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The rise of industrial revolution in the mid-18th century in England, gradually spread throughout the world, though, there had been varied pace of industrial development in different countries. Industrial revolution has not only witnessed rapid change in technological advancement but, however, it highly influenced society too and thereby, changed human values and people's life style.

Modern industrial organizations are giving major emphasis on the utilization of human resources. It is beyond doubt to say that human resource is the key element for industrial productive efficiency, although, other elements - financial, technological, information, and material resources are also necessarily important for productive outcome.

In the world of work, human behaviour has always been considered important for productive efficiency in both qualitative and quantitative terms. Human efficiency at work is one of the most important key element of all resources for manufacturing and moreover, for discharging other responsibilities with whom job incumbents' are entrusted with. Therefore, it is evident from historical perspective that Taylor - a pioneer of the development of industrial psychology showed interest in employees efficiency at work. Taylor's efforts, inspite of getting a lot of criticisms, received widespread popularity and acceptance among industrialists,
psychologists and other social scientists. Taylorism (Scientific Management Principles) was the milestone for the beginning of a new area of psychology namely, Industrial Psychology. Taylor's contributions are still alive although, it later passed through various phases ranging from the emphasis on human relation aspects, job motivation, job satisfaction to the present craving of improving employee's quality of work life. All these efforts were made to reduce intra-individual, interpersonal, inter-group and organizational conflicts in general and however, to enhance job incumbents' motivation, satisfaction, commitment, involvement and other work related behaviour.

It is also witnessed from the history of industrial psychology that Taylors' management-oriented system after heavy criticisms changed to employee-oriented system. The later system i.e. employee-oriented approach started in 1924 by Elton Mayo's famous Howthorne experiments which greatly emphasized to the concept of job humanization and subsequently gave rise to a movement called "human relation movement". The great pioneers of this movement - Mayo, Roethlisberger, and Dickson had pointed out the importance of physical working conditions and supervisory behaviour conducive for effective organizational functioning and efficient work performance as well. However, employee-oriented management approach
later received increasing importance not only from management side but, in fact, it highly attracted employees for getting their psycho-social needs easily satisfied under such system. It was really the effect of human relation movement that human motivation at work place attracted the attention of psychologists, managers, supervisors and other behavioural scientists. Since we are not concerned here with job motivation, as the objective of the present larger investigation has been to study job involvement with reference to certain biographical variables and QWL but inspite of this reality it is highly important to mention the concept of job motivation and its related studies as it will provide a logical ground for highlighting the events in which job involvement, concept and studies began. It is therefore imperative to point out that job motivation theories started coming up to dig-out and explain several factors of productively efficient human behaviour at work, hence human motivation theories though appeared for the first time in 1943 and later it applied in 1954 as a theory of job motivation and satisfaction (Maslowian Need-Hierarchy theory). Thereafter, one after the other, job motivation theories started pouring in,for providing information with regard to wide range of factors determining employees motivation and satisfaction at work.
Motivational behaviour plays significant role in all walks of human life. It has its very important and inevitable role in work situation too as macro level understanding considers motivation as prime factor for efficient and productive performance. Empirically evidences clearly advocate that performance is proportionally related to motivation, i.e. high motivation leads to high performance and low motivation to low performance. Therefore, it is pertinent to mention a saying that, "you can take the horse into water but you can not make him drink unless the horse is thirsty". This saying clearly points out the importance of motivation for any desired activity, thus, people will not work unless they are prepared to or have the will to work and level of performance is most likely to be determined by the strength of motivation.

Vitles (1962) point out the importance of human interest as well as their motivation at work in his book entitled "Motivation and Morale in Industry". The significance of human motivation, indeed, cannot be overlooked as behind every human activity there are some motives that act as motivating force resulting behaviour.

The very basic element in motivational process is the creation and activation of motives or needs. A motive—an internal activator keeps the organism engaged in performing certain activity in quest of maintaining
organismic equilibrium, hence, nature of need determines the goal to be achieved. Therefore, motivation is a goal-directed behaviour. Jones (1995) maintained that motivation is concerned with how behaviour gets started, energized, sustained directed, stopped and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on. But the Industrial psychologists have been somewhat more definitive. Vroom (1964) defines motivation "as a process governing choices, made by persons or lower organism, among alternative forms of voluntary activity". While Dubin (1970) refers "motivation is the complex of forces starting and keeping a person at work in an organization". Halloran (1978) explaining motivation in very simple words contends that "motivation is an internal need satisfied by external expression". Job Motivation can also be described as the degree of intensity of employees' behaviour in the work situation as they strike to satisfy their particular need structure through the work they are doing. Thus, job motivation is likely to be determined by following three factors:

i) need structure of employees.

ii) perceived opportunity to satisfy needs at work and

iii) perceived opportunity to satisfy needs off-the-work situation.

The above aspects highlight the importance of both on-the-job and off-the-job factors as these either
independently or in conjunction with each other are likely to become instrumental to determine employees' level of motivation of work.

In view of the facts, it is very explicit that managers must be aware of employees' needs or need structure which might provide adequate informations to managers for designing appropriate managerial directing and controlling their subordinates.

Taylor had advocated that the primary reason for the people to work is only to earn money or living but later this simplified assumption regarding human motivation for working was ultimately rejected. It is, no doubt, that money is important for everyone because it is the only medium through which things can be exchanged in this modern age but in no way this is the only reason in context of which merely people work. People have different and numerous motives which either independently or in conjunction thereof determine and influence human motivation. Priorities of motive or motives depend upon the importance and strength of motive/motives in a given time. In the light of human nature there have been four managerial assumptions about people at work, which highlight numerous needs that dominate employees in which context they work. These assumptions are being highlighted in chronological order. The first assumption is termed as 'Economic Man Model'. It gives more importance to economic
rewards. Adam Smith put forth equity theory and in his view people primarily work for money. The 'Economic Man Model' which was later modified by Taylor (1911) and renamed as 'Rational Economic Man Model'. This model states that by nature human beings are lethargic, they do not want to work unless they are forced to work. Therefore, for such reasons they could not be motivated through financial rewards/incentives to attain requisite level of work efficiency and moreover, for such people more effective supervisory strategy which is suggested is tight vigilance and very close supervision. Weber (1946) also believed money as primary motivator for the individual. Opsapl and Dunnette (1966) tried to explain the role of money as an incentive. They discussed five functions of money with regard to performance. These are (i) money as a generalized conditioned reinforcer (ii) Money as a conditioned incentive (iii) Money as an anxiety reducer (iv) Money as a hygiene factor and (v) Money as a means of intrumentality.

Rational economic man assumption can be validated by our day to day observation, especially, in our own socio-cultural milieu. People who fit on this model are always highly calculative in nature. They only perform such activities that may give them greatest economic reward. It plays crucial role at all the levels of organization but is more evident at low levels of
organizational hierarchy. Srivastava (1985) found that higher wages would induce greater motivation among workers to keep them dynamically more and more active at work while Verma (1978) pointed out that money does not only fulfill physiological needs but it also ensures the fulfillment of higher order needs. The rational economic man assumption was highly criticised by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Trist and Bamforth (1951), Mayo (1945), Homans (1950), and Trist, Higgin, Murray & Pollock (1963) on the ground that although economic incentives are essential but social needs are important too.

Thus, in the light of heavy criticisms again rational-economic-man model, 'Social Man Model' came into prominence. Zaleznik et al. (1958) found that worker's both productivity and satisfaction were unrelated to individuals pay and job status but were related to group membership. In 1954, Seashore found higher group cohesiveness associated with high productivity and sense of confidence in management.

Relevance of social factors at work place is evident from many researches specially carried out by Jasinsky (1956), Walker and Guest (1952), and Schrank's (1978).

The third assumption is of 'Self-Actualizing Man'. Maslow (1954) McGregor (1969), and Argyris (1964) pointed out that workers are likely to be alienated because
sometimes the work they are asked to perform, do not permit them to use skills and capacities in a mature and productive way.

The last assumption is that of 'Complex Man' which assumes, man is not only complex within himself but he is also likely to differ from his neighbours, friends, and relatives in the patterns of his/her own complexity. In one study, Vroom and Mann (1969) found that workers with different personalities preferred different leadership styles in their supervisors. The studies of Grusky (1962) Argyris (1964), Lawler (1971; 1975) and Pigors and Myers (1977) have supported this complex man model.

With regard to job motivation, a number of theories have also been propounded which can be classified broadly in two categories given as under:

(i) Content Theories: Theories associated with human needs which include Maslow's need hierarchy and Herzberg's two factor theories.

(ii) Process Theories: These includes Vroom's theory of instrumentality and Porter and Lawler's multivariate model.

Maslow - a clinical psychologist and a social scientist as well, originally proposed a "Need Hierarchy Theory" of motivation in 1943 which was applied as a theory of job motivation in 1954. Maslow in his theory proposes that human needs can be arranged in a
hierarchical order. Once the lower order needs are satisfied, need next in order of hierarchy come into prominence and so on. Need hierarchy theory which Maslow proposed starts from the very basic physiological needs. The next need in hierarchy is that of security need, third one is that of social need, the fourth one is esteem need, and the last of all of need-hierarchy theory is that of self-actualization need. According to Maslowian need hierarchy theory once the physiological needs are adequately satisfied then next need in hierarchy come into prominence and the same way, needs one after the other in hierarchy emerges. It is again important to point out that adequate fulfilment of a need in hierarchy is a necessary condition for the emergence of the next higher order need.

Studies such as Hall and Naugain (1964), Castello and Sang (1974), Vig (1978) did not find strong support for the need hierarchy theory. Some others have also criticised need hierarchy theory on the basis of empirical findings. Such studies like Raymond and William (1968); Kumar and Bharguvathi (1989); Mathur and Khurana (1990) who did not find the occurrence of the needs in the same order as proposed by Maslow.

Maslowian approach was reformulated by Alderfer (1969, 1972). He modified and reduced five levels of needs into three namely, (i) existence needs, (2) relatedness needs and (3) growth needs. Therefore, his model is known as ERG theory. Sufficient empirical evidences have not
been found to verify Alderfer's approach but finding of the study made by Raushberger, Schmidt and Hunter (1980) refuted Alderfer's approach.

Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwel (1957) for the first time questioned the basic assumption of linear continuum because till 1950s researches on human motivation had been on traditional lines and motives were supposed to be lying along a continuum, the one end of which was satisfaction and the other end dissatisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) on the basis of the findings advocated that there are two different sets of factors, one set of factors is responsible for motivation and satisfaction whereas, other set of factors lead to only dissatisfaction and lower motivation. The former set of factors is called as either 'content factors', 'motivators' or 'intrinsic factors'. Herzberg meant that these are inherent either in the individual's personality or in the work itself. These factors include achievement, recognition, responsibility advancement, the work itself etc. In view of Herzberg and his associates, contrary to satisfiers, there is other set of factors which is only responsible for dissatisfaction and lack of motivation which is called as dissatisfiers', 'hygiene', 'context', and 'extrinsic factors'. These factors that lie outside the job itself include status, job security, company policy, quality of supervision, supervisory relations,
peer-group relations, pay, working conditions, etc.

Survey of available studies in quest of verifying Herzberg's two-factor theory which are being presented here in the chronological order. The studies can be broadly grouped under three categories on the basis of methodology used and results obtained. These are - 1(A) Studies generally supportive of the two factor theory employing Herzberg's methodology or modified form of it (Schwartz, Jannsaitis and Stark, 1963; Saleh, 1964; Herzberg, 1965; Herzberg, 1968; Dayal and Saiyadin, 1970). 1(B) Studies generally supportive of the two-factor theory employing a methodology different than that of Herzberg (Friedlander and Walton, 1964); House and Wigder, 1967). 2(A) Studies not supportive using Herzberg technique (Wernimonent, 1966; Soliman, 1970; Davis, 1977; Akhtar and Bhargava, 1974; Basu and Pestonjee, 1974). 2(B) studies not supportive using the method different than that of Herzberg (Ewen, 1964; Harding, 1965; Burke, 1966; Graen, 1966a,b; Ewen, Smith, Hulik and Locke, 1966). 3. Studies partially supportive to the two factor theory having used a method different than that of Herzberg (Gordon, 1965; King, 1970; Rao and Ganguli, 1972).

Process theories, unlike the content theories, only explain the processes involved in motivation. Vroom (1964) for the first time took lead and repudiated to the proponents of content theories and presented cognitive model to explain human motivation at work. According to
Vroom, his theory contains three elements, (i) Expectancy, the context in which the individual works (ii) Instrumentality which links outcomes, and (iii) Valence that refers to the strength of attraction. In simple words, it can be said that expectancy theory describes the interaction between an individual's goal and the probability associated with the attainable goal.

Vroom's theory has been found difficult in transforming into empirical researches and its practical implication seems to be quite restricted and difficult as well. Due to such reasons, the theory was criticised for its validity and predictability by many researchers, mainly by Filly, Hourse and Kerr (1976). But few researchers have supported this theory. Wofford (1971) said that VIE theory of Vroom is important for understanding and predicting job motivation. Mitra and Bhattacharya (1983), Bhattacharya (1986) advocated that expectancy theory should be regarded as work motivation theory.

Taking inspiration from Vroom's theory, Porter and Lawler (1968) came up with a slight different explanation to the process of motivation. This model is known as "multivariate model" which explains complex relationship that exists between job attitudes and job performance. In their view, people first try to figure out whether the reward that are likely to be received from doing a job
will be attractive to them. If expected reward is attractive then the individual is most likely to decide to put necessary effort to perform the job well. On the other hand, if the expected reward is not attractive then the individual's effort is not likely to be desirably activated. The other important point is that before people put forth any effort, they also try to assess the probability of a certain level of effort required for a desired level of performance. This multivariate theory was criticised on the ground of being sample biased as the study was conducted on the sample of managers, hence, such results have been obtained. Moreover, this theory was also criticised on the ground of its complexity of the theory which refers human motivation as a process that takes place in some context.

It is quite clear from the preceding description regarding the concept, and theories of motivation that motivational studies in job setting have attracted the attention of large number of researchers in both India and abroad. The reason is very simple as people's motivation is the key element for effective and productive performance. At present, enhancing human motivation for effective performance is the major focus of attention of managers, supervisors and especially of HRD personnel in their modern world of work.

Since the beginning of 1950s, there has been increasingly growing emphasis on employees' job motivation
at work and as a result scores of empirical evidences are available. It is practically impossible to mention all of them over here. Therefore, a very few relevant studies are being highlighted here. Job motivation studies in relation to job levels indicate that higher rank in job hierarchy are likely to be more motivated and satisfied as compared to those who occupy lower job levels. Many researchers have pointed out the significance of job hierarchy for motivation of employees (Porter, 1961, 1962; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Hall and Naugain, 1968). Recently Miner, John, Chen, Cha-Chuan and Yu (1991) pointed out that motivation gets strengthen with position level in general but motivation at managerial level increases with job level. Contrary to the studies referred above there is one study conducted by Manju (1990) who reported no influence of job level on job motivation but she found that if job level is combined with other variables such as special training and promotion earned, then its combined effect leads to motivation. Alam (1992) has reported that job levels failed to influence job motivation.

Some other researchers have also studied job tenure with job motivation. The investigations of Sinha & Nair (1965); Natha (1980); Narchal, Alag & Kishore (1984) and; Dillon & Suja (1990) have reported positive correlation between job tenure and motivation while, Vasudeva and Rajbir (1976) found negative relationship
between these two variables. Alam (1993) found job tenure having no influence on job motivation.

During the year 1960s when heavy emphasis was already being made in the area of job motivation and job satisfaction, the concept of job involvement came into prominence. Job involvement studies started in mid 1960s with the pioneering work of Lodahl & Kejner in 1965 who for the first time explored many important aspects of job involvement. It is a matter of fact that job involvement is an important aspect determining work performance in which the phenomenon of motivation and satisfaction are readily implicit. Actually, the load of researches in 1950s and early 1960s on job motivation and job satisfaction were too heavy, hence, several theories of job satisfaction and job motivation had come into prominence, such as, Maslow's interpretation of his theory of need hierarchy in job context in 1954, Herzberg et al. (1957), Vroom (1964), Porter & Lawler (1968), and Alderfer (1969, 1972) which gained popularity but also received criticisms. Hence, concept of job involvement evolved out of the heavy load on job motivation studies and craze for the new appropriate similar concept to determine work performance. The concept of job involvement attracted a lot of interest and attention of psychologists, managers and supervisors towards job involvement. This all led Lodahl & Kejner (1965) for the first time, to develop a
scale for measuring job involvement. Thereafter, within a very short span of time the phenomenon of job-involvement gained its importance among managers, supervisors and psychologists who started considering job-involvement as a criterion for measuring work-performance. The work of job-involvement as witnessed from the literature has advanced from descriptive and theoretical stage to more theoretical and empirically explanative stage.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) - pioneers in the area of job-involvement contended that "job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of the work in the worth of persons, and perhaps it, thus measures the case with which the person can be further socialized by an organization". Lodahl and Kejner's contention about the explanation of the concept of job involvement puts heavy emphasis on the internalization of values. It is, therefore, quite reasonable to mention that value orientation towards work is learnt in early socialisation process. Lodahl (1964) himself had realized that during the process of socialization certain work values are injected into the self of the individual that remains dynamically active even at the later stage in the form of employees reactions and attitudes towards job. For example, there is a concept of work in Hindu mythology that states "work is worship", hence, their religious value plays a very important role for inducing involvement
in work activities. Similarly, in Islam, greater emphasis has been given to earn a living through Islamic ways (pious means) which puts its emphasis on honesty, sincerity and responsibility. Honesty, sincerity and responsibility in performing any work activity indirectly change employees' behaviour positively in the work context. In the same way, all other religions in the world emphasize directly or indirectly to certain work values that develop commitment and job involvement. Ansari (1988) has reported the importance of socio-cultural aspects for influencing the behaviour of job-involvement. According to him, the social environment where everyone is working and enterprising, and to be an enterprising becomes a social norm which work as a compelling force for the people to get socialized by internalizing the socio-cultural norms and consequently get committed and job-involved.

In plain words, job involvement can be referred to as 'the attitude of employees towards work'. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) further elaborated and considered that "job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of person, and perhaps it thus measures the case with which the person can be further socialized by an organization". It is therefore, clear that the values which are internalized by the individual during the course of socialization are the major outcomes of socio-environmental influences. If there is a positive impact of
these aspects then individual gets committed and job involved. Different thinkers have opted different styles in defining the phenomenon of job involvement. Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined as "the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his work for the importance of his work in his total self image is regarded as job involvement", while, according to Lawler and Hall (1970) job involvement refers to "psychological identification with one's work as well as the degree to which the job situation is central to person and his identity".

There has usually been criticism and controversy regarding any new concept, thus, job involvement is not an exception. Patchen (1970) has pointed out that 'general interest' in the job is more or less similar to the concept of job involvement but he himself accepted that inspite of some similarities between these two, 'general interest' can not be termed as job involvement. Kanungo, Mishra and Dayal (1975) pointed out that job involvement attitude represents the degree to which the total situation is thought as being central to one's life or self-concept while, Saleh and Hasek (1976) have proposed four different conditions in which an individual may be job involved:

(i) When work to him is a central life interest.
(ii) When actively participates in his job.
(iii) When he perceives performance as consistent to his self-concept, and
(iv) When perceives performance as central to his self-esteem.

Kanungo (1979) classified job involvement into two different contexts -
(i) Involvement with "specific job", and
(ii) Involvement with "work in general".

In fact, he focused on sociological and psychological approaches to job involvement after criticizing the traditional interpretation of the concept. Kanungo (1982) defined the phenomenon of job involvement as a "cognitive state of psychological identification with the job and depends on the degree to which the job is perceived to meet one's salient needs, be they intrinsic or extrinsic".

Broadly, there are three important sets of factors which are determiners of job involvement and have been identified after reviewing the definitions with regard to job involvement. These factors comprise, factors related to the job incumbents; aspects of work itself and; organisational conditions.

At the present movement, extensive work is available on job involvement after a pioneering study conducted by Lodahl and Kejner (1965). Bass (1965) found job involvement positively related to performance. Runyon (1973) observed job involvement as a relatively stable
personal characteristics and also found that men are traditionally more likely to value work than women besides its importance to earn a living.

So far as the studies of job involvement in India are concerned, it is to mention that studies in this area started much later than the west. However, successful efforts have been made to study job involvement, keeping in view the Indian social-cultural milieu, and as a result highly commendable studies enriched the literature. Researches conducted on demographic variables (Akhtar and Kumar, 1978; Sharma and Kapoor, 1978; Sharma and Sharma, 1978; Bajaj, 1978; Anantharaman, 1980; Ansari, 1986; Kumari and Singh, 1988; Ansari & Ansari, 1989), anxiety (Bajaj, 1978b) different occupational levels, (Bajaj, 1978a; Anantharaman & Deivasenapath, 1980; Anantharaman and Begum 1982; Singh 1984; Kumari and Singh, 1988) and other variables like childhood aspiration and expectation, participation, adjustment, satisfaction, locus of control, quality of work-life, leadership style, skill, etc. (Akhtar and Bhachcha, 1984; Singh 1984; Kulkarni, 1976; Reddy and Kumar, 1980; Reddy and Kumarraju, 1981; Nath, 1980; Reddy and Rajasekhar, 1988; Dillon and Dondona 1988; Verma, 1988; Kumari and Singh, 1988; Sen and Chadha, 1990; Akhtar and Ansari, 1990) have shown inconsistent relationship to job involvement. The variations in the influence of demographic psycho-social, and personality variables on job involvement can be most likely attributed to the
differing and varying situations, socio-cultural milieu, work values, working conditions, etc.

Misra (1989) reported significant relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement, although, job stressors do not appear to represent as an important moderator variable on the job satisfaction - job involvement relationship.

Several studies have tried to relate job involvement and job satisfaction. A study by Weissenberg and Gruenfield (1968) discusses job satisfaction as a determinant of job involvement. Conversely, results of the study by Schwytant and Smith (1972) indicate that a worker could be involved in his job without being either involved in his company or satisfied with his job. Misra (1989) reported significant relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement, although, job stressors do not appear to represent as an important moderator variable on the job satisfaction - job involvement relationship. Singh and Pestonjee (1990) have reported that job satisfaction is influenced by job involvement.

Results obtained from various studies emphasize the role of personal variables in the development of job involvement and job satisfaction. Sharma and Sharma (1978) provide evidence to show that job involvement increases with job level, age and work experience, but results of the study by Reddy (1989) did not reveal any significant
effect of work experience and locus of control on job involvement.

Patel (1995) reported that personal variables (age, length of service, and caste) except marital status had no influence on job involvement and job satisfaction of the nurses.

Since, objective of the present investigation was to study quality of working life and certain biographical variables as correlates of job involvement, hence, after highlighting in detail the concept and studies pertaining to job involvement, it is also warranted here to take-up the perceived phenomenon of quality of work life (QWL) for comprehensive detail. Historically, human relation movement had not termed its objective as improving quality of working life but the notion of the approach had been similar to the present cry for improving quality of working life.

Improving quality of work life conditions is not a recent approach. Earlier, the terms like job enlargement and job enrichment in the same chronological order were used to minimise monotony and boredom for enhancing motivation and satisfaction at work. Uptill 1960s a lot of work was done related to job motivation and satisfaction. 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 at Arden House, New York.
Today's modern management presumption that make the men gay and happy in their general life conditions especially, at work and then they themselves will become motivated in the job they are doing. Hence, the organizational aspects like organizational structure, modes of communication, leadership behaviour, job design, job enrichment etc., had been given special attention which still remains the greatest source of employee's motivation and involvement at work. These above aspects and other increasing human needs combined together have given rise to the term quality of working life.

QWL is an inevitably significant issue for both employees and employers. It is important for employees as they spend around 30 to 40 years of their lives on the job and the quality of work life has a bearing on quality of their lives. On the other hand, the issue of QWL is also of interest to the employers because it is found instrumental or vital means in achieving organizational goal. Satisfaction and motivation on the job are the behavioural phenomenon which are implicit in the improved QWL. The most important resource of an organization is its employees, hence, improving QWL subsequently leads to healthier, satisfied and efficiency of employees on one hand and organizational profitability on the other.

Since, early 1970s, psychologists and managers become interested in studying the aspect of QWL. The
contribution made by Herrick and Maccoby (1972), Taylor et al. (1974), Chens and Davis (1975), Emergy & Emergy (1974), Miller (1977) and Carlson (1978) are worth considering. In India the work on QWL had begun in 1970s. The efforts made in this area by Ganguly (1976), Joseph (1978), De (1977(a) & 1977(b), Mehta (1976) and Sinha (1977) are to be appreciated. According to De (1980) most of the work on QWL in Indian setting are either in theoretical - descriptive framework or in an action research context.

It is imperative to point out the efforts of Sinha & Sayeed (1980) who developed a scale to measure quality of working life.

It has been mentioned in the beginning of this chapter that the term quality of work life was fabricated by Davis (1972) but its meaning and definition have not been discussed. Therefore, before going into any other details, it is proper here to mention the opinions and ideas given regarding the meaning of quality of work life.

Spink (1975) made a concerted effort to define the concept of QWL as "the degree of excellence in work and working conditions, which contribut to the over-all satisfaction of the individual and enhances the individual as well as organizational effectiveness". Beinun (1974) has defined QWL in terms of the quality of relationship between man and his task.
Lippit (1977) thought of it as "the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs to survive with some security, to interact with others to have a sense of personal usefulness, to be reorganised for achievement and to have an opportunity to improve one's skills and knowledge".

Lippit defining the concept of QWL covers the whole gamut of work life which may enhance organizational effectiveness. QWL has been considered by Cherns (1978) as an area emphasizing to 'humanization of the work place', 'work place democracy', 'work restructuring', or 'job design'. Cherns contention to view the concept of QWL seems to be an inspiration taken from the movement started by Elton Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson in 1930's, which is known as 'human relation movement' - an employee oriented approach for humanising the job.

In the opinion of Menton (1979), QWL is a relatively new term for a bundle of old issues that have long been of interest to philosophers, theologians, social scientists, workers and employers. It is a broad term that can embrace every conceivable aspect of work ethic and work conditions, workers expressions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concerns about efficiency of output and broaden consideration of social cohesion and stability.
The movement for improving QWL is so popular that it has occupied increasing interest and importance in both developed and developing countries of the world. Saiyadain (1977) has rightly pointed out that the importance of QWL in India seems to be more broaden than many labour legislations inacted to protect the workers. Indian labour legislations have its major focusses on job security and economic growth to the employees.

Keeping in view the importance of QWL the 'American Society of Training and Development', established a task force of the QWL in 1979 which defined it as "A process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organizational environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin-goals, i.e. enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved quality of life at work for employees" (Skroun, 1980).

The definition proposed by the task force of the American Society of Training and Development have clearly and precisely elaborated the objectives of QWL programmes at work.

On the basis of the available survey of literature, Nedler and Lawler (1983) came to conclude that the definition of QWL underwent several changes and modifications with regard to its conceptual understanding.
In fact, they came across six significant definitions of the term which modified through various stages depending upon the type of work environments.

According to Nedler and Lawler (1983) the first definition of the term 'Quality of Work Life' came into prominence during the period between 1959 to 1972. In this first stage of the emergence of QWL it was conceived as a variable.

Hence, the emphasis was on the individual workers' reaction to the personal consequences of the work experience as job satisfaction, job motivation, mental health, etc.

During the period 1969 and 1974 the concept of QWL was defined as an 'approach'. This definition focussed its emphasis on the individual worker and neglected the organizational outcomes. To the present investigation this definition seems to be incomplete as for over-all organizational productive efficiency both individual worker's state of living as well as organizational outcomes are equally important, hence both should be equally taken care of.

In the same period between 1969 to 74 the third definition emerged and the QWL was defined as 'methods'. This approach of the term focussed QWL as a set of methods, approaches, or technologies for enhancing the
work environment as to make it more productive and satisfying.

Keeping in view of the above definition of QWL it is amply clear that the concept encompasses the whole aspect of working environment that might be influencing the quality of life of individual worker in the job situation. Nedler and Lawler (1983) pointed out that "Quality of Working Life is a way of thinking about people, work and organizations". In the light of this definition, QWL does not only focus on how people can do work better, but how work may cause people to be better.

According to Reddy (1985) the concept of QWL has been viewed differently. He pointed out that QWL is viewed as "work redesigning in U.K., it is "humanization of work programme" in West Germany, and for the Japanese it is "improving the quality of products". It is interesting to mention here that Japanese appeared to initiate quality circle movements in a large way in their industries, and gradually quality circle programmes dominated the western world and the European organizations. This programme was initiated in the larger interest with the objective of humanising the work culture. This, it contributed towards improving the quality of life of employees at work.

Having discussed the concept of QWL in its historical perspectives it is pertinent to give a detailed description of the researches available in this area so as
to impress the significance of the problem undertaken for the present investigation.

A look over the available survey of literature it is clearly found that QWL studies, have been generally conducted in relation to job satisfaction across managerial levels, organizational climate as well as cultural differences as causing QWL.

The chronological description of studies of QWL in relation to different variables will now be discussed in the foregoing writings.

In one of the studies by Payne and Pheysey (1971) organizational climate scales were correlated with the three facets of Job Descriptive Index Scale viz., satisfaction with work, supervision and pupil. The study was conducted on a sample consisting 348 managers, supervisors and staff personnel, and positive correlations were obtained between a positive perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

As has been pointed out by Payne and Pheysey that organizational climate is positively related to job satisfaction to highlight the quality of employees work life. It is important to mention here that job satisfaction is an indication of positive QWL. Hence, whatever, the studies are being put-forth on job satisfaction would be determining the relationship of some variable with quality of work life as job satisfaction is a good indicator of quality of work life.
A study conducted by Pestonjee in 1973 reported supportive organization to be positively related to workers' morale and job satisfaction. Similarly, in a study conducted by Schneider and Snyder (1975) it was found that climate and satisfaction are positively correlated and almost the same result was found in a study of Lafollte and Sims as they found organizational climate and organizational practices related to job satisfaction.

In one of the very interesting researches conducted by Rajappa (1978) it was found that organizations with achievement-oriented climate were highly productive organizations.

In a very comprehensive study conducted by Kumar and Bohra (1979) on the relationship of workers' job satisfaction with their perception about existing organizational climate, the obtained result clearly pointed out that perceived organizational climate significantly effect worker's job satisfaction. The workers perceiving existing organizational climate as democratic were found to be highly job satisfied compared to those perceiving organizational climate as autocratic or undecided.

In another study Sharma (1983) investigated the importance of organizational climate for employees motivation and satisfaction at work. The study consisted of 50 industrial organizations which were surveyed by the
investigator. She observed on the basis of the survey that the work related facets like, grievance handling, recognition, opportunities for growth and development and participative management have been found to be the important factors for healthy organizational climate, which enhances work motivation and satisfaction of the job incumbents. Almost the same results were obtained by Srivastava and Pratap (1984) who found a significant positive relationship between positive perception of organizational climate and job satisfaction.

Apart from the above studies QWL has also been studied in relation to managerial levels. Extensive studies have been conducted on need satisfaction and job satisfaction across managerial levels as these two are important perceived determiners of quality of work life. Maslowian need-hierarchy theory of job motivation (1954) and its modified version by Porter (1961) have been important approaches for studying need satisfaction at work and work motivation. Porter (1961) taking inspiration from Maslowian (1954) model did a significant work and established that the higher order needs are differentially satisfied at various managerial levels in an organization. Since Porter's work, scores of studies have been conducted.

The phenomenon of need satisfaction on need deficiency of various professional groups have attracted
the attention of psychologists not only in India but almost in all the developing countries of the world.

Johnson and Marcrum (1968) conducted a study on three different levels of army officers and found that perceived deficiency in need fulfilment tend to increase at successively lower levels and they found cravings for esteem and autonomy needs at almost all levels.

Costello and Sang (1974) on the basis of their investigation reported that majority of the job incumbents of publicly owned utility firms were satisfied with security and social needs but were different in the fulfilment of higher order needs - self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization. The study made by Rhinehert, et al. (1969) on managers and compared the managers working in Govt. agencies with those from business and industry. They found that perceived deficiency in need fulfilment likely to increase successively at lower levels which was almost similar to the findings of Johnson and Marcrom (1968). Moreover, this study also revealed that dissatisfaction was found greater among the managers of government agencies compared to the managers of business and industry.

Wance (1970) compared need fulfilment and satisfaction of 675 commissioned officers at three levels of military grades who were serving in command and five
different types of staff assignment. The findings advocated that decrease in dissatisfaction among the higher organizational ranks was not found to substantiate earlier findings but significant differences in need fulfilment and dissatisfaction were observed between the five different types of staff.

The studies reported above were all representing the scenario of the developing countries but a very few studies have been conducted to investigate the problem of industrially developing and under-developing countries. In India no attempts were made to measure need deficiency among government servants till mid 1980s. As witnessed from the survey of literature that first attempt in this area was made by Akhtar, Khan and Ansari (1987) who have conducted a study on perceived need deficiency among three types of government servants namely, judiciary-men, police officers and personnels in administration. Findings of this study were generally found in agreement with Porter's findings, but some discrepancies could have been found, therefore, it is seen that craving to fulfil self-actualization need were almost equal for all three groups but lower order needs such as security and social had deficiency for the police, hence, contradicts Porter's contentions. Moreover, the study also interestingly depicted that judges expressed more craving for esteem need as compared to the people in administration.
Therefore, study provides QWL determinants in terms of needs deficiency and fulfilment.

Mathur and Paranjpe (1988) reported significant relationship of overall job satisfaction with QWL feelings and conditions.

In an study conducted by Anuradha Sharma (1989) on humanization of work and job performance. On the basis of the findings she highlighted quality of work life and organization design as important dimensions of organizational functioning.

Very recently, Sehgal and Rana (1990) made a comparative study of male and female managers in the perception of QWL and they obtained sex difference on the perception of quality of work life.

Having elaborated studies pertaining to job involvement and quality of work life in the preceding descriptions, it is necessary at this juncture to putforth such studies which have been done on the same line, the present study has been carried out. These follow.

The study of Dhillon and Dandona (1990) here receives special mention as their study entitled, "Quality of work life and job involvement: A comparative study of managers of Public and Private Banks" is amost similar to the present endeavour though, biographies have not been undertaken. The findings of the study advocate significant
difference in the QWL variable related to job involvement in Public and Private banks.

In one study, Karrier and Khurana (1996) found that managers with higher job satisfaction and more job involvement had the perception of higher QWL. Srivastava (1996) points out that organizational climate and higher order needs (self esteem, autonomy, and self actualization) are found to be positively related to job involvement. It is necessary to point out at this juncture that this study has not denoted the variables which had been undertaken for study as the term QWL but organizational climate, higher order needs and all other bio-social needs are the determinants of Quality of work life. Therefore it is not always necessary to use the term QWL but the variables are attributed to the aspect referring to quality of work life. This is the case here as well as the studies which have already been discussed or referred in the preceding writings. Very recently, Nasreen and Ansari (1997) studied on supervisors and middle level managers and reporteld that socio-psycho personality variables failed to influence QWL perceptions. In a similar effort Barkat and Ansari (1997) found significant influence of job tenure and number of promotions earned on perceive QWL.

The above last two studies though have not been studied in relation to job involvement but seems to be
very important to highlight the relationship of biographical and psycho-social personality variable in relation to quality of work life. It is also necessary to put forth the view that the phenomenon of job involvement is an outcome of the perception of high quality of work life in which the aspects like identification with work, organization, as well as incumbents conducive conditions most appropriate to the work and working environment - as above all variables combined together determine the level of job involvement.

At length, terminating our discussion pertaining to the concepts of the variables undertaken for the present investigation and related available survey of literature, it is necessarily an important function here to elaborate once again the objective of the study. The objective of the present endeavour was so simple in words but had posed a lot of challenge for the present investigator in carrying out the research successfully on the problem "A study of quality of work life and certain biographical variables as correlates of job involvement". The topic itself speaks about the objective and aim of the study but it only illustrates macro level picture of the whole endeavour. The micro level comprehensive effort to attain the objectives of the study are quiet evident from the hypotheses which were formulated for empirical testing through investigation.
In this study, null hypotheses were formulated as studies illustrated above have failed to provide any clear cut direction. The hypotheses follow in detail.

HYPOTHESES:

\( Ho_1 \) : "Economic Benefit" facets of QWL will not be related to job involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

\( Ho_2 \) : "Physical working condition" facets of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

\( Ho_3 \) : "Mental health" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

\( Ho_4 \) : "Career Orientation" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

\( Ho_5 \) : "Advancement on merit" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

\( Ho_6 \) : "Effect on personal life" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the
position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho7 : "Union Management relation" facet of QWL not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho8 : "Self Respect" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho9 : "Supervisory relations" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho10 : "Inter-Group relations" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho11 : "Apathy" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Ho12 : "Confidence in Management" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.
Hol3 : "Meaningful development" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol4 : "Control, influence and participation" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol5 : "Employee commitment" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol6 : "General life satisfaction" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol7 : "Organizational Climate" facet of QWL will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol8 : "Overall QWL" will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the position of the faculty members and their discipline.

Hol9 : "Job Tenure" will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the positions of the faculty members and their disciplines.
Ho20: "No. of dependents" will not be related to Job Involvement irrespective of the positions of the faculty members and their discipline.

Afore-stated hypotheses clearly indicate the very purpose of the present endeavour which had been carried out to fill the void of knowledge in this area. The findings of the investigation will help the organizations in general and academic institutions in particular to redesign the work condition through improving employees' (especially teachers) QWL for getting them high job involved and it subsequently leading to efficient and decent work performance.

We are drawing the line here to wind up this chapter by giving last word that job involvement is an outcome behaviour which cannot be enhanced and maintained unless human resources are properly developed and then managed but these can not be satisfactorily attained without improving employee's QWL and by giving special attention to employees' related off-the-job problems.