INTRODUCTION

1.1 Quality of Work Life (QWL)

1.1.1 Conceptual Framework of Quality of Work Life:

Human beings are basically psychosomatic entities. They join organizations in their capacities to satisfy their economic, social and psychological needs. In any organization an employee has to adhere to the given quality of work life and play preformatted prescribed roles. Hence, a good quality of work life of any organization play an important role in improving an employee’s working situations, their skills, attitudes and performance at large.

The concept of Quality of Work Life can be traced back during 1911 when a well known scientist Taylor published his book “The Principles of Scientific Management” in which he elaborated the concept of scientific management that till today form the basis for designing jobs in almost every organization across the world. The traditional job design of scientific management focuses on division of labour, job hierarchy, close supervision and the one best way of doing work. The system of job hierarchy has made workers totally dependent upon their superior resulting demoralization of employees’ personal skills. The above said notions demanding to develop the humanized jobs which can satisfy worker’s higher needs, their skills, and to make them better citizens, spouses and parents. The traditional job design needs to be replaced by enriched job design. Employers had two basic reasons for re-designing the job such as: (1) classical design originally gave inadequate attention to human needs, and (2) the needs and aspirations of workers themselves were changing, hence, required appropriate attention.
This conceptual requirement of re-designing the job gave birth to the term “Quality of Work Life” in 1960s emphasizing the human dimension of work by focusing on the quality of relationship between the worker and the working environment. Quality of Work Life as a discipline began in the United States in September 1972 when the phrase was coined by Davis at a “Democratization of Work” conference held at Columbia Universities’ Arden House to discuss two important movements. The first was a political movement in Western Europe called ‘Industrial democracy’, and the second movement was the emergence in the U.S. of a number of Social Science theorists about “Humanizing the Workplace”. This shows that the model which evolved during the early year called for formalizing labor-management cooperation at the workplace by establishing joint committees at various levels to define, diagnose and device solutions of day-to-day problems. For instance, participation programme emerged from contract bargaining between General Motors Corporation and United Auto Workers Union was called Quality of Work Life in 1973. The programme was aimed at increasing worker’s satisfaction with their jobs by providing them more information and power in decision making process in the organization.

Historically, the concept of Quality of Work Life also included wages (Lawler, 1968; Seashore and Barnowe, 1972; Pierce and Danham, 1976), working hours and working conditions (West, 1969; Ganguli and Joseph, 1969; Johnson, 1979). Thus, after making a close scrutiny of historical perspective of Quality of Work Life we can say that Quality of Work Life is a relatively newer term for a bundle of older issues. It has long been of interest to philosophers, technologists, social scientist, workers and employers. It is a broad term that can embrace every conceivable aspect of work ethics, working conditions, worker expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction and
managerial concerns about efficiency of outputs. Quality of Work Life broadens considerations of social cohesions and stability throughout different work settings.

Quality of Work Life is a philosophy, a set of principles, which holds that people are the most important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making valuable contribution to their respective organization, so they should be treated with greater dignity and full respect (Straw et al., 1984). The elements those are relevant to an individual’s Quality of Work Life include the task, the physical work environment, social environment within the organization, administrative system and relationship between life on and off the job (Cunningham et al., 1990). Quality of Work Life consists of opportunities for active involvement in group working arrangements or problem solving that are of mutual benefit to employees or employers which is directly based on labour-management cooperation. People also conceive of Quality of Work Life as a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment, and high level job involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers (Feuer, 1989). It requires employee commitment to the organization and an environment in which this commitment can flourish (Walton, 1975).

Quality of Work Life refers to favorable or unfavorable work environment with which people do their work. If working conditions are healthy then it has fruitfully positive impact on employees output. Negative experience pertaining Quality of Work Life refers to unhealthy work environment which is negatively or inversely related to one’s output and organizational effectiveness. The main objective of Quality of Work Life has been witnessed changing with the passage of time. It started with the objective of improving wage and working conditions. And thereafter, other strategies like job
enlargement and job enrichment emerged for improving employee’s motivation and their work efficiency. Employees are the backbone of any organization. So, a good Quality of Work Life is required for a healthy mind and sound body, fair working methods, high efficiency of employees on one hand and production and profit on the other. Thus, Quality of Work Life is a comprehensive construct that includes an individual’s job related well-being and the extent to which work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences (Shamir et al., 1985).

The term Quality of Work Life has different meanings to different people. Some label it as a happiness programme, others especially trade unions name it as a subtle employee incentive or just another productivity device. Quality of work life has assumed increasing interest and importance in both industrialized as well as developing countries of the world. In India, its scope seems broader than much labour legislation enacted to protect the workers. It is more than a sheer work organization movement which focuses on job security and economic growth to the employees. Thus, Quality of Work Life refers to the level of happiness or dissatisfaction with one's career. Those who enjoy their careers are said to have a high Quality of Work Life, while those who are unhappy or whose needs are otherwise unfilled are said to have a low Quality of Work Life.

Right from very beginning the term Quality of Work Life has been defined differently by different psychologist, researchers and managers in their own respective ways to cover various aspects of Quality of Work Life at large in the following manner such as:
Taylor (1973) and Spink (1975) defined Quality of Work Life as “the degree of excellence in the work and working conditions which contribute to overall satisfaction of the individual and enhance individual as well as organizational effectiveness”. Bennium (1974) viewed Quality of Work Life as the quality of the relationship between man and his task.

Ketzell and Yankelovich (1975) defined Quality of Work Life as “an individual’s evaluation of the outcomes of the work relationship. They observed and witnessed that a worker can enjoy a good quality of life when- firstly, job incumbents have positive feelings towards his/her jobs and its future prospects. Secondly, employees are motivated to stay on the job and perform well. Thirdly, when he/she experiences and feels working life quite benefitting with his/her private life. Walton (1975) on the other hand stated that Quality of Work Life is the degree to which members of work organization perceive that they are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in organization.

Hackman and Suttle (1977) have described Quality of Work Life from different angles. They contented that from professional’s point of view, it refers to the industrial democracy, increased worker participation in corporate decision making, it is related to variety of efforts to improve productivity through improvements in the human rather than the capital or technological inputs of production. From the standpoint of the individual worker, it refers to the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organization. From the Union’s view, it is more equitable sharing of the income and resources of the work organization and more humane and healthier working conditions. As a philosophy Quality of Work Life means the quality of the content of the relationship between man
and his task in a more diversified manner. The relationship can be approached from the
divergent viewpoints including the man, the organization and the society, embracing
job design, work organization, basic human needs, values and societal concepts.

Lippit (1977) thought Quality of Work Life as, “the degree to which work
provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal need to
survive with some security, to interact with others, to have a sense of personal
usefulness, to be recognized for achievements and to have an opportunity to improve
one’s skills and knowledge”. Here Lippit covered the whole gamut of work life which
may increase organizational effectiveness.

Menton (1979) described Quality of Work Life as a relatively new term for a
bundle of old issues that have long been of interest to philosophers, theologian, social
scientists, workers and employers. It is a broad term that can embrace every
conceivable aspect of work ethic and work condition, workers expression of
satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concern about efficiency of output and
broaden consideration of social cohesion and stability.

Carlson (1980) stated that Quality of Work Life is both a goal and an ongoing
process for achieving goal. As a goal, Quality of Work Life is commitment of any
organization to work for improvement, the creation of more involving, satisfying and
effective jobs and work environments for people at all levels of the organization. As a
process, Quality of Work Life, calls for effort to realize the goal through the active
involvement of people in the achievement of organizational goals.

On the basis of the available survey of literature, Nedler and Lawler (1983)
came to conclusion that the definition of Quality of Work Life underwent several
changes and modification, with regard to its conceptual understanding. Infact they
come across six significant definitions of the term which modified through various stages developing upon the type of work environment.

Reddy (1985) viewed the concept of Quality of Work Life differently in different region of the world. He pointed out that Quality of Work Life is being considered as “work re-designing” in U.K., it is “humanization of work performance” in West Germany and for the Japanese it is “improving the quality of products”. It is worth mentioning here that Japanese appeared to initiate quality circle movement in a large way in their industries and gradually such programmes dominated in western world and European organizations. Thus quality circle programme also contributed a lot in improving the quality of life of employees at work.

Dubey et al. (1988) portrays that the term Quality of Work Life tends to cover a variety of areas such as, physical, mental, psychological, social, spiritual, personal functioning and general limitations. In an attempt to define the parameters of the quality of life, Mukherjee (1989) denotes that it comprises “an infinite but enumerable field of concerns” and therefore, “the quality of life is treaded as an all inclusive notion of life and living”. Variables include those factors that are present in the work environment, the behaviour of the workers and their perceptions of the work environment.

Davis (1995) opined that Quality of Work Life is quality of relationship between employees and the total work environment. On the other hand Gani and Ahmad (1995) said that the term Quality of Work Life may be conceptualized as subset of quality of life which includes all life and living conditions.

Yousuf (1996) emphasized that Quality of Work Life is a generic phase that covers a person’s feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards,
benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and inter-personal relations and their intrinsic measuring. De (1997) believes that Quality of Work Life is an indication of how free a society is from exploitation, injustice, inequality, oppressions and restrictions on the continuing growth of an individual.

In the same vein Heskett, Sesser and Schelesinger (1997) define Quality of Work Life as the feeling that employees have towards their jobs, colleagues and organizations that ignite a chain leading to the organizations’ growth and profitability. A good feeling towards their job means the employee feel happy doing work which will lead to a productive work environment. This definition provides an insight that the satisfying work environment is considered to provide better Quality of Work Life.

Proceeding with the previous definitions, Lau, Wong, Chan and Law (2001) operationalised Quality of Work Life as the favorable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth. Indirectly the definition indicates that an individual who is not satisfied with reward may be satisfied with the job security and to some extent would enjoy the career opportunity provided by the organization for their personal as well as professional growth.

On the other hand Sirgy et al. (2001) paralelly suggested that the key factors in quality of working life are : Need satisfaction based on job requirements, Need satisfaction based on work environment, Need satisfaction based on supervisory behaviour and Need satisfaction based on Organizational Commitment. They defined quality of working life as satisfaction of these key needs through resources, activities, and outcome stemming from participation in the work place.
Recently, the term Quality of Work Life has been defined as ‘better job and more balanced ways of combining work life with personal life’ (Eurofound, 2006). As the concept of Quality of Work Life is multi-dimensional, it may not, of course, be universal. However, key concept tends to include job security, reward systems, pay and opportunity for growth among other factors (Rossi et al., 2006).

The definition of Quality of Work Life given by Serey (2006) is quite conclusive and best meet the contemporary work environment. The definition is related to meaningful and satisfying work. It includes (1) an opportunity to exercise one’s talents and capacities, to face challenges and situations that require independent initiative and self direction; (2) an activity thought to be worthwhile by the individuals involved; (3) an activity in which one understands the role the individual plays in the achievement of some overall goals; (4) a sense of taking pride in what one is doing well. This issue of meaningful and satisfying work is often merged with discussions of job satisfaction, and believed to be more favorable to Quality of Work Life.

The above mentioned review on the definitions of QWL indicates that Quality of Work Life is a multi-dimensional construct, made up of a number of interrelated factors that need careful consideration to conceptualize and measure. It is associated with job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety, well-being, job security, competence development and balance between work and non-work life. The definitions also emphasize the good feeling perceived from the interaction between the individuals and their work environment.

1.1.2 Dimensions of Quality of Work Life:

Since early 1970s psychologist and managers become interested in studying various aspects of Quality of Work Life. It was only in (1972) that a comprehensive term
“Quality of Work Life” was coined by Davis who presented a paper at an international conference held at Arden House, New York.

Since then a number of attempts have been made to identify various dimensions of Quality of Work Life in detail. Some have emphasized the improvement of work conditions leading to better Quality of Work Life, while other feel a fair compensation and job security should be emphasized. Walton (1975) one of the major interpreters of Quality of Work Life movement has proposed eight main conceptual categories for understanding the concept of Quality of Work Life. These are briefly presented below;

- **Adequate and Fair Compensation**: This refers to a just and fair balance between effort and reward. It includes such things as a fair job evaluation, training to perform the job reasonably, ability of the organization to pay, demand and supply of talent and skills and profit sharing.

- **Safe and Healthy Working Conditions**: This refers to the work environment which should be free from hazards or other factors responsible for health and safety of the employees.

- **Development of Human Capacities**: This refers to the use of skills and abilities of the employees autonomously and requires immediate feedback to take corrective action.

- **Growth and Security**: This refers to the career opportunities of the employees in the job which finally lead to the personal growth and security.

- **Social Integration in Work Organization**: It refers to the self-esteem and self-identity of the employee that should be free from prejudice based on sex, caste, race, creed, and religion.
- **Constitutionalization in Work Organization**: This refers to the “rule of law” and should also ensure zero violation of the constitutional guarantee by executive or organization decision-making body.

- **Work and Total Life Space**: This refers to the demands of work, like late hours, frequent travel, etc which are both psychologically and socially very costly to the employee or his/her family.

- **Social Relevance of Work Life**: This refers to the organization’s lack of concern for social causes, like waste disposals, low quality products, over aggressive marketing and employment practices make workers depreciate the value of their work and career which effects their self-esteem.

  Boiswert (1977) gave fifteen different dimensions and Carlson (1978) stated sixteen dimension of Quality of Work Life, then after Sinha and Sayeed (1980), developed seventeen dimensions of Quality of Work Life such as:

  - Economic benefits
  - Physical working conditions
  - Career orientation
  - Advancement on merit
  - Effect on personal life
  - Mental state
  - Union management relations
  - Self respect
  - Supervisory relationship
  - Intra-group relationship
  - Apathy
- Confidence in management
- Meaningful development
- Control influence and participation
- Employee commitment
- General life satisfaction
- Organizational climate

Rosow (1981) gave eleven dimensions of Quality of Work Life, such as:

- Pay
- Employee benefits
- Job security
- Alternative work schedule
- Job stress
- Participation in decision-making
- Democracy in work-place
- Profit-sharing
- Pension right
- Company programmes designed to enhance work welfare
- Four days work a week

Heizel et al. (1993) proposed four dimensions of Quality of Work Life as:

- Growth
- Mastery
- Involvement
- Self control
European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Condition (2002) have used different set of dimensions in their Quality of Work Life studies. The dimensions of Quality of Work Life selected are as follows:

- Health and well-being
- Job security
- Job satisfaction
- Competency development, and
- Work and non-work life balance

Quality of Work Life of employees has been widely studied and is still has a greater focus on increasingly far more and more humanizing the job conditions as well as the total work environment from different angle. It is a matter of fact that modern era which is generally assumed as the ‘era of stress’, Quality of Work Life strategies are with the fast pace of technological development are dominating the work culture for enhancing individual working efficiency as well as organizational effectiveness. Thus, employee’s Quality of Work Life seems to be highly important because satisfaction of employees is basically a back-bone for organizational survival and growth.

1.1.3 Quality of Work Life and Other Relevant Dimensions:

Quality of Work Life and Career Satisfaction: A career is the evolving sequence of a person’s work experience over time. Career arises from the interaction of individual with organization and society. Career is not a primarily a theoretical construct but is used in meaningful ways, given meaning and it creates meaning and also experience. More specifically, career is referred to as a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which person moves in an orderly and predictable sequence.
According to Greenhaus et al. (1990) career satisfaction is defined as the satisfaction individual drive from intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of their careers, including pay, advancement and developmental opportunities. This is in contrast to job satisfaction defined as pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from an appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. On the other hand Quality of Work Life focuses on the effects of employment on health and general well-being and ways to enhance the quality of a person’s on the job experience. Quality of Work Life is much broader and more intensified than organizational development, in ensuring adequate and fair compensations, opportunities for personal growth and development, satisfaction of social needs at work, protection of employee rights, compatibility between work and non-work responsibilities and the social relevance of work-life (Walton, 1975; Davis et al, 1975). Thus, employees during their career will like to experience growth and development, a sense of where one is going in one’s work life.

**Quality of Work Life, Health and Well-Being**: Health and well-being of Quality of Work Life refer to physical and psychological aspects of an individual in any working environment. Asakura and Fujigaki (1993) examined the direct and indirect effect of computerization on workers health and well-being. Their results were similar to the study of Iacovides, Fountoulakis and Kaprins (2003) that higher job demand leads to higher strain work environment; hence, it affects their health and well-being. An unstrained work environment ensures good health and psychological conditions which enable the employees to perform job and non-work related functions without inhibitions. Thus, it leads to an un-stressful work environment providing comfortable work life.
Quality of Work Life and Mental Health: A primary indicator of good or poor mental health is the level and quality of a person’s effective well-being. The primary concern here is with feelings of happiness, satisfaction, high self-esteem, interest in the environment and other positive emotions; or with anxiety, tension, depression, apathy, and a sense of hopelessness and generalized feelings of distress (Warr, 1987). The ultimate evaluation of the quality of life is commonly regarded by researchers as ‘satisfaction with life’ or happiness. Indeed, satisfaction and happiness are considered synonymous by some researchers; other suggested a relationship between these two as important dimensions of quality of working life (Mukharjee, 1989).

However, as it was stated before, all facets of one’s life are interdependent. Oshagbemi (1999) points out the relevance of job satisfaction to the physical and mental well-being of employees. He sees work as an important aspect of people’s lives because a large part of their lives is spent at work. Therefore, an understanding of the factors involved in creating work-related satisfaction is relevant to improving the well-being of a significant number of people.

Quality of Work Life Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction: Satisfaction has emotional or affective components. In everyday language, satisfaction/dissatisfaction are a feeling which determines the employee’s job-related behaviour. Landy (1989) examine that there are two critical processes that compose any emotion such as arousal and attrition. An event that causes arousal and psychological changes are noticed by the person who looks to the environment for clues as to what caused the arousal and then decide on an emotional label that fits the clues. Further it means that any particular stimulus or situation is capable of producing either satisfaction or dissatisfaction.
According to Seashore (1975), job satisfaction should be regarded as an attitude resulting from two concurrent, continuing evaluations in which the individual assesses his job and work environment as he perceive them; that is, whether they are likely to aid or undermined the realization of his basic values and the needs and life goals associated with it. Seashore (1975) further states that the tendency among “normal” workers toward experiencing satisfaction and the avoidance of experiencing dissatisfaction. It assumes that, if the worker experiences dissatisfaction with the job or some aspect of it, he/ she will seek and find accommodation in some way. Thus, dissatisfaction is generally an unstable and transitional state. The dissatisfied job occupant will normally find ways to change his job or rationalize a change in his evaluation of it.

1.1.4 Components of Quality of Work Life:

A human being always functions within an environment composed of systems and its sub-systems, such as the physical environment, cultural environment, social environment and psychological close environment. These environmental influences imply that when criteria are considered, a wide range of factors has to be taken into account. Different categories of important job components are considered as a factor that influences the overall satisfaction with Quality of Work Life such as:

**Demographic Variables:** Different authors placed emphasis on different demographic aspects. Nordenfelt (1993) commented on environmental influences. The physical environment within which the individual functions, forms the basis for his or her action, that is, it provides the opportunity to indulge in various activities. Robert Hoppock (1935) found that different levels of satisfaction were related to different occupational levels, with the highest occupational level (professional, managerial and
executive) being accompanied by the highest satisfaction. There were more unskilled manual workers who reported dissatisfaction than professional (Landy, 1989).

Mutran et al. (1997) researched gender differences against other variables, such as age, career phase, education and occupation in order to explore their assessment of the quality of time spent at work and their satisfaction with work. They had the expectation that men and women who are better educated, have higher income and may have experienced fewer difficulties with occupational mobility would be more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. They also summarized that highly educated individuals would be less satisfied with their work, because of elevated, but potentially unfulfilled expectations. On the other hand, it can be assumed that individuals with prestigious and higher paying jobs will be more positive in their subjective responses to work.

**Intrinsic Versus Extrinsic Job Factors** : Considerations in the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic job factors, that have to do with satisfaction with Quality of Work Life are described by Warr (1987), Deci and Ryan (1985), Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and Snelders (1996). Extrinsic factors concern aspects of a job that form the background or context to the task itself. It consists of activities that are externally motivated by rewards and it is carried out only because of its effects. Examples of extrinsic job factors are pay, working conditions, working hours, procedures and job security. Intrinsic factors cover aspects inherent in the conduct of the job itself. It consists of activities that are intrinsically motivating meaning that they are rewarding by themselves. The intrinsic motivation would be brought about by the feelings of competence and self-determination that someone experience while engaging in a task also known as content satisfaction. Examples of intrinsic job factors are
freedom to choose how to undertake the work autonomy, amount of responsibility and initiative that is allowed skill requirement and variety.

Although extrinsic and intrinsic job factors tend to be positively intercorrelated, many investigators emphasized their conceptual separation (Warr, 1987). However, in the literature, authors do not always deal with them separately.

**Social Factors**: Since work and career are typically pursued within a framework of social organizations, the nature of personal relationships becomes an important dimension of the quality of working life. Social factors include social support which occurs in the form of comfort and emotional security, direct help with things like money or practical assistance and information which can help people to solve their problems and reach decisions about their situations (Payne, 1987). Social climate is other important social factor which can modify the effects of negative job conditions. At the individual level, the social relationships surrounding a person (climate) have been shown to have important consequences for mental health and even physical well-being.

**Organizational Climate**: Field and Abelson (1982) found job satisfaction and the climate of the organization as related. They found that the more an area of work is valued, the higher the relationship between the climate and satisfaction. They refer to experiments where different climates were created and showed that different climates contribute to different levels of job satisfaction.

Organizational climate has been defined in terms of attributes, models, organizational context, structure, values and norms as well as different facets of organizational and sub-group processes such as leadership, conflict, reward, communication and control. It was found that members of an organization had more
finely differentiated perceptions of their work climate. According to Field and Abelson (1982), climate occurs on three distinct levels, namely organizational, group and individual level. Climate is, therefore, the perception by individuals of their organizational environment.

1.1.5 Approaches to Quality of Work Life:

Landy (1989) gives a comprehensive summary of the background of how the theories of work satisfaction have been evolved till 1989. Prior to (1930) there was little empirical research. Freud and Janet both felt that unconscious impulses were the cause of either positive or negative effect at the workplace.

In terms of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with Quality of Work Life, Landy (1989) considers many theories. In need theory, the impact of need satisfaction on behaviour is believed to be apparent. In instrumentality theory, it is suggested that satisfaction increases the value of a future reward and that dissatisfaction reduces that value. In self-efficacy theory, it is noted that individuals derive satisfaction from a favorable comparison of their behaviour with some standard that they have set for themselves and that they are dissatisfied when they compare themselves unfavorably to that standard. In equity theory, it is proposed that dissatisfaction results from the discrepancy between expectations and reality, although it could be said that those expectations relate to a person’s needs.

An alternative approach would focus on the behavioural outcomes produced by psychologically harmful jobs. Phenomenon such as rates of turnover, absenteeism, drug abuse, mental illness, tension related physical illness and alcoholism would be measured. This has the advantage of focusing on more “objective” outcomes. However, it has the disadvantage of identifying conditions that produce dissatisfaction only after
they have done their damage. Thus, it is important to identify poor work environments before there are serious negative outcomes. Potentially, measures of the actual physical work environment can also be used to identify poor conditions before problems arise. They also have the advantage of being objective. However, they do not take into account individual difference in how people react to the same work environment (Lawler, 1975).

Mirvis (1980) saw the development in the understanding of work and working people as progressing from the notion that better wages, job security and working conditions contributed to improved performance to identify the social motives of working people and the social purpose of their lives at work. In the view of Mirvis, work behaviour was found to be influenced not only by rewards and social relations, but also by jobs, information systems and leaders. He finally concluded that all these form part of most models used in assessing the Quality of Work Life.

Andrews and Withey (1976) described an approach postulated by Brickman and Campbell in 1971, which focused on hedonic level and adaptation as these processes apply to the quality of life. Their basic observation is that people seem to adapt to highs or lows, and after a while, cease to experience them as extremes, even in the presence of initial external conditions. People have different values and implication may be that they evaluate differently with regard to work related factors (Andrews and Withey, 1976). According to Hartenstein and Huddleston (1984), for Quality of Work Life to be a reality, management and workers must participate in identifying shared values that are essential to Quality of Work Life and not counterproductive to this end.

Warr (1987) proposes three important approaches related to occupational stress. He distinguishes between physical stressors, such as noise, heat, vibration and those
that are psychological, such as job demands and interpersonal problems. The second approach is to identify separate features in the environment that may give rise to strain. The third approach emphasizes that stress should be viewed in relational terms, as a process of interaction between the environment and the person. Warr is also of opinion that strain only arises during those circumstances where an environmental feature is actively appraised as threaten; and people differ widely in their appraisals. This is often summarized in terms of a distinction between objective and subjective stressors. Different values can be obtained even from people working in the same job.

Warr (1987) again refers to the socio-technical system theory which emphasizes the fact that work organizations are human and technical systems operating within a wider environment. Any working organization may be viewed as a combination of technological elements such as the formal task, the physical conditions, layout of work, equipment available and social networks among those who perform the work. On the other hand, Warr (1987) as well as Chelte (1983) rely on Maslow’s theory of higher-order and lower-order needs and Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory. Maslow’s theory suggested the presence of several needs arranged in hierarchical pattern. Once satisfied, a lower order need can no longer produce motivation in an individual. These needs range from physiological necessities to self-actualization. Thus, as lower order needs are satisfied the individual strives for self-actualization, which can only be filled through more interesting and challenging work. Herzberg’s Two-factor Theory (1976) argues that satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different forces such as dissatisfaction is attributed only to inadequate work conditions (extrinsic factors), while feelings of satisfaction are to be associated only with variations in intrinsically rewarding job factors.
Humanistic point of view emphasized that intrinsic involvement in work is tightly connected to positive self-image, satisfaction and the quality of life. Chelte (1983) is of the opinion that the quality of work has an extensive influence on the quality of life that is enjoyed by a worker or vice-versa.

1.2 Ego-Strength

It’s not about leaving your ego at the door: you must refuse to proceed beyond the door without sufficient “Ego-Strength”.

The term "ego" has been used by personality theorists as a construct enabling them to explain why people behave differently in similar situations. Psychologists may use the concept of ego-strength, predicting a good prognosis for therapy with one client and a poor prognosis for another. Therapists often base the client's amenability to therapy upon their evaluation of respective ego functions and ego-strength of the clients involved (Volksdorf, 1969). In order to understand the concept of ego-strength, it is necessary to understand the ego and its functions (Dickinson, 1970).

According to Loevinger (1976), the fundamental characteristics of the ego are that it is a process and a structure. It is social in origin and functions as a whole, guided by purpose and meaning. Both consciousness, with the possibility of freedom, and the validity of the dynamic unconscious are acknowledged in this definition. It is not the same as the whole personality, but is close to what the person thinks of as him or herself.

1.2.1 Conceptual Framework of Ego-Strength:

The concept of the ego received its initial impetus from the origins of Freud (Volksdorf, 1969). In reviewing the building of psychoanalytic theory, Blanck and
Blanck (1974) found it to have developed through four distinct phases. The first phase, the pre-psychoanalytic period, was characterized by a primitive concept of "ego" which meant person, self or consciousness. The term "defense" referred to the disassociation of memory from consciousness during the first period while "repression" represented the concept of defense.

In Freud's An Outline of Psychoanalysis (1949), Freud presented his last definition of the ego. He defined it as an organization with constant cathexis and assigned to it functions, such as defense, reality testing, perception, memory, attention, and judgment. Yet, he still regarded the conscious and the ego synonymously, defining it as a sense organ for perception, for thought process and, thus, for the reception of external and internal stimuli. The beginnings of what later came to be regarded as major functions of the ego, namely, perception, motility, anticipation and delay can be seen in Freud's dealing with the concept of primary and secondary processes. The primary process, according to Freud, is directed toward free discharge of excitation, whereas the secondary process, by using memory traces, employs thought as trial action (Blanck and Blanck, 1974).

In 1911, Freud provided a psychoanalytic view of psychosis, homosexuality, and secondary narcissism (Blanck and Blanck, 1974). He suggested that modification of the ego as a consequence of pathological development results in disturbances in libidinal process. Blanck and Blanck (1974) noted that this has had far-reaching influence on both theory and technique in ego psychology.

The second phase of psychoanalysis, according to Blanck and Blanck (1974), is regarded as the period of instinct theory. While at this time psychoanalysis was largely in the form of an id psychology, Freud in his book An Outline of Psychoanalysis (1949)
assigned the function of self-preservation to the ego. This ego function made the
distinction between the id and the instincts of the lower animals.

The third phase, the structural theory, became the basis for contemporary ego
psychological thought. In Freud's The Ego and the Id (1927), Freud introduced and
refined the constructs of the id, ego and superego. He described the ego as no longer
synonymous with self but one of a tripartite personality structure (Blanck and Blanck,
1974). Freud described the id as the initial component of personality. The pleasure-
seeking activities that man engages in come from the id and Freud theorized that the
source of the id's energies is derived from the individual's organic systems. The
manifestations of the id can be characterized by the two words "I want." It does not
concern itself with the realities of the external environment, but instead focuses on the
primary physiological needs of the person. When the needs of a person are aroused, the
energies of the id are directed toward satisfying these needs in order to produce a state
of tension reduction or balance (Hall and Lindzey, 1978; Volksdorf, 1969).

Because man is a social being, he is governed by the laws and cultural mores of
the society in which he lives. As a child, one learns what behaviour is acceptable within
his or her cultural group and what behaviours are rejected. As these values are
internalized, the individual develops the next facet of the personality, the superego. The
superego is highly idealistic and moralistic and like the id it does not concern itself with
the realities of life. As the ethical-moral arm of the personality, it makes judgments as
to whether an activity is good or bad according to the values incorporated by the
individual (Hall and Lindzey, 1978; Volksdorf, 1969).

The fourth or contemporary phase of theory building began from Heinz
Hartmann's (1958) work. A direct outcome of the introduction of Freud's structural
theory, the contemporary phase of psychoanalytic theory building focuses on the concept of object relations and its role in the development of the personality (Blanck and Blanck, 1974).

The concept of the ego is featured as a key construct in several other theories of personality. Whereas Freud saw the ego functioning at both conscious and unconscious levels, Jung (1916) viewed the ego as the part of the personality that deals with conscious material alone. Like Freud's theory, this included processes, such as thinking, feeling (or self-perception), and remembering. Jung believed that the ego was the center of personality and was responsible for one's sense of identity. Through the ego, the individual is able to impose a degree of structure on the external world. Because the ego is within the conscious realm, the individual is aware of this portion of personality as well as the set of experiences and activities involved (Volksdorf, 1969).

Murray (1938), like Freud, viewed the ego as the central organizer of human behaviour. He saw the ego as having the power to facilitate or to inhibit its impulses. However, unlike Freud, who saw the id as destructive in nature, Murray believed the id was capable of good as well as bad. Therefore, he felt the ego functioned not only as a repressor but also as a force which enhanced pleasure for the id.

Symonds' (1951) position concerning the ego is similar to Jung's and Murray's. He saw the ego as process oriented regulating behaviours such as perceiving, thinking, and remembering. Symonds believed these functions were responsible for the development and execution of the behaviours that are necessary in attaining satisfaction of organism drives. He believed that if the ego is successful in dealing with external realities and internal demands, the individual will experience self-satisfaction and think
highly of himself. When this happens, the individual is more likely to demonstrate effective ego functions.

These recent developments in how the ego is viewed have given impetus to ego psychology. Psychoanalysts, such as Freud, though not denying the existence of the ego, believed it was derived from drives through the process of frustration and enunciation. By contrast, neo-analysts, such as Adler (1927), believed in the spontaneous striving for self-realization as the moving force of ego development. Throughout his work, Adler (1927) stressed the unity of personality. He believed that drives, including the sex drives, are subordinated to a person's goal or purpose in life. In his later years, Adler's most prominent concept, the style of life, was used interchangeably with self or ego, individuality, one's method of facing problems, opinion about oneself and the problems of life and one's whole attitude to life. Adler saw the striving for personal power as guided by social interest, which was seen as a desire for the welfare of others. Adler believed in the idea of spontaneous striving and the idea of self as creative self (Loevinger, 1976).

Adler (1927) felt that what one perceives and understands bears the imprint of the ego. Therefore, the individual is protected against unwelcome observations. Adler believed that the ego provides the frame of reference that structures a person's world and, within this frame of reference, perceives the world (Loevinger, 1976). Adler's creative self is an individualistic, subjective system which interprets one's experiences as well as providing meaning to these experiences. In order to fulfill one's unique style of life, the creative self will attempt to create its own experiences if they cannot be found in the external world (Hall and Lindzey, 1978).
Adler was a pioneer in the development of an ego oriented psychology. In opposition to Freud's theory, Adler believed humans are ordinarily aware of the reason for their behaviour. They are self-conscious individuals’ who are capable of planning and guiding their actions. They are fully aware of their meaning for self-realization (Hall and Lindzey, 1978).

Both the concept of ego and Ego-Strength has been a concern in the traditional psychoanalytic school of thought. Freud was the first to assert that the ego had strengths as well as weaknesses (Volksdorf, 1969). Symonds (1951), in his discussion of the adequacy of ego functioning, believed that individual behaviour differed in the degree of effectiveness demonstrated by the ego. The ability to cope with life's problems, in Symonds’s view, was an indication of the strength or weakness of the ego's performance.

Cattell (1950) theorized that the ego was caught up in the conflict between the id and the superego. He saw the ego as the recipient of the struggle between these two forces that would assume a helpless role, at times, in the structure of personality. However, Freud (1936) stated that when the ego worked closely with the id and superego, the ego would have strength.

Hartmann (1958) developed the concept of the conflict free ego sphere in reaction to psychoanalytic theorists' tendency to view the ego only in terms of conflicts which involved either avoiding dangers or satisfying instinctual needs. He believed that the individual possessed spheres in his or her life in which no conflict is present that could hamper the ego's functioning.

Two lines of thought concerning ego-strength were developed in the late 1930s. One was based on Hartmann's thinking, focusing on the ego's ability to adapt under
stressful conditions. This adaptive capacity was considered to be indicative of the level of strength displayed by the ego. The other line of thought was originally presented by Nunberg (1931), who emphasized the ability of the ego to synthesize. This view supported the idea that Ego-Strength that it was a function of the relative strength of the life and death instinct.

Specific indicators of Ego-Strength have been identified. Cumming and Gumming (1962) noted that Ego-Strength was a construct that can be inferred from observations of behaviour. Freud (1927) suggested typical ego-related behaviours. Two of these behaviours include reality-testing, which refers to the process in which the ego tests its perceptions of the real world through activity and affective tolerance, which refers to the ability of an individual to function adequately while under stress (Volksdorf, 1969).

Hartmann (1958) and Freud (1936) saw two indicators of ego-strength as: (a) the ability of a person to delay impulse gratification, and (b) the ability to use the mechanism of repression to defend against threats of the real world. Fenichel (1937) felt that impulse control indicated Ego-Strength.

Symonds (1951) also considered the ability to control impulses as a sign of Ego-Strength. He defined Ego-Strength as the "efficiency of the ego in regulating impulses and mastering the environment". Symonds (1951) added that it is the "capacity for sustaining emotional equilibrium while waiting or working for later gratification"

Glover (1943) wrote that the most important criterion of Ego-Strength is "the relation of the total ego to its environment" and that determination of "weakness or strength should be in terms of adaptation". Halpern (1953) defined Ego-Strength as the
ability of the ego "to integrate the needs of the conflict and anxiety-provoking drives with the demands of reality in a way that does not interfere with reasonable fulfillment of the individual's potentialities and his desires." Schafer (1954) describes Ego-Strength as "effective and adaptive operations." In summary, Ego-Strength is a measure of the effectiveness with which the ego is performing its task of adapting to the demands of reality (Hartmann, 1958). In other words, it is the ego's task to assess the requirements of reality and to see that the individual's needs are met within that framework.

The Ego-Strengths or ego virtues are inherent active qualities that bring various forms of energy and vibrancy to people across the life span (Erikson, 1964, 1965). They reflect a strong inner core, and ultimately build toward solid commitments to ideals, beliefs, significant others, and the broader society. Erikson was emphatic throughout his writings that the Ego-Strengths can only emerge with interplay between the individual and social institutions and groups (Erikson, 1964, 1968, 1985). Indeed, he argued that the Ego-Strengths are endorsed in human institutions, but questioned the likelihood that precise matches could be made between individual Ego-Strengths and specific institutions.

According to Wolberg (1977) Ego-Strength connotes the positive personality assets that will enable the individual to overcome his anxieties, to yield secondary gains of his illness, and to acquire new, more adequate defenses. Ego-Strength is also the patent’s capacity to hold on to his own identity despite psychic pain, distress, turmoil and conflict between opposing internal forces as well as the demands of reality (Brown, 1979).

Goldstein (1984) viewed Ego-Strength as a composite picture of the internal psychological capacities that an individual brings to his or her interactions with others.
and with the social environment. Those capacities cannot be assessed independently of the nature of the person's needs and the conditions of the surrounding environment. Bellak (1989), have stressed the learned aspects of thinking and behaviour and how they are influenced by heredity and the physiology of the human organism. To the degree the ego can be defined as an aggregate of learned patterns of behaviour, Ego-Strength is the result of behaviour learned from an ego ideal "such as a parent or teacher or psychotherapist who exert a regulating, controlling, or cybernetic influence on behaviour"

Burns (1991) argued that the Ego-Strength can supports the individual to ensures coping abilities, provides an individual with a sense of identity, can be recognized during initial assessment and throughout therapy, represents a foundation on which to build psychotherapeutic gains, and increases as clients grow in maturity. In sum, Ego-Strength is a relevant construct for both assessment and outcome measurement.

Recently Mosby's Medical Dictionary (2009) defined Ego-Strength as the ability to maintain the ego by a cluster of traits that together contributes to good mental health. The traits usually considered important include tolerance of the pain of loss, disappointment, shame, or guilt; forgiveness of those who have caused an injury, with feelings of compassion rather than anger and retaliation; acceptance of substitutes and ability to defer gratification; persistence and perseverance in the pursuit of goals; openness, flexibility, and creativity in learning to adapt; and vitality and power in the activities of life. The psychiatric prognosis for a client correlates positively with Ego-Strength.
1.2.2 Stages of Ego-Strength:

The Ego-Strengths are under examined components of psychosocial theory of human development. The absence of scholarly discussion on this topic is significant because, theoretically, the Ego-Strengths should provide evidence of successful psychosocial stage resolutions. That is, Erikson (1964) asserts that eight distinct and essential Ego-Strengths exist throughout the life cycle and that each strength demonstrates an ascendance in association with positive resolution of its corresponding psychosocial crisis.

The Ego-Strength of hope emerges from trust vs. mistrust in infancy, will emerges from autonomy vs. shame/doubt and purpose from initiative vs. guilt in early childhood, competence emerges from industry vs. inferiority during latency, fidelity emerges from identity vs. identity confusion in adolescence, love emerges from intimacy vs. isolation in young adulthood, care emerges from generativity vs. stagnation in adulthood, and wisdom emerges from integrity vs. despair in later adulthood. Like the psychosocial stages, the Ego-Strengths are thought to be sequential, invariant, and hierarchical.

A measurement of Ego-Strengths could offer an indicator of psychosocial health at a given stage that is embedded in a theoretical framework. A specific Ego-Strength score would reflect the degree of ascendance of an individual's current Ego-Strength, as well as the degree to which other Ego-Strengths are operative at that life stage. Erikson (1964, 1985) contends that all of the Ego-Strengths are present throughout every stage of life, and that the potential for each Ego-Strength to become fully actualized heightens toward the end of the corresponding life stage. Each Ego-Strength is in existence, in some form, from the earliest psychosocial stage of trust to the last of
integrity. Although ever present, Ego-Strength reaches its time of ascendance in association with successful resolution of its corresponding psychosocial stage. Each Ego-Strength is grounded in all those that are prior to its ascendance and, when mature, gives new meaning to all previous Ego-Strengths and all those yet to reach ascendance (Erikson, 1985).

There are several factors that contribute to each Ego-Strength’s time of ascendance. When an individual is physiologically, cognitively, and emotionally equipped and when the appropriate psychosocial crisis has been successfully resolved, there is greater potential that the corresponding Ego-Strength will flourish. However, ascendance of Ego-Strengths occurs not only with internal preparedness and successfully completion of associated psychosocial crises, but requires a unique interdependence between the individual and the surrounding social environment (Erikson, 1965).

1.2.3 Levels of Ego-Strength:

In Freud’s psychoanalytic theory of personality, Ego-Strength is the ability of the ego to effectively deal with the demands of the id, the superego, and the reality. Those with little Ego-Strength may feel torn between these competing demands, while those with too much Ego-Strength can become too unyielding and rigid. Ego-Strength helps us maintain emotional stability and cope with internal and external stress.

Normally our Ego-Strength grows and develops psychologically as we grow and develop physically. It’s part of our psycho-cognitive-social development. We develop more and more of a sense of self as we face reality. As that “I” develops the ability to see and accept reality for what it is, without the magical thinking of wishing
and confusing wishing with reality, we develop more strength for coping and mastering
the facts and constraints that life puts before us.

A strong ego is where a person accepts their reality, explores any situation that
causes frustration and explores it, knowing that they can deal with it. A person does not
tend to personalize things that are done or said. The stronger the sense of ego, the
greater the ability to handle life’s situations. A strong ego is exhibited in the following
characteristics: objectivity in one’s apprehension of the external world and in self-
knowledge (insight); capacity to organize activities over longer time spans (allowing
for the maintenance of schedules and plans); and the ability to follow resolves while
choosing decisively among alternatives. The person of strong ego can also resist
immediate environmental and social pressure while contemplating and choosing an
appropriate course, and strong ego is further characterized in the person who is not
overwhelmed by his or her drives (but instead can direct them into useful channels).

A weak ego is one where a person does not have a sense of self that faces reality
and deals with it properly. It has a tendency to fight reality and has unrealistic
expectations. Because of this a person tends to avoid encounters of this type. The
weaker the ego, the more that a person runs from reality or turns to addictions.
Weakness of ego is characterized by such traits as impulsive or immediate behaviour, a
sense of inferiority or an inferiority complex, a fragile sense of identity, unstable
emotionality, and excessive vulnerability. Perception of reality and self can be
distorted. In such cases the individual may be less capable of productive work, because
energy is drained into the protection of unrealistic self-concepts, or the individual may
be burdened by neurotic symptoms. Ego weakness also underlies the inflated sense of
self, which can be associated with grandiosity and a superiority complex.
1.2.4 Intra-Psychic and Interpersonal Dimensions of Ego-Strength:

The concept of Ego-Strength derives from psychoanalytic theory and refers to the healthy, adaptive functioning of the ego (i.e., the capacity for effective personal functioning). Sigmund Freud conceptualized the ego as an intra-psychic substructure that serves the essential organizing and synthesizing functions that are necessary for an individual to adapt to the external world. When the ego performs these functions adequately, individuals experience themselves as coherent, functional human beings with an enduring sense of personal identity. They are said to possess Ego-Strength.

Ego-Strength has both intra-psychic and interpersonal dimensions. It implies a composite of internal psychological capacities both cognitive and affective that individuals bring to their interactions with others and with the social environment. Ego-Strength reflects a person’s capacities for adaptability, cohesive identity, personal resourcefulness, self-efficacy, and self esteem. Ego-Strength also connotes mental health as encapsulated in Freud’s well known phrase “to love and to work.” Indicators of Ego-Strength include interpersonal competence, a sense of purpose, life satisfaction, and the capacity for meaningful activity. Like the solid foundation of a well built house, Ego-Strength supports the individual across developmental stages in the pursuit of life goals, dreams, and ambitions, especially under stressful conditions or during turbulent times. Ego-Strength provides an individual with a cohesive sense of self, ensures coping abilities, increases as individuals grow in maturity, and is recognizable during initial clinical assessment and throughout psychotherapy.

On the basis of clinical experience, it can be believed that supportive psychotherapy often leads to improvement in adaptive and interpersonal function, even to what may be called "structural" change. This change described as alteration in
specific intra-psychic configurations; such as modification in patterning of defenses, thought and affect organization, anxiety tolerance and Ego-Strength (Wallerstein, 1989). In order to make a bit improvement in its structure or at least internalized in the patient, it should outlast the immediate relationship with the therapist (Muran, 1995).

Interpersonal dimension of Ego-Strength can be measured on the basis of an important circumplex model (Henry, 1986 and Kiesler et al., 1989) which was conceptualized by Leary (1957) and further developed by Wiggins, (1979). The circumplex model arranges interpersonal behaviour and attitudes on a surface defined by two axes: a horizontal axis reflecting affiliation with poles of friendliness and hostility and at the same time a vertical axis reflecting autonomy and control with poles of dominance and submission. The regions between the axes may be subdivided in various ways, but the most psychometrically desirable way usually involves eight regions (Benjamin, 1982; Wiggins, 1982). These regions of interpersonal behaviour are labeled as Domineering, Vindictive, Overly Cold, Avoidant, Nonassertive, Exploitable, Overly Nurturant and Intrusive (Alden et. al., 1990).

In a comprehensive study of personality disorders and character logic disturbances, Akhtar (1995) notes the connection between Ego-Strength and identity and discusses the assessment of identity in the clinical interview where Ego-Strength is lacking to some degree with respect to object relationships, defensive functioning, sense of reality of the world and the self, regulation and control of drives, affects, impulses and synthetic integrative function. Akhtar (1995) also provides helpful suggestions on how to assess in the clinical interview the depth of a client's object relationships as one indicator of Ego-Strength. The interviewer is advised to review the client's interpersonal environment, past and present to elicit detailed descriptions of
significant others such as mothers, fathers, spouses, friends, employers, lovers, thesis advisers and even pets.

The importance of Ego-Strength as an area for clinical assessment derives from the notion that the significant problems in living for which people seek therapeutic assistance often expresses themselves as ego deficits. Deficits in Ego-Strength can manifest as poor judgment, difficulties with reality testing and problems with interpersonal relationships or intimacy. Lack of Ego-Strength can also be shown in extreme defensiveness, lack of self-control and the inability to regulate emotions or self-soothe when distressed. Ego deficits are also apparent in the individual with poor self-esteem, non-cohesive identity, unrealistic or inconsistent life goals, and issues with mastery and competence. Psychotherapists pay special attention to Ego-Strength when assessing a client’s current capacities and potential to benefit from therapy. Their ability to support a client’s current and developing Ego-Strength depends on their ability to identify and assess ego functions in the clinical situation. In psychoanalytic theory, a client can grow their Ego-Strength over time by identifying with and incorporating the therapist’s own Ego-Strength. Across mental health practice disciplines, clinicians assess Ego-Strength to locate a client on a developmental continuum that allows them to identify a suitable place to begin therapeutic work, provides data to develop therapeutic goals and constitutes a baseline against which to measure psychotherapeutic progress.

1.2.5 Ego-Strength at Workplace:

Lots of people will rant about ego having no place at work, how it causes more harm than good. Ego is at the root of many workplace issues. From poor communication to failed negotiation, to faulty decision making, ego can lay a
dangerous path of destruction. The obnoxious and overbearing behaviour that comes through it can damage creativity, undermine effective problem solving, cause stress, and adversely effect morale of employees. So, how many times have we been told to “leave your ego at the door”? But people issuing such advice miss the point entirely. And the truth is scareful because it’s not about killing ego rather it’s about strengthening ego of an individual.

Ego-Strength is the ability of an individual to manage both the id and superego despite the pressures of both that demand to increase pleasure or act within society standards. The Ego-Strength is the balance that Freud emphasized as the key to a healthy personality; one that is both able to seek pleasure successfully but doing so within reason and acceptable time and place.

Ego-Strength refers to our ability to maintain emotional stability and cope with stress. This is not about arrogance. Strength means having a strong and healthy self esteem and the ability to bounce back from rejection. It's realizing that rejection is part of the game and not being immobilized by it. Yet, when referring to a person’s ego getting in the way we are discussing a persons pride and their need to save face and protect reputation. Underlying such behaviour is the presence or lack of Ego-Strength. And that’s what all managers, business students and business schools must focus on: the underlying level of Ego-Strength, building it, and using it. It’s not about leaving your ego at the door; it’s about refusing to proceed beyond the door without sufficient Ego-Strength. In fact, Ego-Strength is an important factor determining the capacity of an individual to perceive challenging situations realistically, to decide the course of action rationally and to execute the response effectively.
Building Ego-Strength while at the same time putting the personal life of the manager into order, it is advisable for the managerial personnel to move toward an internal locus of control, to become more proactive and flexible in their thinking and actions, to open themselves up to change and lean away from pessimism toward optimism. On the other hand the common pitfalls in life and in managing others are external locus of control, reacting, rigidity; negativity, resistance to change and defensiveness etc. there are all signs of low Ego-Strength. A person with high Ego-Strength relies more on his/her own values and is therefore less likely to be influenced by others. Thus, Ego-Strength is actually another term for self-confidence and is strongly associated with personal beliefs.

1.2.6- Guidelines to Strengthen Ego-Strength :

Of course, the idea of Ego-Strength has a long history in the field of psychology. It can be traced back with the concept developed by Freud and his three-fold division of personality in terms of id, ego, and super ego.

If ego is the self in contact with reality then ego-strength refers to the strength of our sense of self or person to look face to face without caving in or being overwhelmed.

The strength of ego-strength is the power, determination, road ability to engage reality for whatever we find it to be. This highlights Ego-Strength as the ability to accept what is as existing and to then use our cognitive-behavioural, emotional and relational skills to deal with such. Ego-strength then is our ability to play the Game of Life according to whatever curves life throws at us. Ego-strength also refers to the inner personal strength by which we tolerate stress and frustration. It is Ego-Strength that allows us to deal with reality without falling back to infantile defense mechanisms.
Hall (1999) has provided different guidelines/ processes which can be incorporated in strengthening one’s Ego-Strength. He further argued that these guidelines will empower you to face life on life’s terms and to develop a sense of self-efficacy in the face of changing times. It will enrich your powers of optimism, resilience, and creativity.

**Acceptance:** First and foremost, Hall (1999) argued to access the state of acceptance and apply that feeling to your “self.” Think of something small and simple that you simply accept. You could get yourself worked up about it, even furious and frustrated, but you have learned to just go along and accept it. It could be something like the rain, the traffic, changing the baby’s diaper, taking out the garbage, etc. Think small and simple. It’s just a feeling of welcoming something into your life but not with any particular thrill or liking. To do that is to experience appreciation. Yet acceptance also is not resignation or condoning. Acceptance is just welcoming something into your world without any negative fanfare.

In this, acceptance can be a truly magical state. In it, we simply acknowledge the world for what it is regardless of our likes or dislikes. We simply acknowledge the constraints that exist and that we have to deal with.

**Adjusting Expectancies:** Second, look at your self-expectancies and expectancies of others, the world, work, etc. and adjust them so that you have a fairly accurate map about what is, how things work, and what you can legitimately expect. What have you mapped about yourself, people, relationships, fairness, life, etc.? A more effective approach is to set out to create a good and useful map that will enable us to go and experience what we desire.
Stepping Into Power Zone: Weak and strong Ego-Strength is related to our sense of personal power or the lack thereof. We increase Ego-Strength when we accept our personal powers or responses of thinking, emoting, speaking, and behaving, meta-state them with a frame of ownership and then by welcoming and practicing the use of our powers, step more and more into our power zone. This increases our self-efficacy, activity, proactivity, etc. The more resourcefulness we have, the more willing and able we are to face reality and to master our world.

Meta-Statement Flexibility: A fourth process for strengthening Ego-Strength involves replacing rigidity and closeness of mind with flexibility, willingness to accept change, and openness to the flux and flow of life. In weak Ego-Strength we strongly feel a sense of insecurity. Then that we don’t want things to be change we want things to stay the same. As we develop more personal security, we are more open to change and to adapting and to using our resources. Openness to change, which supports personal flexibility, enables us to face the world and our future with an optimistic attitude. Then, if things change, we feel fine because our security lies in ourselves and in our strength of ego to figure things out.

Optimistic Explanatory Style: A fifth thing that increases the strength of our ego to face reality is the ability and attitude of interpreting things in such a way that we put a positive spin on things. We call this as an attitude or optimism. It stands in contrast to pessimism.

Martin Seligman identified both the pessimistic and optimistic explanatory styles in his research with laboratory animals and then with humans. The pessimistic style consists of three P’s: personal, pervasive, and permanent. We take a “bad”
thing, an unpleasant or unfortunate event and make it about ourselves (personal), about everything in our lives (pervasive) and about forever (permanent).

Conversely, when we index the specifics of an event, we contain the “evil” or “badness” because then it is about the event and not us (non-personal), it is here in this situation and context (non-pervasive), and it is today (non-permanent). This frames the negative event so that it doesn’t contaminate us with the “evil” and infiltrate our mind so that’s all we can see and feel. It enables us to then think about other things, what we truly are and what we care about, what we can do and how we can take positive action to make a difference. This begins to create the attitude of optimism as it operates from a position of strength, confidence, possibilities, and taking pleasure in what is going right.

It is in this way that we develop sufficient Ego-Strength to face reality and to not be overwhelmed by frustration, disappointment, hurt, etc. We do what we can with what we have and we enjoy the process everyday.

**Consciously Raising our Frustration and Stress Tolerance Level:** If you look around the human situation at all the things that can and does trigger stress in people or that frustrates them and make a list, you will eventually make a list of everything. And the very things that frustrate the hell out of some people thrill and excite others. What one experiences as a stressor, another enjoys as excitement. In this, both stress and frustration are in the eye of the beholder.

The strength of your self develops by framing things in such a way that we endow it with empowering meanings. Positive framing and reframing then allows us to take a new view of things which then effects how we actually feel about things. In this way, framing and reframing things can enhance our Ego-Strength to face, cope with,
and even master the challenges of life. We often do this by developing the kinds of frames of mind that allow us to develop the insights, distinctions, and skills so that what would frustrate others gives us opportunities for development.

1.3 Job Attitude

1.3.1 Conceptual Framework of Job Attitude:

The importance of attitudes in understanding psychological phenomenon was given formal recognition early in the history of social psychology. From the time of the concept’s entry into the language of psychology and till today the interest of researchers in the area of attitude and its measurement has been found growing rapidly. However, with the passage of time and advancement of scientific researches attitudes of people has been studied thoroughly by various methods. For instance, between the 1920s and up to the World War II, the attention of attitude researchers was directed principally towards definitional issues and attitude measurement. In addition, there were studies concerned with relationship of attitudes to some social variables. World War II brought with it a growing concern about the place of the attitude concept in understanding prejudice, particularly anti-semitism. This period also brought the measurement attitudes and opinions concerning various facts of soldiering and war. After the war, the subject of attitudes was taken up by various academicians, particularly in the context of attitude change. Till now, the researchers have developed a loosely structured theoretical framework formulating the psychological processes underlying’ attitude change and the direct application of the study of attitudes to the contemporary problems.

It wasn’t until the end of 20th century that many organizations encouraged employees to become decision makers and business team members. Being a partner in
the business, not just a pair of the callused hands and a strong back, became the new job description of the future. At the same time, as employees became more involved in business, organizations became more interested in keeping their employees attitudes positive. Up until then, employees may have talked about attitudes, however, a person’s attitude was often considered to be separate from his/ her job performance.

Campbell (1963) and Thurston (1928) have given a bit emphasis on cognitive, effective and behavioural elements of attitude space. These researchers have focused job satisfaction on judgment-based, cognitive evaluation of jobs on characteristics or futures of jobs and generally ignored affective antecedents of evaluations of jobs and episodic events that happen on jobs. The issues are not the narrow questions about affect or emotions as influences on Job Attitudes versus affective responses as components of a tripartite conception of attitudes. The issue is the cognitive emphasis that has ignored systematic consideration of affect and emotion as causes, components or consequences of job satisfactions (Weiss and Brief, in press).

The conceptual overlap between social attitudes and job satisfactions is apparent. Relations between social attitudes and behaviours and between job satisfaction and behaviours are an important difference. At the risk of oversimplification, social attitudes are typically weakly related to specific behaviours (Campbell, 1963; Eagley and Chaiken, 1993; Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1974, 1975; Wicker, 1969). Job Attitudes are generally reliably and moderately strongly related to relevant job behaviours. Eagley and Chaiken (1993) on the other hand, concluded that the relationship between attitudes and behaviours is reliable if members of other variables are taken into consideration.
Attitudes are propensities or tendencies to react in a favorable or unfavorable way toward an object. The object could be almost anything in the world around us. Attitudes reflect a person’s likes and dislikes toward other persons, objects, events and activities in their environment. Therefore, it makes sense to study and know about attitude because strong attitudes will very likely affect a person’s behaviour such as attitudes toward supervision, pay, benefits, promotion or anything that might trigger positive or negative reactions. Thus, employee’s satisfaction and attitudes represents one of the key areas for measuring organizational effectiveness.

Because of the importance of the links of the task, contextual and ethical performance with important measures of organizational effectiveness, one of the key goals of managers should be to create linkages between employee performance and their satisfaction. However, it is not always easy to change a person’s attitudes about their job. The reason is that, attitudes toward job may be only one important aspect of the person’s structure of attitudes. They might be linked strongly to other important ones, making them deeply embedded, and thereby limiting how much managers can succeed in altering the way employees feel and act. However, particular attitudes and satisfaction with the job can make change many thing quickly. Employees who are happy and productive one day can become dissatisfied and resentful overnight as a consequence of some managerial action. This is one of the reasons why many organizations pay close attention to attitudes by conducting periodic surveys of employees, and by seeking feedback in one or the other ways.

If we define attitudes as psychological tendencies expressed by cognitive, affective and behavioural evaluations of a particular entity, then in the study of job satisfaction different aspect of job or job as a whole become the target of the
evaluation. Doob (1947), Hull (1943), Thurstone (1928) and Fishbein and Ajzen (1974) have argued that when we identify individual’s attitudes toward an object, we have only identified their general orientation toward the object; we have not identified if or how they may choose to enact a specific behaviour regarding that object. Their attitude will, however, correspond to the centroid of a broad behavioural construct comprising much specific behaviour.

Fishbein and Ajzen (1974, 1975) further argued that we need to distinguish among attitudes toward an object, behaviour and behavioural intentions to carry out that act. Intentions, however related to behaviours. Smith et al. (1985) on the other hand referred to relations between intentions and behaviours as a reduction ad absurdum.

Robbins (1966) stated that attitudes are evaluative statements either favourable or unfavourable concerning objects, people and events. They reflect how one feels about something. When I say, “I like my job”, I am expressing my attitude about work.

Breckler (1984) says attitudes are not the same as values, but the two are interrelated. The attitudes have three components: cognition, affect and behaviour. The cognitive component of an attitude is a person’s beliefs, factual knowledge and the focal object of the attitude. Affective component of an attitude is the emotional or feeling segment of an attitude; and behavioural component of an attitude is an intention to behave in a certain way toward someone or something.

In the eyes of Keller (1997) a person can have thousands of attitudes, but most of the researches in organizational behaviour identified three important job related attitudes. They are job satisfaction, job involvement and Organizational Commitment. These work related attitudes tap positive or negative evaluations that employees hold about aspect of their work and its environment.
An attitude represents a summary evaluation of a psychological object (Ajzen, 2001), captured by such descriptions as good (vs. bad) or pleasant (vs. unpleasant). Early conceptualizations of attitudes mainly focused on this kind of affect for or against a psychological object (Thurstone, 1931). Subsequent conceptualizations, however, have broadened the scope of attitudes to include both a cognitive component and a behavioural predisposition (Katz and Stotland, 1959; Rosenberg and Hovland, 1960). The cognitive component consists of the beliefs, perceptions, and judgments associated with the target of the attitude (Edwards, 1990), whereas the behavioural component reflects the tendency of people to behave in ways that accord with their cognitions and affect toward an object (Ajzen, 2001).

Indeed, attitudes have been studied extensively in social psychology because of the general belief that changes in attitudes are often accompanied by changes in behaviours (Kim and Hunter, 1993). When an individual’s attitude toward an object becomes more favorable, he or she tends to exhibit behaviours toward the object, which are more favorable. Previous meta-analyses have found that the overall relationship between attitudes and behaviours (of all kinds) is .41 (Wallace, Paulson, Lord, and Bond, 2005).

Attitudes are hidden behind particular value judgments and beliefs. Attitudes are formed as patterns of behaviour and action towards the events of life. Thus, attitudes can be defined as being related to a side of the individual’s inner world, processes of enthusiasm and recognition that appear in connection with particular value judgments and beliefs (Eren, 2004).

Each attitude has cognitive, behavioural, and emotional components. The cognitive component shows the knowledge the individual has about a particular
attitude, the emotional component shows the like-dislike degree of the individual towards the attitude, and the behavioural component indicates the tendency of the individual to act in a direction which has evolved under the influence of the former two components (Baysal and Tekarslan, 2004). In this sense, attitude is expressing an emotional, social-psychological, and personal concept.

Job satisfaction is a cumulative phenomenon based on the formation of attitudes related to the job (Baysal and Tekarslan, 2004). In this way, job satisfaction is based on the attitude of the employee to his work, but it relates to a more extensive concept. While satisfactions outside the job are not included with the definition, they may affect job satisfaction. In this context, job satisfaction depends on the degree to which the individual’s job role complies with his cultural value system; it is also affected by his needs, emotions, and expectations.

According to Blasi et al. (1996) attitude to the job can contribute to job satisfaction, because job satisfaction is a general attitude that comprises several attitudes related to various fields. Job Attitude is the state of readiness to act according to job-related personal factors towards a particular objective.

According to Vroom (1964) job satisfaction and Job Attitude are identical and show the emotional reaction of the employees towards their existing job roles. However, this approach may not be appropriate because Job Attitude is one of the factors affecting job satisfaction. Job satisfaction appears as a general attitude formed by several effective attitudes from many areas. Job Attitude is the employee’s condition of readiness to act to achieve job related goals, determined by job related personal factors (Aycan et al., 1999).
Job Attitudes can be defined as summary evaluations of psychological objects in the work domain. There are at least three broad categories of Job Attitudes, which have been frequently studied by researchers: task-based attitudes, people-based attitudes, and organization-based attitudes. This tripartite typology mirrors the three categories used by Tett and Burnett (2003) in their personality– situation integrationist model of job performance. These authors suggest that employees interact with three levels of their work environments on a daily basis such as the task level, the social level, and the organizational level.

Task-based attitudes can be defined as summary evaluations of the job tasks and role duties, which employees perform in their organization. People-based attitudes on the other hand can be defined as summary evaluations of other individuals and groups in their social environment at work, such as supervisors, co-workers and clients. Organization-based attitudes can be defined as summary evaluations of the employer or the employment relationship itself.

Each of the three broad categories of Job Attitudes contains many specific Job Attitudes. There are no hard-and-fast criteria in the literature regarding which Job Attitudes should be included in a meta-analytic study. Here, it has been chosen to focus on the 35 Job Attitudes on which there has been the most research in the context of workplace. Table No. 1, 2 and 3 provides a brief summary of conceptual framework of Job Attitudes in the following manner as below mentioned such as task-based, people-based and organization-based respectively.
Table 1.1 provides a brief summary of conceptual framework of task-based Job Attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task-based attitudes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall job satisfaction</td>
<td>The pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job (Locke, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work itself</td>
<td>Feelings a worker has about job tasks (Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>Feelings a worker has about salary (Smith et al., 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>Feelings a worker has about advancement opportunities (Smith et al., 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic work motivation</td>
<td>The degree to which an employee is motivated to perform well because of some subjective rewards or feelings that he expects to experience as a result of performing well (Lawler, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job involvement</td>
<td>The psychological importance of work to the person’s identity (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job control</td>
<td>Employee perceptions that they have authority to make decisions on the job (Fox, Dwyer, and Ganster, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of psychological stressors, such as requirements for working fast and hard, having a great deal to do, not having enough time, and having conflicting demands (Fox et al., 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of lack of clarity about sent roles (Dougherty and Pritchard, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of incompatible expectations sent to them (Dougherty and Pritchard, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>Employee perceptions that expectations cannot be met in the time available (Dougherty and Pritchard, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>Feelings of being overextended and depleted of one’s emotional and physical resources (Maslach and Leiter, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>A negative, callous, or excessively detached response to various aspects of the job (Maslach and Leiter, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced personal accomplishment</td>
<td>Feelings of incompetence and a lack of achievement and productivity in work (Maslach and Leiter, 2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 provides a brief summary of conceptual framework of people-based Job Attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People-based attitudes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with coworkers</td>
<td>Feelings a worker has about coworkers (Smith et al., 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisors</td>
<td>Feelings a worker has about supervisors (Smith et al., 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of interpersonal incompatibility with coworkers or team members (Simons and Peterson, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust</td>
<td>The extent to which employees rely on words or promises of supervisors and coworkers (Colquitt, Scott, and LePine, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of politics</td>
<td>Employee perceptions that behaviours of others are strategically designed to maximize short-term or long-term self-interests (Parker, Dipboye, and Jackson, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader–member exchange</td>
<td>The extent to which employees perceive that leaders develop close or unique relationships with them (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction fairness</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of fairness of interpersonal treatment people receive as procedures are enacted (Colquitt, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker support</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of the extent to which coworkers or peers provide desirable resources to them (Chiaburu and Harrison, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>The extent to which employees feel their supervisors care about their well-being and value their contributions (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3 provides a brief summary of conceptual framework of organization-based Job Attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization-based attitudes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>The costs employees associate with leaving the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational identification</td>
<td>The extent to which employees incorporate the perception of oneself as a member of a particular organization into one’s general self-definition (Ashforth and Mael, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>The extent to which employees are supportive of organizational actions and willing to hope and wait for improvement at difficult times (Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, and Mainous, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person–organization fit</td>
<td>The extent to which an employee believes that his/her abilities match organizational requirements and his/her interests match organizational rewards (Kristof, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>The extent to which employees feel their organizations care about their well-being and value their contributions (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in organization</td>
<td>The extent to which employees are willing to be vulnerable to the organization or the top management team (Mayer and Gavin, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive fairness</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of fairness of outcomes received (Moorman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td>Employee perceptions of fairness of the procedures used to determine outcomes received (Moorman, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>The extent to which an employee perceives potential loss of continuity in a job situation (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological contract breach</td>
<td>Employee perceptions that organizations have failed to adequately fulfill the promises made (Morrison and Robinson, 1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task-Based Attitudes:

The task-based attitudes include (1) overall job satisfaction, (2) satisfaction with the work itself, (3) satisfaction with pay, (4) satisfaction with promotions, (5) intrinsic work motivation, (6) job involvement, (7) job control, (8) job demand, (9) role ambiguity, (10) role conflict, (11) role overload, (12) emotional exhaustion, (13) depersonalization, and (14) reduced personal accomplishment.

People-Based Attitudes:

The people-based attitudes included (1) satisfaction with co-workers, (2) satisfaction with supervisors, (3) relationship conflicts at work, (4) interpersonal trust at work, (5) perceptions of politics in the workplace, (6) leader–member exchange, (7) supervisor’s interaction fairness, (8) co-worker support, and (9) supervisor support.

Organization-Based Attitudes:

The organization-based attitudes include (1) Affective Commitment, (2) Normative Commitment, (3) Continuance Commitment, (4) organizational identification, (5) loyalty to the organization, (6) perceptions of person–organization fit, (7) perceived organizational support, (8) trust in the organization, (9) distributive fairness, (10) procedural fairness, (11) job insecurity, and (12) perceptions of psychological contract breaches. This tri-pirate definition of Job Attitude does include dimension like turnover intentions here because they have also been frequently used as a proxy for turnover behaviour in past research (Steel and Ovalle, 1984).

1.3.2 Components of Job Attitudes:

Attitudes can be understood more easily if they are viewed in terms of their components and dynamics in the following manner such as:
The Affective Component of Job Attitude: The basic way that we refer to attitudes is to say that they are “positive” or “negative”. The affective component is directly related with positive and negative thoughts of individual. It reflects liking or disliking, avidity and aversion of the individual towards an object, person or individual. Strong and important attitudes are more likely related to a behavioural or psychological response as compared to weak attitudes itself.

The Object Component of Job Attitude: Attitudes always apply to some identifiable object. People have attitudes about something or someone, for example, toward the federal government, their supervisor, their job, or the use of seat belts. It is not technically accurate to say whether someone has a good attitude or a bad attitude without specifying the object of the attitude. Thus, the object of attitude must be clear to a person.

The Cognitive Component of Job Attitude: The cognitive component of the attitude develops as a result of things that we observe in the world around us that we associate, positively or negatively, with the object of the attitude. These are called the cognitive dimension of attitude. If we take the example of attitudes toward the job, or job satisfaction, some of the cognitive components that we might associate with it could be your pay, the actual working condition, the parking facilities, the hours that you work, and so on. What is important is that your specific attitude toward your job will be a function of perceptions and evaluation about these factors. Another person might have a different set of cognition associated with work; he/ she might even be in a job very similar to yours and even in the same firm. For instance, if they are not highly committed to the work, they might focus on the amount of time available for vacation, the hours worked, the level of strict versus loose supervision. The key point is that
these relevant cognition about work can vary from person to person, in a large part depending upon their personality and how they viewed the world.

**Values and Beliefs Component of Job Attitude** : Values reflect a sense of right and wrong. Values are more general than attitudes, and they need not have an identifiable object. They define the good life and identify goals worthy of our aspiration. Values are expressed in statements such as “equal rights for all” and “hard work is the road to success.”

On the other hand beliefs are thinking components of attitudes. They do not refer to favorable or unfavorable reactions; they only convey a sense of “what is” to the person (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). However, beliefs may not necessarily be factual even though they present the truth for a particular person. Beliefs also can vary in how absolute they are. One might believe that nuclear power plants are all unsafe, or believe that this is only sometime true.

Values underlie attitudes are usually consistent with them. Cognitions are evaluated against values and beliefs are formed about whether they are positive or negative. When there are strong positive beliefs about those cognitions that we associate with our work, then these beliefs and values should lead to a positive feeling about work. If they are negative, our attitudes about work may be negative. If they are mixed, then we might have an indifferent attitude about work.

**Attitudes and Intentions Component of Job Attitude** : Managers are concerned about the attitudes of their subordinates towards the job they perform which might lead to take some necessary action. Suppose subordinates attitudes toward their job are negative and they are frustrated because of what they judge to be low pay and poor working condition. This could foster intentions, or motivate them, to seek promotion to
a job where pay is higher and conditions are better, or may be even to seek a job elsewhere, their choice will depend on which alternative they feel have the greatest likelihood of success.

**Attitudes and Overt Behaviour Component of Job Attitude** : Attitudes often lead to overt behaviours, but not always. Except for behaviour, all other aspects of attitudes are internal to the person; they are not observable. The behavioural component of attitudes is important because people draw inferences about attitudes, beliefs, values and intentions by observing what you say and what you do. For example, if you have a co-worker who has been spending a great deal of time working late at the office, you might infer that he or she has a very positive attitude toward work and the company.

**1.3.3 Psychological Functions of Job Attitudes** :

Mostly it has been marked that attitudes renders some useful and important functions for people in general and employees doing their job in their respective organization/company. For example, suppose someone on your work team that you admire and look upto comes under attack in a staff meeting by a team from another department. Your positive attitudes toward her and things she stands for will help you to come to her and even your own defense. In doing so, you protect your self-image and have motive to express the values that you and your friend spouse. Your attitude toward the attackers could shift toward the negative, providing you an even stronger justification about how to deal with them about future. However, these are some important functions of attitudes such as :

**Frame of Reference** : Attitudes help us to make sense of the world by giving us a frame of reference from which to interpret our world. We selectively perceive only a
part of the total world around us. We are likely to select those facts that are consistent with our attitudes and ignore or discount those that are not.

**Expressed Values**: People express values through their attitudes. Words and actions demonstrate our values and allow us to share them with others and to affect the world in which we live. Strong democratic values might emerge at work in staff meetings where employees are given a chance to participate in solving a problem or making a decision.

**Protection of Ego**: Attitudes help us to protect our ego. It also helps us to maintain our self-image and self-respect. For example, a manager might have feelings of superiority regarding subordinates. An attitude that subordinates are lazy and not trustworthy, or that they are not trained well enough to assume much responsibility, probably tends to enhance the manager’s feelings of superiority.

**Reconciling Contradictions**: Attitudes can facilitate reconciling contradictions. Most of us have some contradictory attitudes or beliefs, yet, in many instances, these inconsistencies do not cause us to feel uneasy or have a sense of dissonance. This happens when the contradictions between inconsistent beliefs, behaviours or attitudes are reconciled by compartmentalization. We are able to place the contradictions in separate compartments and not connect them, thereby reconciling them (Judge, Boudreau and Bretz, 1994).

**Personal Adjustment**: Attitudes aid in personal adjustment. We tend to develop attitudes consistent with those parts of our life we find satisfying or dissatisfying. For example, blue-collar workers may be more favourable to political parties which support higher wages, more protectionist trade policies, and better health benefits in general since these might be viewed by workers as being more valuable to them. Similarly you
would expect executives in oil companies to have more favourable attitudes toward politicians who favour more offshore drilling or increased exploration in national parks.

1.4 Organizational Commitment

1.4.1 Conceptual Framework of Organizational Commitment:

The concept of Organizational Commitment has grown in popularity in the literature on industrial and organizational psychology (Cohen, 2003). Early studies on Organizational Commitment viewed the concept as a single dimension, based on an attitudinal perspective, embracing identification, involvement and loyalty (Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, 1974). According to Porter et al (1974) an attitudinal perspective refers to the psychological attachment or Affective Commitment formed by an employee in relation to his identification and involvement with their respective organization.

Porter et al. (1974) further describes Organizational Commitment as ‘an attachment to the organization, characterized by an intention to remain in it; identification with the values and goals of the organization and a willingness to exert extra effort on its behalf’. Individuals consider the extent to which their own values and goals relate to that of the organization as part of Organizational Commitment. Therefore, it is considered to the linkage between the individual employee and the organization.

Another perspective on Organizational Commitment is the ‘exchanged-based definition’ or “side-bet theory (Becker, 1960). This theory holds that individuals are committed to the organization as far as they hold their positions, irrespective of the stressful conditions they experience.
Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) support the “side-bet” theory by describing Organizational Commitment as a behaviour “relating to the process by which individuals become locked into a certain organization and how they deal with this problem”. This behavioural aspect of Organizational Commitment is explained in terms of calculative and Normative Commitments.

The calculative or normative perspective refers to an employee’s commitment to continue working for the organization based on the notion of weighing cost-benefits of leaving an organization (Hrebiniak and Alutfo, 1972). Wiener and Vardi (1980) describe Organizational Commitment as “behavioural intention or reaction determined by the individual’s perception of the normative pressure”.

Meyer and Allen (1984) initially viewed Organizational Commitment as two-dimensional namely, affective and continuance. Meyer and Allen (1984) defined the first dimension namely Affective Commitment as “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to and involvement in the work organization”, and they defined the second dimension, namely Continuance Commitment as “the extent to which employees feel committed to their organization by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving”. After these dimensions, Allen and Meyer (1990) added a third new dimension known as Normative Commitment.

Allen and Meyer (1990) define Normative Commitment as “the employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organization”. Consequently! The concept Organizational Commitment is described as a tri-dimensional concept, characterized by the affective, continuance and normative dimensions (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Common to the three dimensions of Organizational Commitment is the view that Organizational Commitment is a psychological state that characterizes
organizational members’ relationship with the organization and implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

The concept of Organizational Commitment can be better understood and narrated in the following manner such as: According to Kanter (1968) Organizational Commitment can be defined as the willingness of workers to devote energy and loyalty to an organization. In general terms, Organizational Commitment is “a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a definite desire to maintain organizational membership” (Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian 1974).

O’Reilly (1989) defines Organizational Commitment as “an individual’s psychological bond to the organization including a sense of job involvement, loyalty and belief in the values of the organization”. Organizational Commitment from this point of view is characterized by employee’s acceptance of organizational goals and their willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization (Miller and Lee, 2001).

Cohen (2003) viewed that “commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets”. This general description of commitment relates to the definition of Organizational Commitment by Arnold (2005) namely that it is “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization”.

Miller (2003) also viewed that Organizational Commitment is “a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization”. Organizational Commitment is therefore, the degree in which an employee is willing to maintain membership due to interest and association with the organization’s goals and values.
In addition, Morrow (1993) describes Organizational Commitment as characterized by attitude and behaviour. Miller (2003) describes an attitude as “evaluative statements or judgments - either favourable or unfavourable - concerning a phenomenon”. Organizational Commitment as an attitude reflects feelings such as attachment, identification and loyalty to the organization as an object of commitment (Morrow, 1993). Meyer, Allen and Gellantly (1990) also suggested that Organizational Commitment as an attitude is characterized by a favourable positive cognitive and affective component about the organization”.

The second characteristic that is used to describe the concept Organizational Commitment is behaviour (Morrow, 1993). Best (1994) maintains that “committed individuals enact specific behaviours due to the belief that it is morally correct rather than personally beneficial”. Reichers (1985) was of the opinion that Organizational Commitment as behaviour is visible when organizational members are committed to existing groups within the organization. Therefore, Organizational Commitment is a state of being, in which organizational members are bound by their actions and beliefs that sustain their activities and their own involvement in the organization (Miller and Lee, 2001).

The adopted definition for this study corresponds with definitions by Meyer and Allen (1991) mentioned above. According to this definition Organizational Commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization”.

Recently, Maume (2006) stated that “Organizational Commitment is typically measured by items tapping respondents’ willingness to work hard to improve their
companies, the fit between the firm’s and the worker’s values, reluctance to leave and loyalty toward pride taken in working for their employers”, provide a better picture of Organizational Commitment in work settings.

1.4.2 Models of Organizational Commitment:

Meyer and Allen (1997) use the tri-dimensional model to conceptualize Organizational Commitment in three different dimensions namely, Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitments. These dimensions describe the different ways of Organizational Commitment development and the implications for employees’ behaviour.

Figure 1.1 presents the tri-dimensional model of Organizational Commitment in the following manner:
**Affective Commitment Dimension**: The first dimension of Organizational Commitment in the model is Affective Commitment, which represents the individual’s emotional attachment to the organization. According to Meyer and Allen (1997) Affective Commitment is “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization”. Organizational members, who are committed to an organization on an affective basis, continue working for the organization because they want to (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Members who are committed on an affective level stay with the organization because they view their personal employment relationship as congruent to the goals and values of the organization (Beck and Wilson, 2000).

Affective Commitment is a work related attitude with positive feelings towards the organization (Morrow, 1993). Sheldon (1971) also maintains that this type of attitude is “an orientation towards the organization, which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization”. Affective Commitment is the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday et al, 1982).

The strength of affective Organizational Commitment is influenced by the extent to which the individual’s needs and expectations about the organization are matched by their actual experience (Storey, 1995). Tetrick (1995) also describes Affective Commitment as “value rationality-based Organizational Commitment, which refers to the degree of value congruence between an organizational member and an organization”.

The Organizational Commitment model of Meyer and Allen (1997) indicates that Affective Commitment is influenced by factors such as job challenge, role clarity,
goal clarity and goal difficulty, receptiveness by management, peer cohesion, equity, personal importance, feedback, participation, and dependability.

Affective Commitment development involves identification and internalization (Beck and Wilson, 2000). Individuals’ affective attachment to their organizations is firstly based on identification with the desire to establish a rewarding relationship with an organization. Secondly, through internalization, this refers to congruent goals and values held by individuals and the organization. In general, affective Organizational Commitment is concerned with the extent to which an individual identifies with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

**Continuance Commitment Dimension**: The second dimension of the tri-dimensional model of Organizational Commitment is Continuance Commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997) define Continuance Commitment as “awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization”. It is calculative in nature because of the individual’s perception or weighing of costs and risks associated with leaving the current organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1991) further state that “employees whose primary link to the organization is based on Continuance Commitment remain because they need to do so’. This indicates the difference between continuance and Affective Commitment. The latter entails that individual’s stay in the organization because they want to.

Continuance Commitment can be regarded as an instrumental attachment to the organization, where the individual’s association with the organization is based on an assessment of economic benefits gained (Beck and Wilson, 2000). Organizational members develop commitment to an organization because of the positive extrinsic
rewards obtained through the effort-bargain without identifying with the organization’s goals and values.

The strength of Continuance Commitment, which implies the need to stay, is determined by the perceived costs of leaving the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1984). Best (1994) indicates that “Continuance Organizational Commitment will therefore be the strongest when availability of alternatives are few and the number of investments are high”. This argument supports the view that when given better alternatives, employees may leave the organization.

Meyer et al (1990) also maintain that “accrued investments and poor employment alternatives tend to force individuals to maintain their line of action and are responsible for these individuals being committed because they need to”. This implies that individuals stay in the organization, because they are lured by other accumulated investments which they could loose, such as pension plans, seniority or organization specific skills.

The need to stay is “profit” associated with continued participation and termination of service is a “cost” associated with leaving. Tetrick (1995) support the profit notion by describing the concept Continuance Organizational Commitment as “an exchange framework, whereby performance and loyalty are offered in return for material benefits and rewards”. Therefore, in order to retain employees who are continuance committed, the organization needs to give more attention and recognition to those elements that boost the employee’s morale to be affectively committed.

Normative Commitment Dimension: The last dimension of the Organizational Commitment model is known as Normative Commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997) define Normative Commitment as “a feeling of obligation to continue employment”.
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Internalized normative beliefs of duty and obligation make individuals obliged to sustain membership in the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). According to Meyer and Allen (1991) “employees with Normative Commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization”. In terms of the normative dimension, the employees stay because they should do so or it is the proper thing to do.

Wiener and Vardi (1980) describe Normative Commitment as “the work behaviour of individuals, guided by a sense of duty, obligation and loyalty towards the organization”. Organizational members are committed to an organization based on moral reasons (Iverson and Buttigieg, 1999). The normative committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the organization, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the organization gives him or her over the years.

The strength of normative Organizational Commitment is influenced by accepted rules about reciprocal obligation between the organization and its members (Suliman and Ilies, 2000). The reciprocal obligation is based on the social exchange theory, which suggests that a person receiving a benefit is under a strong normative obligation or rule to repay the benefit in some way (McDonald and Makin, 2000). This implies that individuals often feel an obligation to repay the organization for investing in them, for example through training and development.

Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that “this moral obligation arises either through the process of socialization within the society or the organization”. In either case it is based on a norm of reciprocity, in other words if the employee receives a benefit, it places him or her, or the organization under the moral obligation to respond in kindness.
1.4.3 Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment:

There are varieties of factors that shape Organizational Commitment such as: job-related factors; employment opportunities; personal characteristics; positive relationships; organizational structure and management style.

**Job-related factors**: Organizational Commitment is an important job-related outcome at the individual level which may have an impact on other job-related outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism, job effort, job role and performance vise versa (Randall, 1990). The job role that is ambiguous may lead to lack of commitment to the organization and promotional opportunities can also enhance or diminish Organizational Commitment (Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller, 1996).

Other job factors that could have an impact on commitment are the level of responsibility and autonomy. Baron and Greenberg (1990) state that “the higher the level of responsibility and autonomy connected with a given job, the lesser repetitive and more interesting it is, and the higher the level of commitment expressed by the person who fill it”.

**Employment Opportunities**: The existence of employment opportunities can also affect Organizational Commitment (Curry et. al., 1996). Individuals who have a strong perception that they stand a chance of finding another job may become less committed to the organization as they ponder on such desirable alternatives. Where there is lack of other employment opportunities, there is a tendency of high level of Organizational Commitment (Vandenberghhe, 1996). As a result, membership in the organization is based on Continuance Commitment, where employees are continuously calculating the risks of remaining and leaving (Meyer and Allen, 1997).
**Personal Characteristics**: Organizational Commitment can also be affected positively by the employee’s personal characteristics such as age, years of service and gender (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Baron and Greenberg (1990) state that “older employees, those with tenure or seniority, and those who are satisfied with their own levels of work performance tend to report higher levels of Organizational Commitment than others”. This implies that older people are seen to be more committed to the organization than other age groups.

Another personal characteristic that may affect Organizational Commitment in a more positive way is associated with gender (Meyer and Allen, 1997). However, it is argued that gender differences in commitment are due to different work characteristics and experiences that are linked to gender (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

**Work Environment**: The working environment is also identified as another factor that affects Organizational Commitment. One of the common working environmental conditions that may affect Organizational Commitment positively is partial ownership of a company. Ownership of any kind gives employees a sense of importance and they feel part of the decision-making process (Klein, 1987). This concept of ownership which includes participation in decision-making on new developments and changes in the working practices creates a sense of belonging (Armstrong, 1995). A study conducted by Subramaniam and Mia (2001) also indicates that managers who participate in budget decision-making tend to have a high level of organization at commitment.

Another factor within the work environment that may affect Organizational Commitment is work practices in relation to recruitment and selection, performance appraisal, promotions and management style (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Metcalfe and
Dick (2001) in their study conclude that the low level of Organizational Commitment of constables could be attributed to inappropriate selection and promotion which lead to the perpetuation of managerial style and behaviour that has a negative effect on Organizational Commitment of subordinates”.

**Positive Relationships**: The organization as a workplace environment is built up of working relationships; one of which is the supervisory relationship. According to Randall (1990) ‘the supervisory relationship can affect Organizational Commitment either positively or negatively”. A positive supervisory relationship depends on how work-related practices such as performance management are being implemented in the organization (Randall, 1990). When individuals find the supervisory relationship to be fair in its practices, they tend to be more committed to the organization (Benkhoff, 1997).

Other work relationships, such as teams or groups, which exist in the workplace, can affect Organizational Commitment. Organizational members can demonstrate commitment when they are able to find value through work relationships (Mathieu and Zajac. 1990). Brooke, Russell and Price (1988) state that employee commitment and attachment to the organization can be increased through efforts made to improve the organizations social atmosphere and sense of purpose”. In essence, when work relationships reflect mutual respect to individuals, they are able to commit themselves to the organization.

**Organizational Structure**: It is true to emphasize that organizational structure also plays an important role in its commitment. Bureaucratic structures tend to have a negative effect on Organizational Commitment. Zeffanne (1994) viewed that removal of bureaucratic barriers and the creation of more flexible structure are more likely to
contribute to the enhancement of employee commitment both in terms of their loyalty and attachment to the organization”. The management can increase the level of commitment by providing the employees with greater direction and influence (Storey, 1995).

**Management Style**: It was stated by Zeffanne (1994) that “the answer to the question of employee commitment, morale, loyalty and attachment may consist not only in providing motivators, but also to remove de-motivators such as styles of management not suited to their context and to contemporary employee aspirations”. A management style that encourages employee involvement can help to satisfy employee’s desire for empowerment and demand for a commitment to organizational goals.

Gaertner (1999) argued that “more flexible and participatory management styles can strongly and positively enhance Organizational Commitment”. Organizations need to ensure that their management strategies are aimed at improving employee commitment rather than compliance (William and Anderson, 1991).

**1.4.4 Effects of Organizational Commitment**: Organizational Commitment can have either a negative or a positive after effect in the following order in organization:

**Negative Effect of Low Level Organizational Commitment**: The negative effect implies that the level of Organizational Commitment is low. Employees with a low level of Organizational Commitment tend to be unproductive and some become loafers at work (Morrow, 1993).

Lowman (1993) states that Organizational Commitment can be regarded as “work dysfunction when it is characterised by under-commitment and over-
commitment”. The following are the characteristics of over-commitment and under-commitment according to Lowman (1993).

Table 1.4 indicates some important characteristics of over-commitment and under-commitment (Lowman, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under-commitment</th>
<th>Over- commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of success.</td>
<td>Overly loyal employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of failure.</td>
<td>Job and occupational burnout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic and persistent Procrastination.</td>
<td>Obsessive-compulsive patterns at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative cultural, familial and personality factors.</td>
<td>Neurotic compulsion to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic and persistent underachievement.</td>
<td>Extreme high level of energy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In certain cases the high rate of staff turnover and absenteeism are associated with the low level of Organizational Commitment (Morrow, 1993). Cohen (2003) motivates that “lack of Organizational Commitment or loyalty is cited as an explanation of employee absenteeism, turnover, reduced effort expenditure, theft, job dissatisfaction and unwillingness to relocate”.

Organizational Commitment is regarded to be the best predictor of employees’ turnover, than the far more frequently used job satisfaction predictor (Miller, 2003). Given the fact that employees who operate in a Continuance Commitment dimension are calculative of their stay, one would deduce that such employees may continuously stay away from work when they feel like, doing so.

Positive Effect of Organizational Commitment: Committed organizational members contribute positively to the organization which is not the case with less committed members. Cohen (2003) states that “organizations whose members have higher levels of commitment show higher performance and productivity and lower levels of 
absenteeism and tardiness”. This implies that employees with a high level of
commitment tend to take greater efforts to perform and invest their resources in the
organization (Sall and Knight, 1987).

Organizational Commitment can result in a stable and productive workforce
(Morrow, 1993). It enables employees to release their creativity and to contribute
towards organizational development initiatives (Walton, 1985). Employees who are
highly committed do not leave the organization because they are dissatisfied and tend
to take challenging work activities (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Committed members are
normally achievement and innovative orientated with the ultimate aim of engaging in
and improving performance (Morrow, 1993).

Other positive effects of Organizational Commitment include feelings of
affiliation, attachment and citizenship behaviour, which tend to improve organizational
efficiency and effectiveness (Williams and Anderson, 1991). Affectively and
normatively committed members are more likely to maintain organizational
membership and contribute to the success of the organization than continuance
committed members (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

1.4.5 Managing Organizational Commitment:

Organizations are continuously faced with the demand and supply challenges of
the changing market. In order for the organization to adapt to the intense competition in
the market place and the rapid changes in technology, it requires organizational
members have to be internally committed (Miller, 2003). The organization is then faced
with a challenge of managing its employees’ commitment throughout, to ensure
sustainability in the organization.
O’ Reilly (1989) states that “to understand what commitment is and how it is developed, is by understanding the underlying psychology of commitment so that we can think about how to design systems to develop such an attachment among employees”. It is therefore crucial for the organization to first understand commitment in order to manage it.

According to Arnold (2005) Organizational Commitment can be fostered by giving individuals positive experiences”. A study by Finegan (2000) suggests that Affective Commitment correlates with an organization perceived to value humanity, while the value of convention is correlated with Continuance Commitment.

Goss (1994) is of the opinion that the structural and job design techniques can be used to foster Organizational Commitment in the following ways:

- Firstly, structural technique involves a flat organizational structure that limits hierarchical order of reporting and encourages one on one contact. It also encourages the coordination of shared goals and communication in the organization that is both horizontal and vertical, thereby reaching all levels.

- Secondly, job design related techniques focus mainly on allowing employees to be involved in the decision-making processes and it emphasizes the importance of work teams.

Another important mechanism to manage Organizational Commitment is through substantial human resource policies and practices that are fair. Meyer and Allen (1997) argue that “one way that organizational fairness is communicated is through the development and enactment of specific policies and procedures that are and are seen to be fair”.
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This link implies that the employees’ perceptions of human resources policies and practices lead to the development of a particular dimension of Organizational Commitment. Human resources policies and practices that are perceived to enhance employees’ self worth tend to lead to Affective Commitment to the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

On the other hand, Continuance Commitment is due to perceived cost of loss in human resources practices; while Normative Commitment is due to the perceived need to reciprocate (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen (1997) suggest that when implementing human resources policies and practices as a strategy to manage Organizational Commitment, it is important to consider the following:

- Firstly, that interests of the organization and organizational members do not necessarily coincide.
Secondly, management must not define and communicate values in such a way that inhibit flexibility, creativity and the ability to adapt to change.

Thirdly, not too much should be expected from campaigns to increase Organizational Commitment.

Leaders in the organization have an important role to play in developing the needed Organizational Commitment. Tjosvold, Sasaki and Moy (1998) maintain that “the three possible ways to enhance Organizational Commitment such as the employees’ need for fulfillment; their self-esteem; and social support”. This strategy is not an attempt by leadership to manipulate employees to accept management values and goals. In essence, when organizations trust and treat employees like adults, they develop a sense of belonging, as a result employees respond with total commitment to the organization (Finegan, 2000).

The traditional way to build Organizational Commitment or loyalty by offering job security and regular promotions is becoming impractical for many organizations (Arnold, 2005). Another way of managing Organizational Commitment is through resuscitating the survivors of change due to restructuring (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Organizational change through restructuring often involves significant downsizing and thus has a negative impact on the survivor’s moral and Organizational Commitment.