction in the stress levels of the staff, intrinsically motivated, challenged by the work, creative in their approach and solutions to complex task, an increase in self esteem, true team collaboration, products that exceed the customers level of expected quality, are usable by customer, and provide a degree of advancement towards company goals. The creation of the model department within the company on how to develop a true gets the job done right the first time environment where every member is respected, appreciated for their particular contribution, where the staff feels a sense of accomplishment and value in their work and most significantly where the staff enjoys and actually looks forward to each work day. These counter measures would enable the staff to assist other departments and areas of the company using the skills and resources indicative to the group, people would perform work they enjoyed, without grumbling over the boring tasks that need to be done to meet regulations because these tasks are shared equally between all team members.

During the development of this paper a unique opportunity presented itself, the managers held a team meeting without the directors for the express purpose of reviewing the new LOP and other changes. This opportunity developed into an impromptu discussion of the actual events set forth in this paper, a discussion of the issues and the necessary countermeasures for their resolution. The staff listed every point as well as some quality issues raised here. They insisted that they be provided with the criteria for acceptable performance, that meetings such as these in the future be held upstream of document release so their input could be considered before the final product was released, displeasure related to the constant rework on the procedures resulting from continuous changes was expressed, as well as the fact that

they felt devalued and were functioning as document clerks not a document design specialists.

The number of in process reviews and the value added by each review was discussed with the conclusion being that the time and effort needed to be spent up front in the design phase where value is added rather than during the review phase since it is not possible to review in quality it must be designed in. They expressed a low group morale with extremely low motivation and a feeling of extreme fatigue as a result of the constant changes; the group did not have a name for these feelings, however these feelings are described in our text as monotony due to predictable change that is out of the control of the staff, boredom and mental fatigue as one person put it "I do not have the energy to keep redoing the same document over and over again just because we cannot stabilize our template." One of the staff, who has a Masters Degree in Quality remarked on the management style of the director stating they followed one of the oldest known management styles by Taylor, which worked well during the industrial revolution with an uneducated staff where the managers told the staff what to do and the staff was expected to perform the task unquestioningly. They further classified this statement by saying that they needed challenging, complex tasks that they could work on through collaboration with their colleagues and through this interaction felt they could produce a product or solution that exceeded the management and customer needs. This person then went on to say that quality was meeting the customer needs before they knew what the needs are, by the provision of a product that exceeded their current needs and anticipated some future need that could be satisfied today. Staff also related current experiences during encounters with subsidiaries whose comments were that they did not need or care about additional reviews which delayed the release of documents, they needed documents that were workable, provided the appropriate directions and where there when they needed them not weeks or months later as is the present case. Based on this statement it is apparent that the system changes made by the senior management staff in the name of improving quality are not being well accepted by the customers and are not being perceived as providing adequate customer support.

A counter measure not discussed within this paper called Hoshin Kanari (Kroemer, 2003) was suggested during this encounter. Since it seemed appropriate I looked this up and discovered that it is a method of process improvement that focuses the entire company staff on one or two major goals per year by informing the company of the strategic plan and then having the individual departments design an improvement plan to support the accomplishment of the strategic goals. In this manner the company achieves a major goal, some minor process improvements while keeping the entire group focused on the strategic direction of the company. The suggestion for use of this countermeasure was that the department first stabilizes itself, then develops the intrinsic motivational environment and finally selects some strategic goals from the strategic plan and through participative decision making develop a departmental plan to achieve the goal.

During this meeting a number of presentation related to the issues were presented, each talked about an issue and described some tools to be used for situational improvement, however no presentation combined the issues and presented a unified plan to resolve the issues.

They all had a common theme presenting one form or another of process improvement tools without regard for the work environment or the effects on the staff. This single event provided confirmation for the countermeasures contained within this paper and confirmation of the relationship of the stressors presented within. This meeting continues after the scheduled submission date for this paper and as of the close of the meeting today the managers have asked for resolutions to the situation what we would call countermeasures to present to senior management. This is a promising development for the team since now the managers at least are listening to the staff that has to implement the changes and perform the tasks assigned. This dissertation regarding the staff meeting is provided as a real life support for the situation described within this paper and to provide support for the countermeasures presented.

It can be concluded that there is a relationship between rapid change and monotony; this relationship develops overtime because a pattern of predictable change outside the employees control is an essential element to induce monotony. During the elapsed time the situation will invoke numerous other stressors, such as job ambiguity, loss of perceived control and job autonomy each providing a cumulative affect to the staff. This situation left unchecked will result in excessive strain on the physical and mental systems of the employees leading to chronic illness and potential disability. The effect on the work unit can be the loss of talented people who have elected to remove themselves from the stressful environment by moving to another position either within or outside the company, much worse are the staff that choose to remain and through adaptation continue to perform the work without any motivation or actual desire to do so. The resulting situation is staff that is not working at their full potential that then produces a product of less than their top quality. A staff that is not bored or undergone adaptation provided with a supportive environment conducive to intrinsic motivation can and will produce superior quality work just for the sake of doing so, without the need for bribery by extrinsic rewards, however it is important that they be compensated fairly for their efforts so that the focus is on the challenge provided by the tasks at hand not on how they are going to satisfy their daily needs.

Through the study of the relationship between rapid change and monotony, it has become apparent that when the management of a work unit focuses on the development of an intrinsic motivational environment the benefit is an environment with reduced stress with processes that do not need constant massive change but can be improved in smaller planned increments while preventing rework and improving the product quality to the satisfaction of the customer, staff and management. This provides a staff that is challenged by their work, enjoys the social effects of collaboration, feels the tasks they perform have value and they in turn are valued, has control over the work process, and is necessary for the company's health and prosperity.

The staffs employed in this type of an environment are not resistant to change but actually embrace change as positive outcome of their participation on the planning and decision process. They experience less burnout which is the result of how controlled and powerless the staff feels, a higher degree of creativity, and a lower rate of absenteeism.

REFERENCES

- Barling, Julian, Kelloway, E. Kevin. Frone, Micheal R., (2005), *Handbook of Work Stress*. Sage Publications
- Evans, JamesR., Lindsay William M., (2005) *The Management and Control of Quality*. Thomson South Western
- Jex, Steve M., (1998), *Stress and Job Performance*. Sage Publications
- Kakabadse, Andrew, (1982), *Stress, Change and Organisations*. MCB Publications
- Kohn, Alfie, (1999), *Punished by Rewards*. Houghton Mifflin Company
- Kroemer, Karl, (2003), *Ergonomics*. Prentice Hall
- Nelson, Debra L. , Burke, Ronald, J., (2002), *Gender, Work Stress and Health*, American Psychological Assoc
- NIOSH, (2006), *Stress at Work*, <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/stresswk.html>
- Wyatt, Stanley, (1929), *The Effects of Monotony in Work*. London, H.M. Stationery Office