CHAPTER - 1

INTRODUCTION
1.1. INTRODUCTION:

For the last decade or so, the organizations all over the world have experienced complete transformation. Professional organizations such as the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) and the Human Resource Planning Society (HRPS), based on extensive surveys of chief executives and HR managers, have tried to keep a finger on the pulse of major trends. The findings of the same reveal that for the past decade or so, there has been a constant theme around the issues like going global, embracing new technology, managing change, managing talent, responding to the market pressures, containing costs, so on and so forth (Snell & Bohlander, 2007).

With all these in the air, in the recent times, the new face of the corporate world has come up with profound changes in the nature and working of managerial profiles. And the most affected ones are the ‘people managers’ – the HR professionals, with the increased recognition of the fact that your people can only be your long term competitive advantage. Increasingly, the organizations have realized that all corporate strengths are dependent on and centered around human resource (Pande, 2003).

Further, in this cut-to-throat competitive and highly turbulent globalized era wherein all the time the threat of yet another recession is found knocking the doors of the economy, organizations are striving hard to build High Performance Work Culture (HPWC) as there are ever increasing pressures on the organizations to provide more and better services at lesser cost. They need to constantly strive to find out better, cheaper and newer ways to go beyond customer satisfaction and achieve customer
delight. To achieve such diverse ends, it is obvious that the organizations need to bank upon their real assets – the employees. Hence, the higher-ups of every organization is found engaged in devising strategies to get the best out of the human resources – the employees – of the organization (Thakkar & Rajput, 2012).

In fact, people have always been central to organization’s existence, economic well being and prosperity; but their strategic importance has increased in this knowledge based economy (Thakkar, 2008). It is well known that to ensure an organization’s continued survival, growth and prosperity, every organization needs to have competent, committed and motivated people at all levels; as this people dimension can only be a long term competitive advantage for any organization. The same was signaled by Caudron (1994) also when he pointed out that the only thing that will maintain today’s source of competitive advantage is high quality personnel instead of merely capital, technology or long-lived products. On the same line, acknowledging the ever increasing importance of the people dimension in today’s organizations; Abdeen (2002) went a step further. According to him, the employees, in reality are the soft assets of an organization and they are certainly the hidden value of a company. Thus, the employees, being the basic pillars of any sort of organization, must be treated as assets, and not as liabilities; they must be seen as investment, and not as expenditure; they must be acknowledged as the revenue/profit centre, and not as the cost/loss centre. Thus, it is rightly said that an organization is always known by the people it keeps or it is composed of; and the quality of an organization can never exceed the quality of the minds that make it.

Talking from the organization’s practical point of view, the overriding prime focus of attention would certainly be the continuous improvements in employee productivity, and thereby leading to higher profitability. As Lawler (1982) quoted in Katzell (1983) that a major obstacle to the voluntary adoption of QWL programmes by employers is the priority given to economic performance. But, such improvements in productivity of the employees can’t be achieved overnight without focusing on their job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment – the three primary work related
attitudes, ultimately taking care of their productivity. And, for achieving higher levels of these three work attitudes, the organization needs to make the employees feel that they really care for them. The employees should be provided with all the things what they themselves expect to have; and not the things what the organizational authorities feel they ought to have or what they can afford.

In a way; skills, ability and competence of an employee are surely the essential ingredients deciding the amount of contribution of an employee to organizational goal achievement or proving his/her worth to the organization. But, skills, ability and competence would be worthless in absence of inner urge to put higher level of efforts with a feeling of attachment that this is my own organization. Hence, these people – the employees should not only be competent enough to perform their jobs, but also motivated and committed towards achieving organizational goals. But, ensuring higher levels of employee motivation and commitment requires a higher sense of job satisfaction on the part of employees. And for this, the organizations must emphasize on the qualitative aspects of the work life of their employees. Further, one must understand the fact that in the globalized era, most people work in organizations; and given the amount of time and energy people expend at their workplaces, it is important to ensure the fact that they feel satisfied about their work life. Since job/work occupies an important place in the total life space of any employee; affecting him/her in variety of ways, such conditions generating feeling of satisfaction are likely to affect not only their physical but also their psychological, social and spiritual being (Chan & Wyatt, 2007). Considering this only, perhaps, the study of human behaviour at work has remained the focal point of considerable research over the years in Industrial Psychology (Joseph, 1985). Thus, if organizations are concerned about gaining a long-term competitive advantage through this people dimension, it seems inevitable that they take care of their most valuable assets – the people – the employees; that too in spirit, and not only in words or on paper.

So, we can say that if an organization focuses too much on enhancing productivity, ignoring/sidelining the quality of employees’ working life, it will not achieve the
desired aims/objectives. Levering (1988) also argued the same that the profit of successful organization is not to be achieved at the expense of its employees. Realizing this, since times immemorial, organizations have been focusing on how people feel, perceive and what they think about their working life; and it has always remained a major concern area.

Hence, in this cut-to-throat competitive era, with increased concern for economic well being of the organization, more and more organizations are emphasizing on the qualitative aspects of the work life of the employees; and showing concern about ensuring better Quality of Work Life, henceforth QWL, of these real assets who are ultimately taking care of the bottom line of any organization. This may be because of expected linkage between employees perceiving a better quality of work life in the organization and feeling satisfied and displaying greater work motivation. Consequently, their job involvement would also be higher.

This becomes even more relevant when we talk about the Transport Industry in general, and the Passenger Road Transport Industry in particular; wherein the operative level occupies more than 85% of the total manpower strength of a typical transport unit. Yes, in a typical Public Road Transportation Unit, the Operative Level Staff – the real revenue generators – the frontline staff – represent the single largest cohort. In India, as we have adopted the practice of treating Public Road Transport Service (PRTS) as a part of Social Welfare; we have “State Monopoly” in operating Public Road Transport through Bus services. With the provision of forming State Road Transport Undertakings (SRTUs) under the Road Transport Corporation Act, 1950, and the amended form of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1950; the Passenger Road Transportation System in India has been organized in four forms, viz., Public Corporations, Departmental Undertakings, Municipal Undertakings and Government Companies. These four types of set up basically fall under the broad category of State Transport Undertaking (STU), also known as State Road Transport Undertaking (SRTU). These STUs or SRTUs are typically the Government owned and operated or Public Sector organizations.
Further, these STUs or SRTUs, being the State Government Owned and Operated Organizations, they adhere to all the basic regulations of the State and Central Government like safety norms, fare wage policy and employment benefits, etc. So, it is commonly expected that these public organizations or government agencies are relatively far better in terms of offering job security and fringe benefits to their employees in comparison to their counterparts in the private setups. This assumption was well supported by Cacioppe & Mock (1984) with a comparative study of the quality of work experience in government and private organizations. Hence, drawing from Lawler (1973) and Baird & Mainstone (1980), it can be assumed that employees in such government setups are less likely to leave; and for that matter, there is no issue of employee turnover. Most of the employees would be reluctant to leave and seek employment with non-governmental organizations, even when it may lead to larger salary and/or more promotional opportunities. The past and present economic conditions may strengthen this defensive behaviour as these employees observe many private players had to reduce their staff drastically. Because of these reasons, movement – both within the government organization and turnover to other organization is almost nil or very much limited. Consequently, these employees are likely to remain in the same jobs longer than non-government employees. Thus, according to Baird & Mainstone (1980), a very crucial, but equally ignored and unresolved issue in such government organizations is studying and analyzing the effects which the nature of job might have on employees as they remain in them over extended periods of time. Further, as for these employees, saving their present positions is no longer a prime concern, and even promotions are more or less time bound (mostly seniority based); many a times, they tend to become complacent without bothering much about the kind of work that they do. So, concerns related to their job involvement takes on greater importance all the time. Even Koch & Steers (1978) highlighted the need to study job attachment, satisfaction and turnover among Public sector employees.

Further, as we know, the Public and Private Sector Organizations differ considerably in various aspects. In the last few years, numerous studies have been conducted to
examine the differences between the Public and Private Sector Organizations in terms of leadership (Fiedler, 1967; Ganguly, 1977; Singh, 1979; Dwivedi, 1983), managerial style and power profiles (Likert, 1961; Singh, 1979; Maheshwari, 1980), goal setting (Kumar, 1983), organizational activities (Sinha, 1973), initiative and rewards and reinforcement patterns (Sinha, 1975), cooperation and coordination, climate and norms (Sinha, 1973; Roy, 1974; Ganguly, 1977), organization culture (Prasad, 1979; Jaiswal, 1982) and several other variables, such as control of economy, autonomy, communication networks, etc.

Public and private sector organizations, being different in their structure, processes and control systems, are likely to induce noticeable differences in terms of employees’ expectations in terms of QWL, job attitudes like job satisfaction and job involvement, and overall job behaviour. Studies have been conducted to compare the job attitudes and behaviour of the employees of the two types of organizations. Sinha (1973) noted that the employees in public and private organizations differed in terms of their expectations, performance patterns, feelings towards their job and organization, and job satisfaction. They also differed significantly with respect to their cognitive and affective patterns (i.e., job satisfaction, motivation, morale, and identification) as a result of difference in the leadership style in the two types of organizations. Narain (1981) reported that confidence, trust, motivation, and loyalty were higher among the employees in private sector organizations. Kumar (1983) observed that the private sector employees felt higher sense of accomplishment. In another study, private sector employees were found to be more committed to their jobs (Jaiswal, 1982). Nisonko (1981) reported that the employees of public sector organizations generally believed that hard and sincere work ‘brought nothing in particular’, and appreciation and recognition ‘were very far away things’. The differences in values and beliefs were attributed to the difference in the climate and culture of these organizations which, in turn, affected the future expectations, efficiency and performance of the employees. In her study Krishna (1988) found significant differences in attributions of the employees of the two types of organizations. She observed that public sector employees gave more importance to external factors such as nature of work, organizational policies etc.,
whereas private sector employees rated higher the internal factors, such as ability and efforts for their success/failure. She also reported that the private sector employees possessed more positive feelings, higher expectations and greater organizational commitment as compared to the employees belonging to public sector organizations. Among other factors, employees’ alienations from or involvement in their jobs and their overall psychological well being are likely to be affected by the environment and climate of the organizations they belong to. The study of Srivastava & Krishna (1992) also confirmed that employees of Public Sector Organizations were relatively less involved in their jobs in comparison to their counterparts in Private Sector Organizations. Argyris (1964) and McGregor (1960) have accordingly stressed job involvement as a response to organizational conditions rather than personal characteristics. A good number of studies have concluded positive relationships between perceived congenial organizational climate and job involvement. Hence, as employees’ job attitudes and behaviour are influenced by their job involvement and consequent psychological well-being (Repetti, 1987); the top management in Public Sector Organizations should show more concern about increasing their employees’ job involvement. And one possible way to do so is by taking care of employees’ quality of work life concerns.

Considering the wide variety of differences between these two set of undertakings namely – the public and private sector undertakings, one would certainly expect that the employees of STUs or SRTUs in India would have peculiar patterns with reference to their Quality of Work Life as well as Job Involvement.

Further, in the recent times, due to open, loud and frequent criticisms of inefficiency of government sector organizations, even the public sector organizations are also under pressure to control their operational costs and improve productivity (Williamson & Alexander (III), 1986); and thereby justify their existence itself. So, without exception, top management, in both – the public and private sector organizations have been searching for a new, palatable “panacea – cure for all organizational ills” sort of
mechanism; that could achieve these diverse ends. And Quality of Work Life (QWL) is seen by many as this much needed remedy (Macarov, 1982).

Considering all these, the present study is focused on assessing the perceived quality of work life (QWL) and job involvement of the Class-III-operative staff (Drivers, Conductors, Driver-cum-Conductors and Mechanic) of one of the largest STUs in India, that is, the Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation (GSRTC).

Out of GSRTC’s the total staff strength of 40,670; these categories – Drivers, Conductors, Driver-cum-Conductors and Mechanics occupy nearly 87% (35200). The Quality of Work Life and Job Involvement of these Class-III-Operative (Frontline) staff of GSRTC – the Drivers, Conductors, Driver-cum-Conductors and Mechanics (Workshop & Maintenance staff) requires a careful study, as they are the ‘real on and off-the road soldiers’ fighting for the glooming bottom line leading to economic wellbeing of GSRTC. They are the real revenue generators by executing various schemes, policies and decisions in the best possible way. Considering all these, there is a need to assess the QWL and Job Involvement among these staff, and ensure at least a satisfactory level in it, as research studies have suggested that improvement of QWL seems to be an indispensable ingredient to increased productivity in any sort of organization.

So, my present research is an attempt to study and analyze the QWL concerns and Job Involvement extent among this single largest cohort in GSRTC. I have undertaken a study on perceived QWL and Job Involvement among Employees, to be precise the Drivers, Conductors, Driver-cum-Conductors and Mechanics (Workshop & Maintenance staff), of selected two divisions – Nadiad and Bharuch of GSRTC.
1.2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE (QWL):

From the perspective of Behavioural Science, every organization is dependent on its four key elements for effective functioning. These four key elements are People, Structure, Technology and Environment; and out of these four, people are the most important element, as no organization can exist without people.

From the perspective of Economics, there are four factors of production namely Land, Labour, Capital and Entrepreneur. Here, Labour; being living, thinking and feeling human being; needs to be treated differently.

Similarly, in Management domain, it is said that every organization has four ‘M’s namely Man, Material, Money and Machine. Out of these four Ms also, it is always suggested that if you can manage your Man well, they will effectively manage the other three Ms.

Thus, the importance of People as Employees or Human Resources in an organization stands unquestionable. But, organizations in the past were either not aware of the significance of people dynamics or reluctant to accept the same.

It would be several decades before the social sciences and humanities showed real interest in the work and, more specifically, in the relationship between workers’ attitudes and job behaviours on the one hand, and the company’s productivity on the other (Bagtasos, 2011). After the negative outcomes of the Frederick Taylor’s ‘Scientific Management’ came on the surface, that mechanical or robotic approach to treat man as an appendix to machine was severely criticized from all corners, which led to the rise of human relations movement. In this human relations movement, one historical landmark was the hitherto ‘Hawthorne Experiment’ – the first ever attempt to systematically study the importance of human element in the work setting as well as the importance of socio-psychological context of the work place. So, it was only after
the pioneering and path breaking findings of the famous “Hawthorne Experiment” by
the Harvard University Psychologist George Elton Mayo and his team at the Western
Electricity Company’s Hawthorne plant during 1927-32; organizations across the globe
started realizing the importance of people in ensuring continued survival, stability and
sustainable growth. The behavioural approach to management of people and
paternalistic approach on the part of higher-ups were certainly the welcome signs.
Everywhere, a new air was blowing, spreading the fresh fragrance of treating people as
the basic building blocks and ideally the mind, body and soul of any sort of
organization (Mayo, 1960). In a way, Mayo’s results on the influence of work
environment factors on employee’s attitude, behaviour and performance tempered the
Taylorian performance norms that were prevailing earlier (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). So,
1940s onwards, employees at the work place started gaining due recognition; but this
new approach remained marginal. So, a lot of things were required to be accomplished
to match two diverse ends – one is to humanize the work place and the other is to
improve productivity, and consequently profitability. Majority of the studies in this
period of time, emphasized on the importance of coordinating the organization-human
relationship to enhance productivity and ensuring simultaneous development of human
capital – may be by focusing on human needs (Maslow, 1954) or by changing the
belief system of management in the form of shift from Theory X to Theory Y
(McGregor, 1960) or through efforts to integrate the individual and the organization
(Argyris, 1964) or by understanding and applying the logic of two distinct set of factors
– hygieners and motivators (Herzberg, 1968).

The notion of Quality of Work Life, popularly abbreviated as QWL, seems to be
standing at the confluence of these two separate streams of thought, i.e., ensuring
humanization of the work place without compromising productivity and profitability.
As Martell (1983) commented that productivity may be viewed as a dirty word by
some employees, as if it’s a way to exploit people at work. So, QWL seems to be a
balancing approach – trying to gain a balance between the needs of the employees and
the needs of the organization. In a way, the goals of improved quality and greater
employee involvement are mutually dependent; and the same has been the mainstay of
the QWL movement (Rubinstein, 1980). While many other approaches to resolving productivity crisis are uni-dimensional in nature; QWL seems to be taking care of both – the employees’ interest as well as the organizational interest (Martell & Tyson, 1983). Martell (1984) pointed out that each employee is an important resource and he/she should be encouraged to maintain and elaborate upon his/her role by creating a climate to grow and develop. Not only this, Martell & Konselman (1984) goes a step further by emphasizing that organizations need to unlock the potential of their human resources by taking due care of the factors that constrain their commitment. QWL, being a measure of favorableness of an employee’s work life, seems to be a measure to accomplish this.

1.2.1. Theoretical Underpinning of QWL - Socio-Technical Systems Theory:

The Socio-Technical Systems (STS) theory gives rise to many theoretical antecedents of QWL. Developed in the 1950s, STS posits that organizations fully engaging employees in work design promote employee fulfillment while simultaneously achieving organizational goals. The term, *quality of work life* (QWL), was coined in settings using the STS approach to work design (Davis & Trist, 1974). STS theory has emerged as a significant approach to designing organizations, especially at the interface of technology and people. Productivity is improved and humans are enriched through a design process that focuses on the interdependencies among people, technology and the environment. In contrast to both traditional and behavioral approaches, which emphasize individual motivation rather than organizational features, STS theory recommends simultaneous modification of technical and social systems to create work designs that can lead both to greater task productivity and to increased fulfillment of organization members (Hackman, 1980).

In viewing organizations as open and living systems interacting with the environment, STS emphasizes that organizations are embedded in, and affected by, an outside environment (Cherns, 1976). Thus, the way in which work is accomplished in any
given organization is inextricably linked to society at large. At the same time, the organization’s internal environment has social and technical subsystems, as well as physical design and work settings, which act together to influence and produce the outcome (product or service). Socio-technical systems theory defines an organization’s environment as having two components, the social and technical subsystems.

- **Social subsystem of STS:** The social subsystem, comprising people who work in the organization and the relationships among them, must be able to attain the goals of the organization, adapt to the environment, integrate the activities of the people in the organization, and provide for continued occupation of the essential roles through recruitment, socialization, and retention (Cherns, 1976). More broadly, the social subsystem includes the reasons that organizational members choose to work in the organization, their attitudes toward it, their expectations of it, patterns of supervisory-subordinate relationships, skill levels of employees, and the nature of the subgroups within the population. In short, the social subsystem encompasses all of the human qualities that members of an organization bring with them to work. The STS theorists contend that the surest way to direct the efforts of organizational members toward organizational goals is to identify the needs that people bring with them to the workplace, and incorporate the means to meet those needs through the design of the technology and the work itself (Davis & Trist, 1973; Cherns, 1976; Pasmore, Francis, Haldeman, & Shani, 1982).

- **Technical subsystem of STS:** Similarly, the technical subsystem of an organization consists of the tools, techniques, procedures, skills, knowledge, and devices used by members of the social subsystem to accomplish the organization’s tasks. The most direct impact of technology is upon organizational productivity; this is not surprising since organizations acquire technology to increase speed and efficiency (Pasmore et al., 1982). Technology also affects the location of the workers, the motions required to operate equipment, and the behaviors required to keep the whole system running smoothly. Roles and responsibilities develop for those who are designated to manage the equipment and people assigned to operate it. Historically, STS analysis has
been applied primarily to organizations employing physical technologies such as coal mining or the automobile industry (Davis & Cherns, 1975; Emery & Trist, 1965; O’Toole, 1974; Trist, 1983; Trist & Bamforth, 1951).

• **Theoretical assumptions of STS:** Socio-technical systems theory is based on two underlying assumptions:

  (a) *Organizational performance can be improved by allowing employees at lower levels to assume more responsibility for their efforts, and*

  (b) *Employees will become more responsible and self-directed as their work offers opportunities to fulfill important psychological needs, such as learning, growth, self esteem and significance in their working lives (Pasmore et al., 1982).*

The major objective of the STS theory approach to organizational change is to optimize jointly the organizational goals and the needs of the employees (Davis & Cherns, 1975).

The open-systems approach, in which technical as well as social aspects of the organization are recognized, offers a sound starting point for studying and (re)designing productive organizations while meeting the needs of employees. Although STS researchers have generally reported positive effects (for example 87% of the interventions with productivity data show an improvement in productivity [Pasmore et al., 1982]), this approach does have its drawbacks (Van Der Zwaan, 1975).

Criticisms include a lack of coherence between theoretical concepts, ambiguous definitions of social and technical subsystems, unclear boundaries between organization and the environment, and a preponderance of research on the social subsystem that ignores the technical subsystem (Pasmore, 1988; Van der Zwaan, 1994; Adler & Docherty, 1998). In a meta-analysis of 17 socio-technical studies, the impact of socio-technical interventions, although positive, varied greatly across studies (Beekun, 1989). Productivity was moderated by variations in the use of autonomous
work groups, changes in the technological system, changes in the pay system, and the scope of the change.

Thus, the concept of quality of work life arose from the theoretical underpinning of the socio-technical systems theory. Relying on the two assumptions underlying STS theory, employees’ quality of work life can be improved by allowing them to assume more responsibility for their efforts while providing opportunities to fulfill important psychological needs.

1.2.2. Concept and Meaning of Quality of Work Life (QWL):

Historically, the origin of the term “Quality of Work Life” can be traced back to the early 1970s, when in September 1972; about 60 experts from different parts of the world assembled at the Arden House, Columbia University in New York to share their experiences relating to work place democratization and formed the First Council for Quality of Working Life. Many people have the misconception that this term QWL was first defined at this 1st International Labor Relations Conference on QWL at Arden House in New York in 1972; but that is not true. As Saklani (2010) reveals that at the Arden House Meeting, this term was not defined specifically. It was certainly coined at this conference. But, it was defined and popularized only after Davis and Cherns, the two leading personalities at the Arden House Meeting, came out with two comprehensive volumes; wherein they defined QWL and used this term to describe job and organizational redesigning to achieve democracy at the work place (Davis & Cherns, 1975). The term gained international status and wide scale recognition when the United Auto Workers and General Motors used it as the umbrella concept for the work reforms they would jointly sponsor (Beer et al., 1985). Prior to this also, different approaches to improving work productivity and job satisfaction have existed for some time, the actual term ‘quality of work(ing) life (QWL) seems to have been coined only in early 1970s (Kolodny & Van Beinum, 1983).

Since then, the term has become buzz word across corporate corridors and a matter of high concern in work organizations. While there seems to be no agreement upon
definition of quality of work life, it has been used as a construct to describe the well-being of the employees at their work place. Even though there is an ongoing confusion about the precise meaning of this term and even more contradictions about the constituents of the QWL; the term quality of work life has emerged as the most discussed term in Human Resource Management and it is getting space in almost all HR discussions (Natarajan & Annamalai, 2011).

A growing number of organizations have been seen experimenting with Socio-technical Systems approach of Trist (1981) and QWL Programmes (Davis & Cherns, 1975; Walton, 1977; Perkins, Nieva & Lawler (III), 1983), to address the problems of poor quality of life at the work place (Davis, 1977). According to Ondrack & Evans (1987), despite its widespread popularity and increasing applications, the concepts are diffuse (Taylor, 1978); and may mean different things to different people.

Cherns (1975) referred to QWL as a contemporary expression of something which was referred to as “humanization of the workplace”, “workplace democracy”, “work restructuring” or “job redesign”.

Herrick & Maccoby (1974) stressed upon action oriented concept of QWL which focuses on the synthesis of criteria for the success of work humanization into a set of principles. Delamotte & Walker (1975) while emphasizing the breath and historical antecedents of QWL, identifies two important strands of the contemporary wisdom: First, the renunciation of the assumption of technological determinism and the demand that technology and work organization be changed to provide more fulfilling work assignments and, secondly, the concept of worker participation. Spink (1975), though against the phrase of ‘quality of working life’ agreed that the so-called quality of working life is concerned with enriching the nature of work experience, grappling with the issues of efficiency and satisfaction.

Barbash (1976) treats QWL as a set of factors which constitute what he calls the New Organizational Ethic. Horn (1976) opined that QWL is a social concern and as such its assessment should also be tried through social indicator approach.
Taylor (1977) defined the term ‘quality of working life’ as “the phenomenal experience of people at work”; and it aims at healthier, more satisfied and more productive employees and more efficient, adaptive and profitable organization (Suttle, 1977). Mills (1978) noted that the term QWL had moved permanently into the vocabulary of unions and management, even if a lot of the people were not exactly sure what it exactly covered. Guest (1979) referred to QWL as the measure of the quality of human experiences in the organization. Similarly, Walton (1980) opined that the term ‘QWL’ referred specifically to changes that enhanced human experience at work or, stated negatively, decreased the social and psychological costs incurred in producing goods and services.

Carlson (1978) put forward a unique way of looking at the concept of QWL and suggested that it can be studied and analyzed in any of the following three ways:

(a) as a movement;

(b) as a set of organizational interventions, and

(c) as a type of working life felt by employees.

In the opinion of Hackman & Oldham (1980) and Rice, et al; (1985), the construct of QWL is the interplay between work environment and personal needs of the employees.

According to Nadler (1981), QWL is concerned with improving the workplace, bringing humanity into the work situation, and creating the environment where people will find work personally satisfying as well as economically rewarding. QWL is also seen as less dogmatic in its insistence that work is positive. Ronchi (1981) feels that work can be, and sometimes, is bad – at least for some of those involved. But, there are ways to reduce, or at least redistribute, the “badness” and increase, or even, redistribute, the “goodness”; and QWL is just one of such ways.

According to Jenkins (1981), the quality of work life is a broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories, and management styles through
which organizations and jobs are designed so as to grant workers more autonomy, responsibility, and authority than is usually done. To simplify somewhat, the general objective is to arrange organizations, management procedures, and jobs for maximum utilization of individual talents and skills, in order to create more challenging and satisfying work and improve organizational effectiveness.

QWL activities are basically designed to free workers to fulfill their productive function more effectively by opening up new ways for them to apply their energies at work (Schlesinger & Oshry, 1982). In this regard, in the opinion of Scobel (1982), OD and QWL both began as ‘emotional movements’, as sincere attempts to pay attention to the unlimited creative power of that vast body of people in the organizations called “the managed”. QWL arose on the feet of these managed, rather mismanaged ones, with an emotional cry for instilling industrial democracy within the organizational setup.

As per the definition given by Davis (1983), Quality of Work Life is the quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment, with human dimensions added to the usual technical and economic considerations.

There is a growing recognition of QWL as a ‘multidiscipline’ construct (Pettman, Newton & Leckie, 1980), and there is no general consensus regarding its meaning (Ledford & Lawler, 1983). Probably that’s why, QWL has been defined by many researchers in a variety of ways, such as referring to human relation, OD, redesign of work systems and industrial democracy (Sayeed & Sinha, 1981); a management style (Stacey & Wise, 1983); a concern for people’s experience at work (Jain, 1983, 1984); quality of work (Attewell & Rule, 1984); a shared value approach (Hartenstein & Huddleston, 1984); a start for developing more flexible and participative form of workplace organization (Straw & Heckscher, 1984); subjective assessment of the relationship conditions between management and labour (Nirenberg, 1986); a cooperative effort on the part of union and management to involve employees in the decision making process (Thacker & Fields, 1987); concern for well-being of the worker and organizational effectiveness (Berkman & Neider, 1987); environment based on mutual trust (Ellinger & Nisen, 1987); intervention strategies for
organizational improvements (Gowdy, 1988); a working experience that is physically and spiritually life enhancing (Wyatt, 1988); employment quality (Kraut et al., 1989); the favorableness or unfavorableness of a total job environment for people (Davis & Newstorm, 1989); a mechanism for facilitating the release of human energy (Burstein, 1989); a construct mostly indicated by the individual work attitudes (Loscocco & Roschelle, 1991); a process by which organization responds to employee needs (Robbins, 1998). Thus, it appears that QWL is loosely used to cover a broad spectrum of activities (Jenkins, 1983): For some QWL corresponds with a specific set of theories, philosophies and schools of thought; for some it is an organization design approach; for some it is a problem solving approach; for some it is a technique to improve quality; for some it is an OD strategy; for some it is a method to improve organizational effectiveness and productivity; and yet, for many others, it may be a technique to improve labour-management relations.

Adding a new dimension to QWL, Smith (1985) pointed out the need to involve lower level employees also, through participation mechanisms, to support and maintain QWL initiatives; and added that it would boost productivity, product quality and employee morale.

Adding a new perspective to the concept of QWL, according to Schouteten (2001), QWL refers to the extent to which characteristics of work offer opportunities to create a balance between ‘control need’ and ‘control capacity’ as to meet demands and competencies of the workers. This definition combines the two most important perspectives in the discussion on QWL:

(a) *A Conditional Approach to QWL* that assumes that work characteristics determine the outcomes of the work. As an example of this approach, Karasek’s Job Demand – Job Control Model (1979) stresses the balance between job demands (control need) and decision latitude (control capacity) as determinants of QWL. Important job characteristics to be focused for achieving balance between these two are – wholeness of the work process, responsible autonomy and employee’s multiplicity of skills (Trist & Bamforth, 1951). This simply means that a job comprising of complete tasks and
sufficient control capacity to deal with control need is to be considered as having good QWL.

(b) A Fit Approach to QWL also includes the workers’ perceptions and capacities. A widely known example of the same is the Job Characteristics Model of Hackman and Oldham (1980), which emphasizes that perceived or experienced job characteristics are the most important determinants of worker’s behaviour, and hence, the outcome of work. But, at the same time, this perception or experience of job characteristics is affected by a worker’s knowledge, skill and the strength of the growth need. This partially explains us why different workers respond differently to the same job characteristics.

As quoted by Morin & Morin (2004) and Sturges & Guest (2004), QWL is a multidimensional construct usually referring to overall satisfaction with working life and with work/life balance, a sense of belongingness to a working group, a sense of becoming oneself, and a sense of being worthy and respectable.

Thus, as quoted by Efraty & Sirgy (1990), it appears that in spite of several researchers’ sincere efforts to study the concept of QWL (Champoux, 1981; Davis & Cherns, 1975; Hackman & Suttle, 1977; Kabanoff, 1980; Kahn, 1981; Lawler, 1982; Near, et al., 1980; Quinn & Shephard, 1974; Quinn & Staines, 1979; Staines, 1980), there is no one acceptable description of what QWL really means. Amongst this pool of various researchers trying to define the term in different ways, the most widely accepted and frequently quoted definition was given by J. Richard & J. Loy as follows:

“Quality of Work Life refers to the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy their important personal needs through their experiences in the organization”.

On the same line, QWL is also defined as the satisfaction of an individual’s various needs, such as health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetic needs from his/her
participation in the work place (Sirgy et al., 2001). Ensuring better QWL should be the organizational responsibility, as employees who commit themselves fully to achieving the organizational goals should also experience a high quality of work life (Kotze, 2005).

QWL initiatives are also defined as “any activity which takes place at any level of the organization, which seeks greater organizational effectiveness through enhancement of human dignity and growth... a process through which the stockholders in the organization – management, employees and unions - learn how to work together better to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve the twin and simultaneous goals of an improved quality of life at work for all members of the organization and greater effectiveness for both the company and the unions” (Subba Rao, 2005).

From an organizational perspective, QWL is the tendency for humanization of work environments and for democratization of work relations based on practices, principles and interventions undertaken in organizations (Elisaveta, 2006).

To Huang et al. (2007), QWL is the favorable conditions and environments of the work place that addresses the welfare and well-being of the employees. Contrary to this, Knox and Irving, as cited in Lewis et al. (2001), pointed out that the determination of QWL should not only be based on strengths or favorableness of the total work environment, but it should also include its weaknesses. This is because whether presence of strengths or absence weaknesses – both as essential ingredients of an ideal work environment – affects the employees and motivates effective work performance (Gnanayudam & Dharmasiri, 2007).

So, QWL is a broad umbrella covering a wide variety of programmes, techniques, and management styles through which organizations in general, and jobs in particular, are designed in such a way that employees get more autonomy and authority at work (Ghosh, Nandan & Gupta, 2009).
At the same time, Rao (2010) rightly suggested that QWL is a goal, as well as a process. It’s an ongoing process wherein the unions as well as management have equal responsibility to ensure its effective functioning (Hian & Einstein, 1990). So, organizations must understand that ensuring better QWL to employees is not a one-shot affair; it’s a never ending ongoing process that demands continuous whole hearted efforts and support of the top beyond ‘lip service’.

In general, QWL can be understood as a generic term for a range of techniques and processes that are designed to give employees greater discretion and control over their work. The basic idea behind any QWL initiative is that greater participation and involvement in decision making by employees will lead to improvements in satisfaction, motivation and commitment, which, in turn, might lead to positive improvements in productivity.

The present research study has utilized two conceptual perspectives related to the construct of QWL – one is of Carlson (1978) and the other is of J. Richard & J. Loy, which are as follows:

As per the opinion of Carlson (1978), as quoted in Miller (1978), QWL can be studied and analyzed in any of the following three ways:

(a) as a movement;

(b) as a set of organizational interventions, and

(c) as a type of working life felt by employees.

This study is basically focused on the third perspective of QWL, that is, studying and analyzing QWL as a type of working life felt by employees of GSRTC. So, here, the main focus is on finding out what constitutes a QWL experience among the employees of GSRTC, and what the perceived availability of various QWL attributes at their work place is. This is measured by relying on the fact that QWL refers to the degree to which
members of a work organization are able to satisfy their important personal needs through their experiences in the organization (Richard & Loy).

After years of economic development and income growth, compensation and benefits are no longer the only things that employees want. As Sharma (1987) puts, they are no longer interested in bread alone. The changing values of the new age workforce indicate that they are more interested in elevating their quality of life (Huang, Lawler & Lei, 2007). Here, it would not be out of context to mention that several studies (Sinha, 1982; De, Nitish, 1982, 1984, Verma, 1993) indicated that there is a strong interlinkage between quality of working & quality of life. The same was supported by London, Crandall & Seals (1977) by focusing on contributions of job and leisure satisfaction to quality of life; and by Elizur & Shye, (1990) by studying the relation of quality of work life with quality of life.

With this changed workforce demographics in terms of increased education, awareness and expectations, the QWL concerns are increasingly drawing attention of the organizational authorities, as it was reported way back by Ganguly & Joseph (1976) and Mehta (1982) that quality of working life concerns are taking on increasing space in the aspirations of ‘Young Workforce’ in India and abroad alike (Roan & Diamond, 2003). Stepp (1985) reported that in a study of New York Stock Exchange revealed that one in seven companies with 100 or more employees has some form of QWL programme. This increasing popularity of QWL is possibly because of the expected linkage between employees perceiving a better quality of work life in the organization and feeling satisfied and displaying greater work motivation. The underlying assumption of this is that the employees who perceive a better quality of work life in the organization are likely to take more risks, generate new ideas, and might make mistakes, which in turn lead to new products, services, and markets. Because employees will feel more satisfied, they are more likely to display greater work motivation and job satisfaction. Because they are more informed and empowered, they are likely to feel that they have a fuller role to play in the organization and that their opinions and expertise are valued more. This of course underlines greater commitment.
With higher skills and greater potential for contribution, they are likely to have more job security as well as be more marketable to other organizations. Hence, they feel a sort of value addition in terms of their career prospects and consequently job involvement and organizational commitment are bound to increase.

1.2.3. Components / Constituents of QWL:

According to Cronbach and Meehl (1955), whenever no universe of content is accepted as entirely adequate to define a construct, the empirical referents need to be explicitly delineated from other similar sounding constructs. While the literature on STS provides the theoretical underpinnings for the construct QWL and provides general understanding of QWL; the theoretical markers for the construct of QWL need to be found in the literature on constituents/components of QWL.

Despite rich literature available on QWL constituents, there seems to be an annoying ambiguity with respect to the constituents of QWL, as a number of researchers and theorists have tried to identify the factors that can be considered as the integral part of QWL experience at work; and they have reported different referents of QWL. Thus, as the term Quality of Work Life (QWL) have different connotations to different persons; the factors contributing to QWL are also varied (Joshi, 2007).

To a worker on the assembly line it may simply mean a fair day's work, safe working conditions, and a supervisor who treats him/her with dignity. To the young professional it may mean opportunity for advancement, career growth, being able to utilize one’s talents, etc. To an academician it may mean being able to satisfy important personal needs, etc.

However, comprehensive delineation of the QWL concept is found in three major works of Walton (1975), Taylor (1978), and Levine, Taylor & Davis (1984); as depicted in Table 1.1. Although speculative, Walton (1975) was considered to be the first to propose eight dimensions and empirical referents based on studies of workers and their experiences at work. Following him, Taylor (1978) conducted the first
empirical examination using factor analysis to investigate the underlying structure of QWL. He even added items to include the employer and society at large, as recommended by Seashore (1975). On the other hand, Levine et al. (1984) defined and measured QWL in an insurance company from the perspective of white-collar employees. Thus, it should be clear that all empirical referents are not equally relevant for different categories of employees, and different sets of empirical referents for different groups of employees are required. However, some inferences can be drawn about QWL from the fit between the patterns of data in Table 1.1. Thus, fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, use and development of human capabilities, security, social integration, constitutionalism, favorable work life interaction with home life, and social relevance of work seem to be the pattern of relationships that permit naming and structuring the QWL construct (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955).
### Table 1.1: Empirical Referents of QWL – Three Major Studies

|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|

Source: Brooks & Anderson (2005)
Other prominent researchers have attempted to measure QWL in a variety of settings using combinations of various questionnaires. Job satisfaction (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Igbaria, Parasuraman, & Badawy, 1994; Studt, 1998), organizational commitment (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Igbaria et al., 1994), alienation (Efraty & Sirgy, 1990), job stress (Baba & Jamal, 1991), organizational identification (Efraty & Sirgy, 1990), job involvement (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Igbaria et al., 1994; Studt, 1998), and finally work role ambiguity, conflict, and overload (Baba & Jamal, 1991) were used as proxy measures of QWL. This adds to the ongoing confusion as to what constitutes quality of work life, as significant overlap is found in the exact referents of QWL.

Most research studies in the field focus on two sets of factors having a bearing on job satisfaction and motivation and ultimately on quality of work life:

- **Organization driven factors; and**

- **Individual driven factors.**

Under the first category of ‘Organization Driven Factors’, policies and procedures that deal with retaining the employees such as training and education advancement opportunities, grievance handling, monetary benefits, participative management, safety and security, welfare measures and recognition and appreciation may be highlighted. To a large extent, QWL in the organization becomes conducive if policies on the above mentioned issues are designed and implemented in a proactive manner, leading to high degree of satisfaction with them.

The second category, having a bearing on QWL, is called ‘Individual Driven Factors’. Individual driven factors are those which are mostly governed by individual idiosyncrasies, likes and dislikes. These generally include managerial style, delegation, communication and interpersonal relations. The quality of work culture, to a large extent is influenced by these variables as they directly deal with people management.
By and large the studies in this area show the effect of organization and individual driven factors on satisfaction and commitment of employees to their jobs/organization. Indirectly the emphasis has been on the QWL conditions and feelings.

Various studies conducted on QWL include employment conditions, employment security, income adequacy, profit sharing, equity of pay and other rewards, worker autonomy, worker commitment, social interaction, self esteem, self expression, democracy, worker satisfaction, employee involvement, advancement, relations with supervisors and peers, and job enrichment (Walton, 1974; Davis & Cherns, 1975; Chander & Singh, 1993; Gani, 1993).

There is a plethora of literature highlighting the factors critical for the assessment of QWL; and a number of researchers and theorists have been interested in the meaning of the QWL concept and have tried to identify the kinds of factors that determine such an experience at work (Walton, 1973, 1974, 1975; Seashore, 1976; Morton, 1977; Carlson, 1978; Rosow, 1980; Kahn, 1981; Lawler, 1982; Delamotte & Takezawa, 1984; Kalra & Ghosh, 1983, 1984, 1985; Mirvis and Lawler, 1984; Kerce and Booth-Kewley, 1993; Srinivas, 1994).

For example, Seashore (1975) stated that, “... a significant by-product of the approach to the quality of working life discussed has been the identification of those aspects of jobs and work environments that impact most strongly upon the job satisfaction, job performance, and life-long well being of those who are so employed.”

But, a careful review of such earlier studies leads to a conclusion that whatsoever may be the nomenclature of various factors of QWL reported in these studies, mainly the discussion of QWL seems to be centered around two general factors namely the work/work environment, and the employee welfare & well being.

The following Table 1.2 presents a comprehensive summary of a number of previous studies on QWL indicating the various factors deemed to be of significance for employees.
Table 1.2: Constituents of QWL – Insights from Previous Research Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Study</th>
<th>Constituents of QWL</th>
<th>Employee Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lippitt &amp; Rumley (1977)</td>
<td>Organizational Environment, Physical Environment, Features of Job Itself</td>
<td>Healthy Social Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn (1981)</td>
<td>Task Content, Supervision, Resources, Promotion, Work Conditions, Organizational Context</td>
<td>Autonomy &amp; Control, Relations With Co-Workers, Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkman (1981)</td>
<td>Job Mobility, Quantity &amp; Quality of Leisure Time Created by Job</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macarov (1981)</td>
<td>Chance to Advance</td>
<td>Seniority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz (1982)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Job Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delamotte &amp; Takezawa</td>
<td>Challenging Work Content, Traditional Goals, Influence on Decisions</td>
<td>Fair Treatment, Work as Part of Life Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Study</td>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>Employee Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Earlier Research Studies
Out of these comprehensive listing of constituents of QWL, the research of Saklani (2003) appears to be the most recent and advanced version. In the process of QWL scale development, based on the sample survey of 294 respondents, he developed this framework, and further empirically tested it in the Indian context (Saklani, 2004, 2010). Hence, in this research study, the Quality of Work Life (QWL) is measured by using this 13 component framework of Saklani (2003).

1.2.4. Significance of Quality of Work Life (QWL):

It has been recognized since long that the work environment provided by the organization has an important influence on the job attitudes of industrial employees (Ganguli, 1955), psychological health of its employees, and consequently the health of the organization itself (Argyris, 1957; McGregor, 1960); as life at work place is an integral part of total life space of an individual (Lawler III, Nadler & Cammann, 1980). The influence and importance of the workplace in providing a sense of community for workers, and thereby improving their sense of belongingness; has been highlighted in a number of earlier research studies (Deyo, 1980; Fine, 1986; Hochschild, 1997). According to Green (2005), concerns about improving the total working environment were triggered by rapid advancements in technology that threatened de-skilling, dehumanization, alienation and the objectification of labour under Taylorist and Fordist influence. Highlighting the same concerns, Mumford (2006) also reported that the resourcefulness of the employees in an organization depends largely on the quality of work life experienced at the workplace, and due attention should be paid to providing a satisfying and high quality work environment for the employees commensurate with other associated work factors. Moreover, the issue of QWL is getting increasing attention in the recent times not only due to increasing demands of today’s business environment, but also of the family structure, which ultimately made it popular across all professions and fields (Akdere, 2006).

In the present are also, the importance of work and the life associated with the workplace for an employee is certainly becoming increasingly significant; and hence
organizations have to find ways to respond to the new realities of the workplace, that is, showing genuine concern for providing better QWL to its employees (Kandasamy & Sreekumar, 2009). The ever increasing popularity and concern for ensuring better QWL perhaps has been due to the realization that human resource is the most important asset which must be nurtured and developed (Saklani, 2010).

From a business perspective, quality of work life is important since there is evidence demonstrating that the nature of the work environment is related to satisfaction of employees and work related behaviours (Greenhaus et al., 1987). Lambert (1991) also noted that job characteristics have a definite impact on the job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation of men and women workers. Parker et al. (2003), based on researchers’ report, contended that there exist definite relationships between employees’ positive perceptions of their work environment in terms of QWL and outcomes of organizational interest like employee attitudes such as job satisfaction, job involvement, and job performance. The same was signaled by Brown & Leigh (1996). So, improving the QWL of employees is seen as one of the crucial competitive factors to improve an organization’s ability to compete in this turbulent and highly demanding business era (Chan & Wyatt, 2007).

While evaluating the bottom-line benefits of work/life programmes, Landauer (1997), highlighted the crucial role of QWL. Thus, QWL is important for ensuring better job performance, job satisfaction, labour turnover, labour-management relations and such other factors which play an important role in determining the overall well-being of an organization (Hoque & Rahman, 1999). Besides better human resource outcomes, the organizational efforts to provide better QWL seem to also benefit business performance. While comparing the companies that were identified as the “best companies to work for” to the Standard and Poor’s 100 companies, Lau & May (1998) found that companies offering/providing high QWL enjoy exceptional growth and profitability. Once again, in 2000, using samples from Standard & Poor’s 500 companies, Lau (2000) found that QWL companies have a higher growth rate as measured by the five-year trends of sale growth and asset growth. Kirby & Harter
(2001) pointed out that underscoring most QWL programmes is an assumption that organizational survival and economic well-being is directly related to dynamics of the “total job environment” for people. Lawler (2005) also highlighted the role of QWL in creating high performance organizations. LooSee & Rose (2007) reported that QWL can prove to be a source of sustained human capital and competitive advantage when assessing what is truly unique about organizations.

Thus, the significance of this multifaceted concept of QWL can never be overlooked. It has many promising outcomes. In a way, improvement in QWL is a certain source of numerous gains not only for the employees, but also for the organization and the society at large. In this regard, White (1983) puts that the quality of working life and its relationship to other aspects of life is important to individuals, to the organizations in which they work, and to society as a whole; as QWL has many direct, indirect and unintended effects on people’s working lives. Thus, in addition to the concerned employees, the society as a whole might gain from QWL, as certain social problems like unrest in society, mental and health problems, drug and alcohol abuse and inequitable distribution of national income can be effectively combated with better QWL (Hackman & Suttle, 1977). Moreover, QWL programmes can lead to greater self esteem and improved job satisfaction on the part of employees (Suttle, 1977) and satisfied employees are more likely to work harder and provide better services (Yoon & Suh, 2003). A number of researches conducted across the national boundaries demonstrate that improvement in QWL has definite potential and scope for improving productivity and overall organizational effectiveness (Cherns, 1973, 1975; Lupton, 1975; Cummings & Molloy, 1977; Lawler & Drexler, 1978; Sayeed & Sinha, 1981; Lawler & Ledford, 1982; Buchanan & Buddy, 1982; Crick, 1982; Stein, 1983; Levitan & Werneke, 1984; Simmons & Mares, 1987; Sharma & Ghosh, 1993). Even in the recent study of 475 managers of manufacturing industry, conducted by LooSee & Rose (2007), found that QWL is a good predictor of job performance and the predictive validity is significantly high. They further elaborated on the relationship that job performance can be captured by QWL, demonstrating the dynamism of the work life. This finding is consistent with Delaney & Huselid (1996), Pruijt (2000) and Lau
who also indicated that QWL is a significant factor in determining job performance. However, it must be noted that the relationship between changes in the QWL and productivity/performance depends to some extent on the particular employee’s awareness of certain deficiencies (Walton, 1975), and whether the organization has union or not, as QWL programmes have a greater likelihood of success in nonunion settings (Glaser, 1976; Greenberg, & Glaser, 1981; Ashkenas & Jick, 1982), as unions play a significant role in success/failure of QWL efforts (Rubinstein, 1984).

When it comes to a Public Sector organization like GSRTC in the present research study, these findings can only have meaning if we take into consideration a set of situational variables that predispose successful QWL applications in the public sector (Golembiewski & Sun, 1991). Herrick (1972, 1983) also noted some of the experiments with Quality of Working Life Systems in improving the humanization of work as well as working of Government Organizations.

Considering all these, management always viewed QWL programmes as a way of reducing costs and improving productivity (Gordon, 1987); and organizations that have introduced techniques to improve QWL have reported increased productivity (Craver, 1983; Towe, 1990; Cole, 1991). Even QWL efforts have been reported to have positive effects on improving the economic performance of the organization through positive effects on industrial relations performance (Katz, Kochan & Gobeille, 1983).

In fact, over the years, QWL has emerged as one of the increasingly popular cross-cultural interventions which resulted in improving quality, productivity and enhancing employee involvement (Cummings, et al., 1975; Chers, 1983; Shani & Pasmore, 1983; Cummings & Mohrman, 1987; Bushe, 1988; Mirvis, 1988; Baba & Jamal, 1991, Brooks, 2004). On the same line, based on the study of 231 applications of QWL conducted over 22 years, Golembiewski & Sun (1990) reported that the success rates for QWL are substantial encompassing positive changes in attitudes, opinions, and self reports about worksite features.
The outcomes of improved QWL may vary ranging from improvement in working relationships (Keidel, 1982), improvement in organizational performance and product quality (Macy, 1982), improvement in employee commitment (Walton, 1982), improvement in work design (Goodman, 1982), improvement in organizational effectiveness (Sorensen & Hed, 1983), to serving as a foundation for a climate for providing better services to customers (Schneider & Bowen, 1985). Based on over 3 dozen separate surveys, QWL applications show a very strong record of intended outcomes like planned change in organizations (Sun, 1988; Golembiewski & Sun; 1988, 1990).

High level of QWL has also been reported to be associated with high level of job satisfaction on many aspects of working life, commitment and performance (Nadler & Lawler (III), 1983; Wilcock & Wright, 1991). On the same line, QWL is also found to be positively affecting employees’ work responses in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover, and personal alienation (Carter et al., 1990; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Efraty et al., 1991). Studies of Haque (1992) and Hoque & Rahman (1999) also revealed that QWL is important for job performance, job satisfaction, labour turnover, and labour management relations.

Even organizations showing more concern regarding ensuring better QWL for their employees are found to be more effective in retaining their employees and achieving their goals (Louis & Smith, 1990; May, Lau & Johnson, 1999, Hayes et al., 2006) by ensuring greater attraction and retention of the best employees, and thereby enhancing the ability of the organization to deliver high quality services (Berry, 1981). This may be due the fact that better QWL in terms of better job characteristics and work environments positively relate to organizational commitment, which in turn reduces the intention of turnover (Steers & Mowday, 1981). Similar sort of findings were reported in the study of Huang, Lawler & Lei (2007), wherein QWL dimensions were found significantly and positively related to career commitment and affective commitment.
However, Thacker & Fields (1987, 1992) reported that organizational commitment increases only when employees perceive the QWL efforts as successful.

It is also found to be associated with reducing grievances (Macy, 1980; Ronchi, 1981; Stein, 1983; Straw & Heckscher, 1984; Lawler, 1986; Marshall, 1987; Voos, 1989), turnover, absenteeism, and industrial accidents (Macy & Mirvis, 1976; Guest, 1979; Macy, 1980; Canmam & Ledford, 1985; Havlovic, 1991; Gani & Ahmed, 1995).

Ronchi & Wilkens (1977) also reported 16 percent reduction in absenteeism after QWL intervention, while Straw & Heckscher (1984) supports this finding with the fact that the base absentee rate declined in the post-QWL period. In addition to this, Goodman (1980) reported that absenteeism, turnover and tardiness are strongly and positively affected in most QWL projects. Pais (1981) found that on account of poor QWL, workers in textile industry were having higher absenteeism rate.

In the opinion of Cohen-Rosenthal (1984), Quality of Work Life programmes change the traditional adversarial and hierarchical workplace: labour and management work more cooperatively, and employees at all levels are more fully involved in decision making.

It has also been identified as a significant predictor of organizational commitment of managers and auditors (Anuradha & Pandey, 1995; Huang, Lawler & Lei, 2007). According to Von de Looi & Bender (1995), low QWL may adversely affect the quality of services and organizational commitment; as quality in the work environment is seen as a prerequisite for success in new service development (Edvardsson & Gustavsson, 2003).

This is particularly relevant in case of Service Sector organization like Transportation Sector, wherein organizational success is largely dependent on the encounter between employees and customers (passengers in case of transportation sector) (Testa & Ehrhart, 2005). So, more favorable outcomes are realized when employee expectations are understood, communicated and consistently measured (Knight, Crutsinger & Kim,
In a way, ‘quality’ in the work life of an employee reflects spontaneously in mental well-being (Gavin, 1975) and physical well-being (and is duly transferred as ‘quality in the service towards customers (Kandasamy & Sreekumar, 2009). This need was aptly signaled way back by emphasizing on treating the employees as internal customers, who also want ‘quality’ of work life in return to their contributions (Berry, Hensel & Burke, 1976), and understanding of employee expectations is important for successful external marketing (Greene, Walls & Schrest, 1994) in terms of achieving excellent service and customer satisfaction (Meudell & Gadd, 1994; Borchgrevink & Susskind, 1999). Complementing this viewpoint, Kotler (2000) and Berry & Parasuraman (1992) point out that internal marketing is more important than conventional external marketing, wherein internal marketing emphasizes on treating employees as internal customers and devising ways and means to shaper their job products to fit their needs, which can ultimately lead to higher level of external service quality (Johnson, 1996; Griffith, 2001).

Extensive review of the health and well-being literature also confirms that people who experience higher levels of QWL are more likely to be experiencing higher levels of health and well-being also (Danna & Griffin, 1999). And these days, for an organization to be successful and achieve its objectives, it is essential that its employees are satisfied with their work and have high level of well-being also (Rathi, 2010). And it is well established in the literature that employees are likely to have higher well-being if they are satisfied with their work and organization and if they perceive positive QWL (Chan & Wyatt, 2007; Srivastava, 2007), and consequently they would be more committed and productive (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000, 2004). Researches in the domains of industrial/organizational psychology also indicate that QWL is an important predictor of life satisfaction (Rice, Near & Hunt, 1980), health and psychological well-being of employees (Repetti, 1987; Sirgy et al; 2001; Wilson et al; 2004; Martel & Dupuis, 2006).

So, almost all the earlier researches on QWL invariably establish the fact that QWL is a significant determinant of various enviable organizational outcomes, such as increased
task performances, lower absenteeism and turnover rate, lower tardiness frequency, increased organizational effectiveness, and organizational commitment (Donaldson et al; 1999; Sirgy et al; 2001; Wilson et al; 2004; Srivastava, 2008). Improvements in QWL might lead to more positive feelings towards one’s self (greater self esteem), towards one’s job (improved job satisfaction and involvement), and towards the organization (stronger commitment to the organization’s goals) (Saklani, 2003). According to Steers & Porter (1983), as quoted in Saklani (2004), research has provided empirical support to the contention that enhanced QWL leads to improved employee satisfaction and fulfillment (Sashkin & Lengermann, 1984), increased mutual trust, improved employee-supervisor relationships, reduced stress and improved health, reduced counterproductive attitudes and behaviors, increased job security, reduced grievances, better utilization of human resources, deeper sense of worker responsibility, reduced labour-management conflict, increased productivity, bolstered strength of unions in given settings and a strengthened position of companies in competitive markets.

Recently, Kaushik & Tonk (2008) reported that the benefits of enhanced quality of work of life can be given as follows:

- Positive feelings towards one’s job (improved job satisfaction and job involvement);
- Positive feelings towards oneself (improved self esteem);
- Positive feelings towards the organization (stronger commitment to the organization);
- Improved physical and psychological health;
- Greater growth and development of the individual as a person and as a productive member of the organization;
- Decreased absenteeism, turnover, and accidents; and
- Higher quality and quantity of output of goods and services.
Considering all these, the significance of fostering better QWL can be easily understood and perhaps realizing this only, QWL has become a ‘buzz’ word across the corporate corridors.

1.2.5. Approaches to Assess/Examine Quality of Work Life (QWL):

Quality of Work Life (QWL), being an abstract and seemingly philosophical concept, needs to be measured carefully to derive meaningful conclusions. According to Hannif, Burgess & Connell (2008), the term job quality closely ties in with the concept of QWL, and the two are often exchangeable. Both concepts are concerned with the characteristics or attributes that a job possesses, how employees perceive the same, and both are concerned with the well-being of the employee in relation to the working environment. Over the years, various approaches used to assess or examine job quality and the QWL are also similar.

Out of various approaches used to measure job quality or QWL; the approaches suggested by Burgess (2003) are the widely accepted ones. The four key approaches, put forward by Burgess (2003) are as follows:

(A) The first, ‘The Minimum Standards Approach’, involves identifying the basic standards that all work arrangements should meet.

(B) The second approach, termed as the ‘2nd Tier Standards Approach’, involves identifying those attributes that go beyond the minimum labour standards to constitute a ‘decent’ job.

While both these approaches are useful for determining what constitutes a sub-standard work condition, they fail to provide insight into factors that determine quality in employment from the perspective of those experiencing them – the workers or employees. They also overlook the influence these factors may have on workers and their workplaces, and imply some preexisting process for identification, measurement and the establishment of the standard.
Figure 1.1: Approaches to Assess/Examine QWL

**Approaches to Assess/Examine QWL**

- **Minimum Standards Approach**
  Identifying the basic standards that all work arrangements should meet.

- **2nd Tier Standards Approach**
  Identifying those attributes that go beyond the minimum labour standards to constitute a ‘decent’ job.

- **Job Quality Index Approach**
  Developing an index based on careful measurement, and the identification and inclusion of relevant job quality measures.

- **Job Characteristics Approach**
  Identifying the key elements that contribute to job quality while examining these elements against specific jobs.

(C) The third - ‘Job Quality Index Approach’ is described as a process of developing an index based on careful measurement, and the identification and inclusion of relevant job quality measures, separation of data, and the weighting of specific job characteristics. Although this approach lends important insight into the general trends on job quality in the labour market, there are a few limitations that must be noted. The first is the absence of clear, unambiguous data. Data on many job quality components (such as individual autonomy, monitoring, and managerial relationships) are often unavailable, or are unusable because of the uncertainty and/or inconsistencies surrounding their measurement. Furthermore, Meisenheimer (1998) notes that even where acceptable measures of job characteristics exist; their interpretation is often dependent on the individual preferences of employees,
discarding those job characteristics that lack clear, unambiguous measures. Data is also problematic as it can result in incomplete and potentially misleading index-score/s. Another difficulty associated with this approach is the determination of how much weight to attach to each job quality component when calculating the index. Finally, these measures are based on theoretical frameworks that are rarely spelled out. This may be due to the fact that, as with the other measures, they are largely ad hoc and based on some processes of consensus of what constitutes a standard or an important aspect of job quality.

(D) ‘The Job Characteristics Approach’, the forth approach consists of identifying the key elements that contribute to job quality while examining these elements against specific jobs.

Consistent with this approach, a unique list of job quality, here, Quality of Work Life (QWL) components have been determined for the employees of a STU like GSRTC. To determine this framework, the researcher reviewed the QWL literature and the frameworks that have been previously used to examine job quality, precisely QWL, in different sectors, industries and countries. Even literature concerning the working of GSRTC as well as other STUs in India was also thoroughly reviewed. Based on this extensive review of literature, especially the published and unpublished documents of GSRTC, coupled with insights gained from the in-depth interviews and discussions with the key informants during the Exploratory stage, the researcher came to the conclusion that three very recent pioneering empirical studies conducted on QWL assessment in the Indian Context by Saklani (2003, 2004, 2010) are particularly useful and relevant in structuring the present research study. So, for developing the structured questionnaire, precisely the Pre-coded Interview Schedule, these three studies have been taken as a base.

1.2.6. QWL v/s Job Satisfaction:

Many a times, quality of work life and job satisfaction are treated as synonyms. But, it is a mistaken approach. While referring to quality of nursing work life, Brooks (2004)
clearly pointed out that the published literature clearly demonstrates that QWL and job satisfaction are entirely different things and should not be confused as if they are synonymous.

A dominant approach adopted in previous research studies on QWL was to consider Job Satisfaction as a ‘measure of QWL’. So, most of the earlier job satisfaction research predominantly focused on employees’ likes and dislikes and proposed solutions to dissatisfaction as if something is to be fixed by the management (Davis, 1971, 1972; Taylor, 1973; Walton, 1974; Seashore, 1975). But, research has consistently revealed that there is no point in measuring job satisfaction among the employees; as high job satisfaction among employees does not necessarily lead to improved organizational outcomes (Goodell & Coeling, 1994; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Nadler & Lawler, 1983; Organ, 1988), like the age old saying, ‘a happy and satisfied employee may not necessarily be a productive one’. So, for assessing what the employees feels about their job/work, QWL construct seems to be better one compared to job satisfaction construct (Davis, 1975; Taylor, 1977), as job satisfaction, being a micro concept in comparison to QWL, is an unsatisfactory construct to assess either the jobs themselves or employees’ feelings about the work/job. Additionally, job satisfaction is only one of the many aspects of QWL (Davis & Cherns, 1975; White, 1981), and therefore, the use of job satisfaction as a measure of QWL has its limitations (Wilcock & Wright, 1991).

Essentially, QWL can be defined as the favorable conditions and environments of a workplace that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing rewards, job security and growth opportunities (May et al; 1999). QWL has also been interpreted as ‘internal service quality’ to the quality of work environment that contributes to employee satisfaction (Heskett et al; 1994). The literature on QWL presents contradiction in terms of delineating between QWL and Job Satisfaction, as some treats QWL as a concept that is concerned with employees’ job satisfaction (Juuti, 1991; Lau & Bruce, 1998; Anbarasan & Mehta, 2010); while some others feels that the concept of
QWL goes beyond examining only job satisfaction (Considine & Callus, 2001; Sirgy, et al; 2001).

However, QWL is thought to lead to job satisfaction, as job satisfaction is a primary outcome of work experiences that meet valued needs of individuals and thus represents a key indicator of the quality of work life (Igbaria, Parasuraman & Badawy, 1994). Haque (1992) examined the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction and found that QWL led to greater job satisfaction. Hossain and Islam (1999) found that there existed a positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction among government hospital nurses in Bangladesh. Several other studies also indicated that QWL has a significant impact on job satisfaction, as with higher QWL if one’s needs are satisfied, one would certainly experience higher levels of job satisfaction (Porter, 1961, 1962; Hall et al; 1978; Danna & Griffin, 1999). Job Enrichment and Job Satisfaction were also found to be high in QWL Work Sites compared to non-QWL Work Sites (Ondrack & Evans, 1986). The study of Elisaveta (2006) reported that total job satisfaction is a strong determinant that contributes to the significant variance in the perceived QWL across the sectors. Daud (2010) reported that providing better quality of work life to employees is an important consideration for employers who are interested in improving employees’ job satisfaction and commitment.

QWL refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life (job satisfaction), satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life (Sirgy et al; 2001). Danna & Griffin (1999) see QWL as a hierarchy of concepts that include non-work domains such as life satisfaction at the top of the hierarchy, job satisfaction at the middle position, and more work-specific aspects of job satisfaction like pay, coworkers etc. at a lower place in the hierarchy.

But, the fact remains that QWL differs from job satisfaction, which has been supported by several researches (Quinn & Shephard, 1974; Davis & Chermans, 1975; Hackman & Suttle, 1977; Kabanoff, 1980; Near et al; 1980; Stains, 1980; Champoux, 1981; Lawler (III), 1975, 1982).
In nutshell, we conclude that QWL and Job Satisfaction are two separate constructs, however higher QWL may lead to higher Job Satisfaction. But, the reverse need not be true, as compared to Job Satisfaction, QWL is a macro concept. So, Job Satisfaction may be treated as a part of QWL, and not the whole of it.

1.3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF JOB INVOLVEMENT (JI):

1.3.1. Concept & Meaning of Job Involvement (JI):

Taking clue from the term ‘Job Involvement’ itself, we can say that it is an indicator of how much an employee is involved in his/her job. For an organization, it is important that all its employees are highly involved in their jobs, that is, they should have high job involvement level. Conceptually, job involvement is an employee’s work related attitude which is reflected in his/her enthusiasm, zeal and interest in his/her job. So, in a layman language, job involvement is defined as attitude held by an employee towards his/her job.

Job Involvement is one of the primary work/job related attitudes in which organizations are showing increasing interest now-a-days; and it appears that over the years, this concept has been gaining steadily in importance (McKelvey & Sekaran, 1977). According to Verma (1987), the concept of job involvement has gained an intense importance in the systematic study of human behaviour within the organizational setup.

According to Misra (1979), research on job involvement is comparatively recent and mostly based on extensive contributions of empirically oriented psychologists. It appears that the term ‘job involvement’ is still in quest of a distinct identity, as there is a problem of semantics. A number of other terms are used by people to convey the same meaning as ‘job involvement’, such as, attachment to work, central life interest, commitment to work, intrinsic motivation, ego involvement, morale etc., and this adds to the complexity of precisely defining this construct. Paullay, Alliger & Stone-
Romero (1994) also supports this notion that there are numerous terms such as work alienation, work involvement, job commitment, work commitment etc., that have been used by the researchers to describe attitude or orientation towards one’s job; and this leads to considerable confusion.

However, the process of ‘ego involvement in work’ has remained a long time concern of both psychologists, such as McGregor (1944), Allport (1947) and Vroom (1962), and sociologists such as Hughes (1958) and Dubin (1958, 1961), with one noticeable difference. While the psychologists have focused on organizational conditions that lead to job involvement; such as meaningfulness of work, adequacy of supervision, etc., the sociologists have shown more concern about the various aspects of the socialization process through which a person inculcates the work relevant norms, values and behaviour. So, much of the earlier efforts were focused on defining job involvement as the amalgamation or merging of an individual’s ego identity with his or her job.

Even though, several studies (Lodahl & Kenjer, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Gechman & Wiener, 1975; Saal, 1978; Kanungo, 1979; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981) have tried to identify job involvement as a distinct work attitude, the problem of delineating job involvement from other seemingly similar work attitudes, especially job satisfaction, has still remained.

In the opinion of Lodahl & Kenjer (1965), who developed the most celebrated and widely used measure of job involvement, this primary work attitude - job involvement affects people for whom his/her job constitutes the most important portion of life. Thus, job involvement can be conceptualized as “the degree to which a person identifies psychologically with his/her work or the importance of work in his total self image. So, in a way, job involvement refers to the internalization of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the total worth of the person, and thereby it provides an insight about the ease with which the person can be further socialized by the organization, in the organization. So, job Involvement is a cognitive
belief state reflecting the degree of psychological identification with one’s job (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Locke, 1976; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Kanungo, 1981, 1982).

Supporting the same notion, Agarwala (1978), who has done pioneering research for developing the scale to measure job involvement in Indian context, refers to this construct of job involvement as an individual’s willingness to invest himself/herself in pursuit of job activities perceived to be meaningful. In his opinion, a highly job-involved person is sure to demonstrate a strong desire to be at work, would be willing to exert himself/herself to cope with the demands of the job, consider the work activities as self-rewarding etc. So, job involvement can be considered as an indicator of an individual’s commitment towards his/her own work/job.

Bass (1965) refers to job involvement as a peculiar indicator of an employee’s ego involvement in his/her job; and further specifies the organizational conditions that lead to strengthening this work attitude, such as, opportunity to make more of the job decisions, the feeling that one is making an important contribution to organization’s success, recognition, achievement, self-determination and freedom to set one’s own work place.

In the opinion of Lawler (III) & Hall (1970), the way a job is designed has a substantial impact upon the attitudes (Steers, 1976), beliefs, and the feelings of the job holder; even though there is relatively little theoretical or empirical evidence to support this notion. On the same line, according to literature, Job Involvement is also seen as a construct that arises out of interactions between individual disparity of sensitivity about the work settings and personality traits (Sandler, 1974; Ruh et al., 1975; Schein, 1983). Hence, job involvement appears to be a construct that follows directly from the way individuals are affected by their immediate work environment and interpersonal relationships (Ruh et al., 1975).

Wood (1974, 1975) felt that job involvement, though a multidimensional construct, can be generalized to refer to how a person perceives his/her work performance affecting his/her self esteem. Thus, the primary determinant in being highly job involved seems
to be a general, rather pervasive foundation of value orientation toward work, learned during the early stages of the socialization process.

Kanungo, Misra & Dayal (1975) were of the opinion that the attitude of job involvement represents the degree to which the total job situation is thought of being central to one’s life or self-concept. Thus, for highly job involved employee, performance of the job becomes the top most priority in his/her life; and his/her self image is largely dependent by the same.

Saleh & Hosek (1976) put forward four different interpretations of the concept of JI, as follows. In their opinion, an individual is job involved:

- When work to him/her is a central life interest;
- When he/she actively participates in his/her job;
- When he/she perceives performance as consistent with his/her self-concept;
- When he/she perceives performance as central to his self-esteem.

Gorn & Kanungo (1980) have conceptualized the notion of job involvement as having two components:

- The degree to which an individual is involved in a particular job and actively participates in it, and
- A psychological state of identification relative to other activities (family, leisure), that is, the importance of work in the person’s self image.

Thus, job involvement also reflects one’s emotional attachment to one’s job (Cheloha & Farr, 1980). Saleh (1981) identifies job involvement as a “self-involving attitude”. In his opinion, JI is a multidimensional construct having basic dimensions as cognitive, conative and evaluative. JI can be defined as a generalized cognitive state of psychological identification with work/job insofar as work is perceived to have the
potentiality to satisfy one’s salient needs and expectations. Brooke, Russel & Price (1988) considers job involvement as the degree to which an individual is absorbed in or preoccupied with his/her job.

Job involvement is frequently suggested as being related to the characteristics of the job itself (Baird & Mainstone, 1980). Trying to relate this construct with the Herzberg’s 2-factor theory of motivation, Weisenberg & Gruenfeld (1968) contended that job involvement can be treated as positively related to the presence of what Herzberg et al., (1959) termed as ‘Motivator’ variables and unrelated to the ‘Hygiene’ variables.

Considering all these, we can certainly come to a point that there are three possible sources of influence, which affect an individual’s job involvement level. These three sources are as follows:

- Personal background and socialization (Dubin, 1956; Lodahl, 1964; Blood & Hulin, 1967; Hulin & Blood, 1968),

- Job characteristics (McGregor, 1960; Vroom, 1962; Argyris, 1964; Blauner, 1964 Bass, 1965), and

- A combination of job and personal factors (Lodahl & Kenjer, 1965; Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Farris, 1971; Lawler, 1973; Ruh & White, 1974).

In the opinion of Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale (1977), in all these studies, relative importance of individual differences and job characteristics in predicting job involvement has not been adequately dealt with, even though their own study as well as Schuler (1975) reported that both types of variables are equally important predictors of job involvement; and job involvement has a significant individual difference component.

With reference to our country India, Agarwala (1978) reported that in India, an individual is seldom judged by what work he/she does and how he/she does it. More
often, the criteria are: how he/she relates with others (e.g., family and friends), how willing he/she is to make sacrifices for his/her sons, daughters, relatives, friends, and even strangers, etc. (Sinha, 1975). This seems to be consistent in the line of Hofstede’s (1984) finding that Indian culture is more relationship oriented and collectivist. Unlike the Western Country, the typical orientation of Indian employee is a strong preference for ‘aram’ (rest and relaxation). As a result, the Indian employee seems to be less competitive and committed, as he/she has an annoying preference for ‘aram’ over work (Sharma, 1973), and prefers personalized relationships in the work situation. The Indian employee is usually known to show increasing concern for the job-context factors, contrary to the Westerners who emphasize on job-content factors.

Further, in India, the central meaning of work is that it provides the means to pursue other interests. Work is indispensable for survival, and managers rank job security as the highest priority factor in the list of important job factors (Roy & Raja, 1974). Work values internalized during the socialization process mitigate against the industrial values, as for a typical Indian employee, a personalized relationship gets priority over office hours, duties, and responsibilities, and is much more satisfying than contractual work relationships (Sinha & Sinha, 1974). Preference for rest and relaxation, combined with a tendency to escape from work responsibility, is evident from the fact that Indian managers do not rank responsibility as an important factor. Thus, willingness to place work above free-time activities should be given due consideration while measuring Job Involvement in Indian context (Agrawala, 1978).

All the above definitions have a common thread or are centered around a common theme that job involved person is the one for whom work is a very important part of life and who is affected very much personally by his/her whole job situation; the work itself, his/her coworkers, the company and such others. Thus, employees with a high level of job involvement strongly identify with and really care about the kind of work they do (Robbins & Sanghi, 2006). Thus, the amount of job involvement an individual will have with his/her job will depend upon the affirmative strength with which he/she psychologically perceives the various facets of his/her job and job environment.
(Biswa, 2006). On the other hand, the non-involved employee does his/her living off-the-job. In other words, work is not as important a part of his/her psychological life (Shanthamani, 1982, 1983). His/her interests are elsewhere, and the core of his/her self-image, the essential part of his/her identity, is not greatly affected by the kind of work he/she does or how well he/she does it.

1.3.2. Significance of Jon Involvement (JI):

According to Singh & Kumari (1988), productivity in organizations depends upon two major variables – employee’s job performance and resource utilized. In most organizations, the performance of employee is relatively more important than equipments and raw materials. Even in automated operations, productivity in strategic and coordination systems largely depends upon the human dynamics. And, as we all know, accept and appreciate the fact that performance of an employee on a task or job is direct function of his/her motivation to perform effectively (Vroom, 1964). And in the opinion of Patchen (1970), the job involved person is highly motivated and feels a sense of pride in his work.

Thus, job involvement can be considered as an important measure of organizational effectiveness, potentially very important to organizational success (Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale, 1977; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981); as the most crucial challenge to organizations today is how to motivate human beings – the employees – towards greater work efficiency (Singh, 1988).

The positive relationship between employee attitudes like job involvement and employee performance was conceptualized way back by Brayfield & Crockett (1955). Even Argyris (1957) and McGregor (1960) referred to JI as a means of aiding productivity by creating work situations in which there would be better integration of individual and organizational goals. On the same line, Marcson (1960) & Kornhauser (1962) argued that one of the best ways to increase the productivity of professionals is to provide them jobs demanding more involvement. This underlies the assumption that jobs requiring a high degree of involvement are seen as vehicles through which
employees can satisfy their need for growth, especially in the areas of competence (White, 1959), achievement (McClelland et al., 1953) and self actualization (Maslow, 1954). This partly explains the reason why in recent years, the concept of job involvement has steadily gained importance, as it has been found playing pivotal role in providing a link between productivity on the one hand and satisfying employee needs and quality of working life on the other (Hall & Lawler (III), 1970; Walton, 1972; Dewhirst, 1973).

McKelvey & Sekaran (1977) considers the concept of JI as the mainspring energizing the symbiotic relationship between JI, performance and the quality of working life, because individuals who are highly involved in their jobs, have a higher stake in performing well and there is often a strong desire to satisfy the need for ego identity and development in their jobs. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) and suggested that performance is closely related to job involvement. Madhu & Harigopal (1980) also found a significant and positive relationship between job involvement and job performance. Cotton (1993) also figured out the crucial role of Job Involvement as a method for improving performance and work attitudes. This may be because of the fact that employees with a high degree of job involvement are more likely to regard work as the center of their self-concepts (Frone & Russel, 1995); and they are also more likely to increase their self respect through successful job performance (Burke, 1991). Mishra & Gupta (1995) also observed that job involvement and motivation are significant predictors of performance of blue collar industrial workers. Keller (1997) also considered job involvement as one of the longitudinal predictors of Job Performance. Lassk, Marshall, Cravens & Moncrief (2001) also suggested that job involvement is an important construct in relation to salesperson socialization and performance.

Agrawala (1978) reported that job involvement is considered to be:

- Important for both the employee’s and organization’s perspective;
- A component of the quality of working life; and
- A predictor of individual performance and organizational effectiveness.

Thus, the significance of this multifaceted concept of JI can never be under estimated as it has many promising outcomes as a certain source of numerous gains, that too, not only for the employees, but also for the organization. Job involvement is considered to be a key factor influencing important individual and organizational outcomes (Lawler (III), 1986). Many researchers consider job involvement to be a primary determinant of organizational effectiveness (Pfeffer, 1994).

Several studies have reported that job involvement has been negatively related to one of the top most concern of modern day organizations, that is, employee turnover (Wickert, 1951; Bass, 1965; Blau & Boal, 1987, 1989; Martin & Hafer, 1995). Further, Baysinger & Mobley (1983) observed that the act of quitting an organization occurs at a specific point of time. Such intention to quit occurs at the time when an employee responds to stress factors arising out of incongruence between an individual’s psychological perception about his/her job environment on the one hand and his/her needs and aspirations on the other, mediated by his/her level of involvement (Mobley, 1982).

March & Simon (1958) and Ruh et al., (1975) suggested that job involvement may also be related to the decision to participate and the decision to produce. The underlying logic behind this is that among other things, both of these decisions are affected by the individual’s perception of a variety of alternatives. And the fact is that the person who is more involved may perceive fewer available alternatives; he/she may, therefore, be more inclined to participate more actively in the required activities of the organization. In the opinion of Katz & Kahn (1966), job involvement is a necessary condition for an individual to accept fully the organizational demands placed upon him/her as a result of his/her membership in the organization. They further added that the extent of job involvement is related to level of aspiration and to the degree of internalization of organizational goals; and job involvement is a moderating variable in the relationship between satisfaction and performance. This is based on the fact that the positive
relationship between satisfaction and performance holds true only in case of involved employees.

Aminabhavi (1996) found that quality of life of professionals is related to their job involvement. Biswas (1998) reported that job involvement has been found to be related to various individual and organizational outcomes such as satisfaction, withdrawal behaviour etc.

The willingness to exert effort in achieving organizational goals is found to be a closely related outcome of job involvement in several studies (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Kanungo, 1982). This willingness is surely a function of need satisfaction on the part of the employees. Singh & Pestonjee (1990, 1995), while studying the banking sector employees; found that job satisfaction is influenced by job involvement. Srivastava & Krishna (1992) also supported this finding with their study that reported the fact that employees’ involvement in their jobs contribute to their job satisfaction and fulfill their intrinsic needs. In the study of sales professionals, it was found that high job involvement contributes to salespeople’s willingness and ability to contribute to sales unit effectiveness (Brown, Cron & Leigh, 1993; Brown, 1996).

According to Katz & Kahn (1966), effective organizational functioning requires that the employees not only perform their roles, but also engage in behaviours that go beyond these formal obligations. This aspect of performance is consistent with Organ’s (1988) conceptualization of OCB. In this regard, a recent study of Diefendorff, et al; (2002) found that job involvement is a significant predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) and in-role performance. The study of Chen & Chiu (2009) further highlighted the mediating role of job involvement in the relationship between job characteristics and OCB.

Job involvement is also found to have significant influence on the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation patterns among the employees. Conceptually, based on the importance an individual attaches to needs and its satisfaction, employees can be
classified into two groups: Intrinsically Motivated Employees and Extrinsically Motivated Employees. Here, extrinsically motivated employees emphasize the importance of social and security, that is, lower order needs; while the intrinsically motivated employees attach greater importance to esteem, achievement, responsibility, that is, higher order needs (Maslow, 1954; Alderfer, 1972). In this regard, even the study of Aleem & Khandelwal (1989) found that job involved individuals attach greater importance to intrinsic or higher order needs, which ultimately proves the significance of JI for fostering inner urge to exert extraordinary efforts towards realization of organizational goals. Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968), Cumming & Bigelow (1976), Rabinowitz & Hall (1977), Baba (1979), Agrawal & Chadha (1989) also provided evidence for this. A number of other studies have also found a positive relationship between growth need strength and job involvement (Kanungo, Misra & Dayal, 1975; Hall, Goodale, Rabinowitz & Morgan, 1978). Consequently, these employees feel satisfied and derive intrinsic pleasure from their work. Such positive experiences of the job involved employees also enhance their overall psychological well-being (Srivastava & Krishna, 1992) and improve their mental health (Srivastava, 2001). Similar finding was reported way back by Stafford, et al; (1980). However, one earlier study of Gechman & Wiener (1975) found low correlation between positive mental health and job involvement (.10). This may be because of two reasons:

(i) The concept of mental health or psychological well-being also implies commitment to other areas of life such as family, community, and avocational activities (Jahoda, 1958); and

(ii) There is some evidence that over-involvement in the work role may be associated with reduced mental health (Oates, 1971).

Empirical evidence also suggests that job involvement is negatively correlated to absenteeism problem (Patchen, 1965; Hackman & Lawler (III), 1971; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). Even Nicholson (1977) proposed the idea that job involvement directly affects attendance motivation, which, in turn, directly affects absence frequency. This seems to be logical as the person with high job involvement is really absorbed in
his/her job to such a great extent that he can’t think of missing even a singly minute of his/her job, forget about remaining absent for the whole day. So, in a way, job involvement influences attendance motivation. Steers & Rhodes (1978) also supported this finding with empirical evidence that attendance is based on two things: one is an employee’s ability to attend work; and the other is his/her motivation to attend. In their opinion, the motivation to attend is related to the extent of job involvement. Cheloha & Farr (1980) landed a strong support to this by reporting that job involvement has a stronger and consistent negative relationship to excused absenteeism.

Hamner & Tosi (1974) and Madhu & Harigopal (1980) found an inverse relationship between role stress and job involvement. Same finding was reported by Srivastava (2007) also who found job/role stress to correlate negatively with job involvement. However, the study of Singh & Singh (1984) reported opposing fact. According to them, highly involved employees in their job would feel highly stressed by undesirable situations or exceedingly demands of their jobs; while the less involved or uninvolved employees perceive their job situations to be less stressful. Thus, according to them, there is significant positive relationship between occupational stress and job involvement. Even the study of Mishra (1984) observed that occupational stress is positively related to job involvement. Turnipspeed (2000) observed that burnout was associated with job involvement.

Srivastava & Sinha (1983) found employees’ job anxiety as a resultant of their level of job involvement. However the study of Allam (2007) found that job involvement is low positively related with job anxiety among managers.

Considering all these, the significance of JI, as a primary work/job related attitude, can be easily understood and perhaps realizing this only, organizations are showing increasing interest in finding our ways and means to increase the job involvement of their employees.
1.3.3. Job Involvement v/s Job Satisfaction:

The problem of semantics seems to be prevailing in case of the two widely researched work attitudes namely – job satisfaction and job involvement also. Prior empirical researches reveals varied and inconsistent results regarding the role and place occupied by job involvement in terms of its relationship with the other job attitude – job satisfaction. Many researchers (Kanungo, 1979, 1982; Gorn & Kanungo, 1980; Blau, 1985; Brooke, et al; 1988) opined that Job involvement is both conceptually and empirically distinct from job satisfaction. Even though, several studies (Lodahl & Kenjer, 1965; Weissenberg & Gruenfeld, 1968; Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Gechman & Wiener, 1975; Saal, 1978; Kanungo, 1979; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981) have tried to identify job involvement as a distinct work attitude, the problem of delineating job involvement from other seemingly similar work attitude namely job satisfaction, has still remained.

Over the years, several research studies tried to unearth the distinctions between these two constructs; but the results are confusing. Surprisingly, little empirical evidence of their discriminant validity is reported (Blau, 1985; Morrow, 1983; Mathieu & Farr, 1991). Added to this, research also indicates similar sort of correlations between these two work attitudes and other important job related variables like absenteeism and turnover.

While some studies indicate that job involvement is an index of well-being along with job satisfaction (Blau, 1987; Morris & Koch, 1979; Dreher, 1980; Sekaran & Mowday, 1981; Morrow & McElroy, 1987), others suggest that job involvement may be a predictor of job satisfaction (Wiener & Gechman, 1977; Ben-Porat, 1980; Rabinowitz, 1985). A few studies also provide limited support for job involvement as a mediator of the relationship of individual and job situation variables with job satisfaction and other variables (Dailey & Morgon, 1978; Batlis, 1978; Saal, 1978, 81). One study (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977) even reported that job involvement is an outcome of job satisfaction.
So, in the absence of rigorous empirical evidence of discriminant validity between job satisfaction and job involvement; coupled with similarities in their relations with other variables raise the possibility that both these work attitudes may not be distinct. (Brooke, Russel & Price, 1988). Even Lodahl & Kenjer (1965) found that in a sample of engineers, job satisfaction and job involvement had roughly the same factorial content. Other researchers reported correlation between these two constructs ranging from .22 to .62 (Newman, 1975; Saal, 1978).

On conceptual ground, Locke (1976) distinguished job satisfaction as a positive emotional state reflecting an ‘affective response’ to the job situation, from job involvement, which is defined as a ‘cognitive belief’ state reflecting the degree of psychological identification with one’s job (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Locke, 1976; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Kanungo, 1982). Although both these constructs refer to a specific job only, several researchers (Locke, 1976; Kanungo, 1982) tried to distinguish between the emotional state of liking one’s job (job satisfaction) and the cognitive belief state of psychological identification with one’s job (job involvement).

In the opinion of Kanungo (1979), satisfaction of needs on-the-job may be a sufficient but not a necessary condition for job involvement. So, in his opinion, satisfaction might increase the likelihood of job involvement, it is not the definition of job involvement itself.

Further, several studies (Lawler (III) & Hall, 1970; Hackman & Lawler (III), 1971; Wanous, 1974; Brief & Aldag, 1975) found that person-job interactions occur in the prediction of job satisfaction; and therefore, job involvement and job satisfaction are distinct work attitudes.

So, we may conclude that even though job satisfaction and job involvement may appear to be the same construct or merely different labels for the same phenomenon of emotional attachment to the job; the fact remains that these two are separate and distinct constructs. However, they are logically related to each other. People who treat these two construct similar usually ignore the fact that it is possible for some persons to
be highly satisfied, but not involved, and for others to be highly involved, but not satisfied.

Thus, Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement – the two primary work related attitudes – are different from each other.