

REVIEW ARTICLE

The Stress of Boredom and Monotony: A Consideration of the Evidence

RICHARD I. THACKRAY, PhD

Boredom and monotony are generally conceded to be negative factors that can have adverse effects on morale, performance, and quality of work. This article examines the evidence for yet another claimed effect of boredom and monotony, viz., that these factors are stressors, and that because they are stressors, they may produce effects even more detrimental than those mentioned above. Both laboratory and field studies are examined for evidence of increased neuroendocrine activity during exposure to conditions determined to be, or generally acknowledged to be, boring or monotonous. It is concluded that the available data offer no support for the belief that boredom or monotony per se produces the syndrome of stress. However, monotony coupled with a need to maintain high levels of alertness could represent a combination capable of eliciting considerable stress.

INTRODUCTION

Boredom and monotony are widely recognized as undesirable side effects of repetitious work. With an increasing trend toward the application of computer control, more jobs are becoming automated and, despite a concomitant demand for programing and other computer-related work associated with a high degree of job satisfaction, there is concern that this trend will result in a net increase in the number of fragmented and routine jobs; in this event the effects of boredom and monotony will become increasingly important considerations in job design and personnel management.

Most of us would readily agree that boredom and monotony are unpleasant, undesirable states. During recent years, however, a number of investigators have begun to refer to monotony and boredom, especially that resulting from repetitive industrial work, not simply as undesirable aspects of automation, but as stressors that may be as potentially harmful to the individual as are the more commonly acknowledged effects of exposure to overstimulation or conditions of excessive workload (1-7). If boredom and monotony are significant determinants of stress, then attempts to reduce the strain of excessive workloads through increased automation could have the ironic effect of replacing one sort of stressor with another.

The intent of this article is to review the literature that bears on the alleged relationship of boredom and monotony to stress. For purposes of this discussion, boredom and monotony will be used in-

From the Civil Aeromedical Institute, Federal Aviation Administration, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Address requests for reprints to: Dr. Richard I. Thackray, AAC-118, CAMI-FAA, P.O. Box 25082, Oklahoma City, OK 73125.

Received for publication March 18, 1980; revision received November 3, 1980.

terchangeably to refer to the experience that arises from exposure to stimulus conditions which are perceived to be either uniform or repetitive, and which also induce a desire for change or variety. This is essentially the same definition of boredom and monotony as proposed by Smith (8).

The studies reviewed will be drawn largely from the literature on vigilance, sensory deprivation, and repetitive industrial work. It is, of course, recognized that exposure to such stimulus conditions is not always perceived as monotonous and that monotony can certainly arise in the presence of multiple, varied stimulation. However, virtually all studies in which boredom or monotony are either measured variables or inferred to be generally present, and in which physiological indices of stress are also available, are studies dealing with repetitive uniform stimulus conditions of the type mentioned above.

Stress will be used in the Selye (9) sense to refer to the nonspecific response of the body to any demands placed on it, with principal measures of stress being biochemical indices of increased sympathetic-adrenomedullary and pituitary-adrenocortical activity. Since autonomic and electrocortical changes associated with increased "activation" or "arousal" (10) are commonly considered to be components of the generalized stress response (2, 11, 12), some studies employing responses of the central or autonomic nervous system will be considered when biochemical indices are lacking. Finally, since clinical and experimental evidence suggests that chronic or recurrent elevation of arousal levels may lead to a variety of diseases (2, 13, 14), studies purporting to relate monotony to the incidence of illness will also be included.

LABORATORY STUDIES

Task Performance

To my knowledge, the only laboratory study of monotony that has actually compared sympathetic-adrenomedullary activity both during performance of a monotonous (vigilance) task and during performance of a highly stimulating sensorimotor task was conducted by Frankenhaeuser, Nordheden, Myrsten, and Post (4). Because of its importance, this study will be considered in some detail. All subjects performed the complex sensorimotor task on one 3-hr occasion and the vigilance task on another. A third session (control) was spent reading magazines. Subjective ratings of boredom, unpleasantness, concentration, and irritation obtained during task performance revealed that boredom was the feeling state that differed most in the two tasks, with boredom being considerably higher during vigilance performance. Urinary excretion of adrenaline and noradrenaline was measured prior to and during the two task conditions and the control condition. Analyses of variance of these data revealed significant differences between the three conditions for both measures. Interestingly enough, although mean values for adrenaline and noradrenaline were generally higher during the course of both treatment conditions than during the control condition, both catecholamines increased rather markedly during performance of the complex task, but they either declined continuously or showed a decline followed by a slight increase during the vigilance task. Also, the greater level of noradrenaline excretion during vigilance performance relative to the control condition was present even prior to the

BOREDOM AND STRESS

start of these conditions. Since the authors failed to report individual comparisons between the treatment and control conditions at the various measurement periods, it is impossible to determine whether catecholamines for both task conditions were significantly greater than the control, or whether the significant main effect for treatment groups was the result of the much greater increase in sympathetic-adrenomedullary activity during performance of the complex task. On the basis of the evidence presented by Frankenhaeuser et al (4), it would appear premature to conclude that the monotony of repetitive stimulation is associated with any significant increase in sympathetic-adrenomedullary activity.

Other performance studies in which boredom was a measured variable have generally tended to rely on autonomic rather than biochemical indices of sympathetic-adrenomedullary activity. The most extensive series of studies was conducted in the 1930s by Barmack (15-18).

In his initial study, Barmack (15) was concerned with how boredom was related to changes in oxygen consumption and blood pressure during performance of a repetitive task. His data strongly suggested an inverse relationship between reported boredom and physiological arousal, i.e., with reports of sustained interest, oxygen consumption and systolic and diastolic blood pressure either remained the same or increased, while reports of increasing boredom were associated with declining levels of physiological activity. In addition, he also found reports of increasing boredom to be associated with decreased performance efficiency and increased drowsiness. One of Barmack's most interesting findings was

that administration of benzedrine significantly increased wakefulness, blood pressure, and heart rate, with a significant reduction in reported boredom (18).

Two more recent performance studies, in which boredom was a measured variable and arousal was assessed physiologically, fail to provide any strong support for Barmack's findings, although neither of these studies offers any real support for the opposing view that boredom is a state of high arousal.

London, Schubert, and Washburn (19) manipulated boredom by using tasks differing in interest. Tasks rated high in boredom were found to induce higher levels of heart rate and skin potential than was the case with tasks rated low in boredom. However, the apparent difference in heart rate between the high- and low-boredom conditions was on the order of one beat per min, and palmar skin conductance, the third measure of arousal used, failed to differentiate between the two conditions. Since subjects also rated themselves as being significantly more tired and sleepy during the monotonous tasks than during the interesting ones, the authors' conclusions favoring a heightened arousal interpretation of boredom are not convincing.

Thackray, Bailey, and Touchstone (21) examined the degree to which reported boredom and monotony were related to performance on a complex monitoring task and explored the general pattern of physiological changes associated with boredom. Subjects performed a simulated air traffic control task for 1 hr. Recordings of blood pressure, oral temperature, skin conductance, body movement, heart rate and heart rate variability, and performance measures of detection latency were obtained. In addition, subjects rated their

feelings of boredom, monotony, and attentiveness at the beginning and end of the session. For the total group, a significant increase in detection latencies was accompanied by significant increases in boredom, monotony, and body movement, along with significant decreases in conductance, heart rate, blood pressure, oral temperature, and attentiveness. However, subjects falling at the extremes of rated boredom differed on only a few variables, with the high-boredom group showing a greater increase in detection latencies and heart rate variability and a greater decrease in attentiveness. The authors concluded that the nature of the pattern associated with extremely high feelings of boredom suggested a pattern more closely associated with attentional processes than with "arousal," although they theorized that this change in indices of attention was probably the initial manifestation of a greater decline in arousal among the high-boredom subjects that might well have extended to some of the other physiological measures had the session been longer.

Although numerous other studies have investigated changes in arousal during exposure to vigilance or repetitive task situations, their primary intent has been to examine the extent to which performance covaries with arousal. While boredom must be inferred in the studies to be considered now, it is commonly accepted that most individuals find tasks of the type used to be boring and monotonous. Indeed, all of the studies considered thus far have deliberately employed such tasks to induce boredom, with Barmack (15), in particular, showing that rated boredom increases progressively during the course of repetitive performance.

O'Hanlon (21) and O'Hanlon and Horvath (22) report two studies dealing with

catecholamine levels during vigilance performance that appear to be similar in design, but with findings directly contrary to those of Frankenhaeuser et al. (4). In both studies, indwelling catheters were used to allow relatively continuous measurements of biochemical changes during vigilance performance, as well as during a control period of magazine reading or viewing travelogue slides. Relative to the control condition, there was an initial significant rise in adrenaline at the beginning of task performance (which was attributed to anticipation) followed by a decline to control levels by the end of the task session (180 min in the earlier study, 60 min in the more recent one). (It should be recalled that Frankenhaeuser et al. (4) found adrenaline to increase towards the end of vigilance performance.) In neither study did noradrenaline levels for the experimental condition differ from those for the control condition.

Additional studies of vigilance and arousal have relied on autonomic or electrocortical measures. One of the most commonly used measures in these studies is palmar skin resistance (or its reciprocal, conductance). The general finding is that continued performance of repetitive or vigilance-type tasks is associated with declining performance efficiency and increasing skin resistance (declining conductance) (23-27). With the possible exception of a study by Ross, Dardano, and Hackman (28), who compared individual trends, there appears to be no evidence of an overall conductance increase during performance of typical vigilance tasks.

Other commonly employed measures include heart rate (20, 25-27, 29, 30), respiration rate (26, 27), and measures of electroencephalograph (EEG) amplitude or frequency (24, 31). While these measures frequently do not reflect as pro-

BOREDOM AND STRESS

nounced a decline in arousal as does conductance, and may even show no change, they nevertheless do not reveal changes that would suggest any increase in arousal level.

Sensory Deprivation or Isolation

Exposure to conditions of isolation or sensory deprivation is frequently felt to be stressful (32). Usually, it is the boredom or monotony believed to be produced by these environmental conditions that is implicated as a primary stressor (33).

In a recent review, Suedfeld (33) has dealt with the stressfulness of sensory deprivation. He notes that "the harmfulness of sensory deprivation has been discussed at great length, often without much evaluation of the known factors" (p. 61), and states further that the known facts are very different from the myths that continue to be perpetuated. In a questionnaire sent to over 20 leading researchers in the field of sensory deprivation, Suedfeld found that out of 3,300 subjects who had participated in sensory deprivation studies only one subject experienced stress that was sufficiently pronounced to require any subsequent treatment.

This is not to deny that boredom is commonly experienced in studies of sensory and perceptual deprivation. Most investigators, however, have relied on anecdotal reports of boredom among subjects or have noted comments concerning boredom in postexperimental interviews. Those few studies using a standardized questionnaire, such as the Isolation Symptom Questionnaire (34), which yields a measure labeled "tedium stress," tend to show that tedium is significantly greater among deprivation subjects than among controls (35). Yet, boredom does not appear to be a principal reason given

by subjects who terminate a deprivation study early. In a study dealing with factors associated with tolerance for sensory deprivation, Myers (36) found two general, uncorrelated types of adverse reaction to deprivation. One was tedium and the other was labeled "negativity of subjective experience" (operationally defined by terms denoting a frightening, subjective "bad trip"). Subjects who terminated at some time during the course of the 7-day study scored significantly higher on negativity of subjective experience than did those who completed the study, but there was no difference between the two subject groups with respect to the tedium measure.

While it is not always easy in studies of sensory deprivation to separate the effects of boredom from those of fear or apprehension, the available evidence suggests that subjects who elect to endure prolonged deprivation or isolation are bored by the experience but do not rate the experience as frightening or stressful (36). On the other hand, those who prematurely terminate the sessions tend to do so primarily for reasons of fear or apprehension rather than because of boredom (36,37). Because of this difference between subjects who remain and those who terminate sensory deprivation, it is of interest to examine biochemical changes in the two groups.

Of the few studies that have examined catecholamine levels, the general finding is that there is little or no difference in either adrenaline or noradrenaline output between subjects who remain for the entire experiment and control subjects (38). In two separate 7-day studies, urinary excretion levels of catecholamines during perceptual deprivation (39) and during immobilization (40) were compared with levels of control subjects. In neither study

did the catecholamine levels of experimental subjects who completed the experiment differ from control levels. Both studies, however, showed higher adrenaline, but not noradrenaline, excretion among quitters relative to those who remained for the entire session.

Comparable studies examining adrenocortical activity of quitters with those who remain during prolonged deprivation or isolation have apparently not been conducted (38). However, Zubek (38) concludes that 11-oxycorticoids, 17-hydroxycorticosteroids, 17-ketogenic steroids, and 17-ketosteroids all appear unaffected by prolonged perceptual deprivation or isolation per se. An exceptionally long confinement study (105 days) revealed no evidence of stress as defined by an increase in adrenal cortical activity among those experimental subjects who remained relative to control subjects (41).

Other Tasks or Stimulus Conditions

Several studies have been conducted that bear upon the issue of boredom and stress but do not fit the two previous categories of studies. In these studies, boredom is not even a factor of primary interest. Levi (42), for example, compared catecholamine response to a bland, natural-scenery film (control condition) with responses to three films each chosen to evoke one of three emotional patterns: a) laughter and happiness, b) agitation and hostility, and c) fear. Interestingly, self-reported boredom was the only subjective measure to increase significantly during the natural-scenery film, and this film condition was the only one in which both adrenaline and noradrenaline levels significantly decreased. Subjective responses to the other three films were gen-


erally in the expected direction, and all were associated with significant increases in adrenaline.

A similar study by Patkai (43) examined catecholamine excretion and subjective response to several kinds of situations designed to evoke either pleasant or unpleasant feelings. The four situations consisted of a) playing bingo, b) performing paper-pencil tests, c) watching medico-surgical films, and d) reading magazines. Lowest adrenaline values were obtained for the magazine-reading (inactive) condition. This was also the condition rated the lowest in interest (highest boredom).

Summary

The findings of these laboratory studies clearly suggest that feelings of boredom or monotony are accompanied by low or declining rather than high or increasing levels of physiological activation. Thus, because changes in certain physiological indices are the most widely acceptable criteria of stress (44), it must be concluded that boredom is not associated with such physiological effects and does not, therefore, contribute to stress in the conventional sense of the word.

It should be noted, however, that in the laboratory studies just considered the monotonous environments are those in which the subject responds in a rather passive manner to a set of nondemanding experimental conditions. Thus, although sensory deprivation, viewing bland travelogue films, and watching for the appearance of an infrequent signal in a vigilance experiment differ in detail, all are characterized by a similar redundancy/reduction of the sensory environment in which little or no active participation is required and few demands are placed upon the subjects.



BOREDOM AND STRESS

When boredom and monotony are the subjects of stress studies in the field, a number of additional elements, not usually found in laboratory studies, may be included. These elements will now be considered.

FIELD STUDIES

An extensive investigation dealing with the impact of technology on workers' health and job satisfaction has been underway in Sweden since 1965 (5). Most of the studies conducted under this program appear to have involved employees of the sawmill industry. Johansson, Aronsson, and Lindstrom (6), for example, studied indices of stress in two groups of employees. One group, which they refer to as the high-risk group, consisted of workers who operated high-speed saws and edging equipment, while the control group consisted of repairmen and maintenance workers. Urinary excretion of adrenaline during the workday, past history of illness, and self-ratings of boredom, monotony, and tension were all significantly higher in the high-risk than in the control group. The authors chose to focus on monotony as a principal factor contributing to stress in the high-risk group. However, although the jobs of the high-risk group were apparently more monotonous than those of the control group, the former group worked also on machine-paced tasks with extremely short operating cycles that placed continuous, high demands on the ability to make fast and correct decisions. Jobs of the control group were largely self-paced. Since monotony coexisted along with many other possibly stressful aspects of the jobs of the high-risk group (no opportunity to change jobs, isolation from others, hazardous work, little interest displayed

by management, physical constraint imposed by job, etc.), performing a simple correlation of monotony with adrenaline excretion without adequately holding constant or partialling out the effects of these other job features does not allow one to conclude anything about the effect of monotony per se on stress. It should be noted that the authors (6) are aware of this methodological problem and state their conclusions regarding monotony and stress as tentative.

A large-scale study of job demands and worker health has recently been reported by Caplan et al. (1). In this study, 23 occupations ranging from factory jobs to scientific/professional occupations were examined in detail. For purposes of this presentation, only those jobs in which workers reported boredom and monotony to be particularly undesirable features of their jobs will be singled out. These jobs were forklift driver, assembler (machine-paced), assembler (machine-paced relief), assembler (nonmachine-paced), and machine tender. Again, however, boredom was only one characteristic of these jobs. With minor exceptions all of the above occupations fell into a cluster characterized by above average feelings of a) general job dissatisfaction, b) ambiguity concerning future job security, c) underutilization of skills, d) poor social support from others, and e) low participation. Workers in this cluster of jobs tended to report more anxiety, depression, irritation, and somatic complaints. Yet, none of the other indices of stress, including behavioral (smoking, coffee consumption, obesity) and physiological indicators (pulse rate, blood pressure, levels of cortisol, cholesterol, thyroid hormones, and serum uric acid), were higher in this cluster of jobs than in the other occupations studied; nor was the incidence of disease

higher. As with the previously considered Swedish study of sawmill workers, even if the above cluster of factory jobs had shown definitive evidence of stress, one could not implicate boredom as a principal source of stress in view of the many other seemingly stressful characteristics of these jobs.

Reports of high occupational stress among telegraphers in Australia prompted another recent study (3). Stress in this occupational group was represented as arising from a "monotonous, high skilled, repetitive task that demanded intense concentration amid noise and other distractions under conditions of machine pacing" (3, pp. 649-650). These job conditions were attributed to the introduction of semiautomated telegraphy equipment. Medical records revealed that telegraphers had a somewhat higher rate and duration of sickness absence than did the control groups (mail sorters and mechanics), with this higher incidence of illness confined largely to the rather large number (33%) of telegraphers diagnosed as neurotic. Among the entire group of telegraphers (neurotics included), the three most commonly stated reasons for job dissatisfaction were a) monotony, b) lack of sense of achievement, and c) loss of personal contact. All of these reasons were related to the introduction of automated equipment. However, again there is no way of determining from this study what role, if any, monotony played in precipitating neurotic disorders or in contributing to illness in general, since the effect of monotony cannot be separated from the effects of a number of other work elements also related to job dissatisfaction and (possibly) to stress.

The final research findings to be considered involve the question of stress in

air traffic controllers. During a significant portion of their time, controllers are faced not with high traffic density, high "stress" situations, but with situations of low to moderate traffic density. Controllers much prefer high density conditions to those of low traffic load, which they consider boring and generally objectionable (45). In spite of their distaste for working under boring, low traffic load conditions, physiological indices of stress suggest these conditions to be less stressful. Thus, controllers show significant increases in catecholamine levels and 17-hydroxycorticosteroids during times when traffic load is high, but no significant increase in these measures when traffic is light (46). Melton, Smith, McKenzie, Wicks and Saldivar (47) have recently extended these latter findings in a study that correlated excretion levels of adrenaline, noradrenaline, and 17-ketogenic steroids with annual traffic counts across different facilities having traffic densities ranging from very low to extremely high. The correlation of adrenaline level (the others were nonsignificant) with traffic count was 0.96. While the relationship of boredom to adrenaline level must admittedly be inferred in this study, if we couple these results with Smith's (45) finding that controllers find low workloads to be boring, there is clearly no evidence here to support the belief that boredom is stressful.

CONCLUSIONS

There can be no doubt that boredom and monotony are negative factors and that, with respect to the working environment, these factors can be detrimental to morale, performance, and eventually to

BOREDOM AND STRESS

the quality of work produced. Thus, it is not the intent of this article to denigrate that view nor to discourage attempts to reduce the monotony of industrial work through job enlargement and enrichment programs. The main purpose of this review has been to examine the validity of yet another claimed effect of boredom and monotony, that these factors are stressors and that, because they are stressors, they may produce effects even more damaging than those mentioned above.

Experimental evidence that boredom and monotony can, through effecting increases in neuroendocrine activity, produce the syndrome of stress, is highly important and should be examined carefully. This has been the purpose of the present article. From the laboratory studies reviewed here we cannot conclude that feelings of boredom and monotony are accompanied by any significant increase in the commonly employed indices of stress or arousal.

Given the fact that monotony is almost always associated with low or declining levels of arousal in laboratory studies of repetitive, uniform stimulation, why is stress or increased arousal so frequently felt to be associated with the monotony induced by repetitive tasks in industry? The answer may lie with elements of the total job other than monotony. The study of Swedish sawmill employees discussed previously illustrates one such element. Although workers in the high-risk group rated their jobs as boring and monotonous, the jobs themselves were characterized by fast, machine-paced work demanding continuous attention and alertness in order to avoid production "bottlenecks" or serious personal injury. If one were to analyze separately these various job elements, it could be

hypothesized that the monotony of a repetitive situation results in a process somewhat analogous to that of habituation (decreased arousal or cortical alertness), which, when combined with the opposing requirement to maintain a constant high level of alertness (increased arousal), results in considerable effort or energy expenditure on the part of the individual. This is supported by the fact that these sawmill employees commonly reported utter exhaustion and fatigue at the end of their shifts. Monotony in combination with a need for high alertness appears related to stress in other industrial jobs as well. Thus, repetitive, machine-paced work with a need for intense concentration and errorless performance also characterized the work environment of the telegraphers studied by Ferguson (3). Compared with supervisors, mechanics, and sorters, telegraphers complained the most of monotony and had the highest incidence of stress-related disease. In the study by Caplan et al. (1), forklift drivers, machine-paced assemblers, nonmachine-paced assemblers, and machine tenders were the occupations in which high levels of boredom were reported. Interestingly enough, although all of these occupational groups complained of boredom and job dissatisfaction, only among the machine-paced workers were somatic complaints, anxiety, depression, and frequency of dispensary visits uniformly the highest. As Caplan et al. note, "... if one were to pick out the most stressed occupational groups, they would tend to be the machine-paced assembly line workers" (p. 191).

The coupling of monotonous, repetitive work with requirements for high alertness, continuous and rapid decisions, and various penalties for any errors that occur,

may very well represent a combination that is quite stressful. Such a combination has also been recognized by others, notably Frankenhaeuser and Gardell (48) and Johansson et al. (6), as being potentially very stressful. However, these investigators attribute the stressfulness of this combination to the additive effects of two separate stressors which they refer to as understimulation and overstimulation. The position advanced in the present article is that it is the coupling of a monotonous (arousal-reducing) task characteristic with the opposing requirement for high arousal that may make this combination particularly stressful.

In conclusion, it would seem that reports of boredom or monotony could serve most usefully as "marker items" or "flags" to warn that some of the elements in an automated job may be contributing not only to lowered attentiveness, but to general work dissatisfaction as well. Whether or not such a job is also stressful cannot be determined from reports of boredom or monotony alone. Future research in this area should not continue to employ some of the simplistic assumptions used in the past. If there is stress associated with high levels of automation, sophisticated techniques and approaches will be necessary if any real progress is to be made in our understanding of which job elements, either by themselves or in combination, actually do contribute significantly to occupational stress.

SUMMARY

Within recent years, it has become increasingly common for boredom and monotony to be referred to as stressors

that may be potentially harmful to the individual. This review has examined the results of laboratory and field studies for evidence of increased neuroendocrine activity during exposure to those repetitive stimulus or work conditions that typically evoke feelings of boredom and monotony.

Laboratory findings of physiological change during sensory deprivation and vigilance performance failed to support the claim that boredom is associated with increased neuroendocrine activity. When the effects of fear, novelty, or anticipation were taken into account, the general finding was that boredom and monotony are associated with low or declining, rather than high or increasing, levels of arousal.

Field studies of occupational stress likewise revealed no clear evidence that monotony per se is stressful. However, when a monotonous task is coupled with a machine-paced demand for continuous attention (a combination found in a number of the studies), there was suggestive evidence that this combination is quite stressful. It was hypothesized that combining a monotonous, repetitive task with the opposing requirement for a constant high level of alertness could result in considerable effort expenditure and fatigue. This was advanced as one possible explanation for the recurring belief that monotony is stressful.

The belief that boredom and monotony per se are stressors appears to be based more upon myth than upon the available data. If monotony does contribute to occupational stress, it probably does so through complex interactions with other job variables. If these interactions are to be understood, future research will have to employ far more sophisticated approaches than have been used in the past.

BOREDOM AND STRESS

REFERENCES

1. Caplan RD, Cobb S, Franch JRP Jr, Harrison RV, Pinneau SR Jr: Job demands and worker health. Washington, DC, Dept Health Educ Welfare Pub No. 75-160, 1975
2. Cox T: Stress. Baltimore, University Park Press, 1978
3. Ferguson D: A study of occupational stress and health. *Ergonomics* 16:649-663, 1973
4. Frankenhaeuser M, Nordheden B, Myrsten A, Post B: Psychophysiological reactions to understimulation and overstimulation. *Acta Psychol (Amsterdam)* 35:298-308, 1971
5. Gardell B: Technology, alienation, and mental health. Reports from the Psychol Lab, Univ of Stockholm, Sweden, No. 456, 1975
6. Johansson G, Aronsson G, Lindstrom BO: Social psychological and neuroendocrine stress reactions in highly mechanized work. *Ergonomics* 21:583-599, 1978
7. Reighard HL: Aviation medicine FAA Office of Aviation Med Report No. AM-76-8, 1976
8. Smith PC: The prediction of individual differences in susceptibility to industrial monotony. *J Appl Psychol* 39:322-329, 1955
9. Selye H: *The Stress of Life*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1956
10. Lindsley DB: Emotion, in *Handbook of Experimental Psychology*. Edited by SS Stevens. New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1951, pp. 473-516
11. Lazarus RS: *Psychological Stress and the Coping Process*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966
12. Oken D: The psychophysiology and psychoendocrinology of stress and emotion, in *Psychological Stress*. Edited by MH Appley, R Trumbull. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967, pp. 43-76.
13. Frankenhaeuser M: Sympathetic-adrenomedullary activity, behavior and the psychosocial environment, in *Research in Psychophysiology*. Edited by P Venables, MJ Christie. New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1975, pp. 71-94
14. Kagan AR, Levi L: Health and environment—psychosocial stimuli: a review. *Soc Sci Med* 8:225-241, 1974
15. Barmack JE: Boredom and other factors in the physiology of mental effort: an exploratory study. *Arch Psychol* No. 218, New York, 1937
16. Barmack JE: The effect of benzedrine sulfate (benzyl methyl carbinamine) upon the report of boredom and other factors. *J Psychol* 5:125-133, 1938
17. Barmack JE: The length of the work period and the work curve. *J Exp Psychol* 25:109-115, 1939
18. Barmack JE: Studies on the psychophysiology of boredom: part I. The effect of 15 mgs. of benzedrine sulfate and 60 mgs. of ephedrine hydrochloride on blood pressure, report of boredom, and other factors. *J Exp Psychol* 25:494-505, 1939
19. London HD, Schubert SP, Washburn D: Increase of autonomic arousal by boredom. *J Abnorm Psychol* 80:29-36, 1972
20. Thackray RI, Bailey JP, Touchstone RM: Physiological, subjective, and performance correlates of reported boredom and monotony while performing a simulated radar control task, in *Vigilance: Theory, Operational Performance, and Physiological Correlates*. Edited by RR Mackie. New York, Plenum Publishing Company, 1977, pp. 203-215
21. O'Hanlan JF Jr: Adrenaline and noradrenaline: relation to performance in a visual vigilance task. *Science* 150:507-509, 1965
22. O'Hanlon JF, Jr Horvath SM: Interrelationships among performance, circulating concentrations of adrenaline, noradrenaline, glucose, and the free fatty acids in men performing a monitoring task. *Psychophysiology* 10:251-259, 1973
23. Andreassi JL: Skin-conductance and reaction-time in a continuous auditory monitoring task. *Am J Psychol* 79:470-474, 1966
24. Davis DR, Krkovic A: Skin-conductance, alpha-activity, and vigilance. *Am J Psychol* 78:304-306, 1965
25. Eason RC, Beardshall A, Jaffee S: Performance and physiological indicants of activation in a vigilance situation. *Percept Mot Skills* 20:3-13, 1965

26. Stern RM: Performance and physiological arousal during two vigilance tasks varying in signal presentation rate. *Percept Mot Skills* 23:691–700, 1966
27. Thackray RI, Jones KN, Touchstone RM: Self-estimates of distractibility as related to performance decrement on a task requiring sustained attention. *Ergonomics* 16:141–152, 1973
28. Ross S, Dardano J, Hackman RC: Conductance levels during vigilance task performance. *J Appl Psychol* 43:65–69, 1959
29. Surwillo WW: The relation of autonomic activity to age differences in vigilance. *J Gerontol* 21:257–260, 1966
30. Thackray RI, Jones KN, Touchstone RM: Personality and physiological correlates of performance decrement on a monotonous task requiring sustained attention. *Br J Psychol* 65:351–358, 1974
31. O'Hanlon JF, Jr Beatty J: Concurrence of electroencephalographic and performance changes during a simulated radar watch and some implications for the arousal theory of vigilance, in *Vigilance: Theory, Operational Performance, and Physiological Correlates*. Edited by RR Mackie. New York, Plenum Publishing Company, 1977, pp. 189–201
32. Levi L: Psychosocial stress and disease: a conceptual model, in *Life Stress and Illness*. Edited by EKE Gunderson, RH Rahe. Springfield, IL, Charles C Thomas, 1974, pp. 8–33
33. Suedfeld P: The benefits of boredom: sensory deprivation reconsidered. *Am Sci* 63:60–69, 1975
34. Myers TI, Murphy DB, Terry DF: The role of expectancy in subject's responses to sustained sensory deprivation. Paper read at the Am Psychological Assoc Meeting, St. Louis, MO, September 1962
35. Myers TI: Tolerance for sensory and perceptual deprivation, in *Sensory Deprivation, Fifteen Years of Research*. Edited by JP Zubek. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, pp. 289–331
36. Myers TI: Psychobiological factors associated with monotony tolerance. Report No AIR-26400-7/72-FR, Washington, DC, Am Inst for Research, 1972
37. Myers TI, Johnson E, III Smith S: Subjective stress and affect states as a function of sensory deprivation, in *Proceedings of the 76th Annual American Psychological Association Convention*, 1968, pp. 623–624
38. Zubek JP: Physiological and biochemical effects, in *Sensory Deprivation: Fifteen Years of Research*. Edited by JP Zubek. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, pp. 254–288
39. Zubek JP, Schutte W: Urinary excretion of adrenaline and noradrenaline during prolonged perceptual deprivation. *J Abnorm Psychol* 71:328–334, 1966
40. Zubek JP: Urinary excretion of adrenaline and noradrenaline during prolonged immobilization. *J Abnorm Psychol* 73:223–225, 1968
41. Vernikos-Danellis J, Leach CS, Winget SM, Goodwin AL, Beljan JR: The influence of 105 days social deprivation on adrenocortical function. Paper read at the annual meeting of the Aerosp Med Assoc, Washington, DC, 1974
42. Levi L: Sympathoadrenomedullary response to "pleasant" and "unpleasant" psychosocial stimuli. *Acta Med Scand (Suppl 528)* 191:55–73, 1972
43. Patkai P: Catecholamine excretion in pleasant and unpleasant situations. *Acta Psychol (Amsterdam)* 35:352–363, 1971
44. Appley MH, Trumbull R: On the concept of psychological stress, in *Psychological Stress*. Edited by MH Appley, R Trumbull. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967, pp. 1–13
45. Smith RC: Job attitudes of air traffic controllers: a comparison of three air traffic control specialties. *Aerosp Med* 44:918–927, 1973
46. Hale HB, Williams EW, Smith BN, Melton CE Jr: Excretion patterns of air traffic controllers. *Aerosp Med* 42:127–138, 1971
47. Melton CE, Smith RC, McKenzie JM, Wicks SM, Saldivar JT: Stress in air traffic personnel: low-density towers and flight service stations. FAA Office of Aviation Med Report No. AM-77-23, 1977
48. Frankenhaeuser M, Gardell B: Underload and overload in working life a multidisciplinary approach. *J Hum Stress* 2:35–46, 1976