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INTRODUCTION

Industrial and organizational psychologists have done a tremendous work in quest for improving human efficiency in general and organizational total effectiveness in particular. The advent of industrial revolution had revolutionized the system of working that gradually and continually have become instrumental for work automation but inspite of this reality it is, indeed, true that the world of work may become highly mechanized but behind all operations, there is a man who controls key functions, hence, he may never be replaced in totality. However, in developing and maintaining man-machine interface, it has been witnessed that it has a chequered history starting with the pioneering work of Taylor (1901) in the form of scientific management which has its greater implication in the world of work. Taylor’s management - centered scientific management approach could not be continued free from criticisms, hence, received criticism inspite of its utility in enhancing individual as well as organisational efficiency. Therefore, beginning of 1920s witnessed a turning point for a major change from Taylor’s management-oriented to employee-oriented approach. With the work of Mayo who is found to be a pioneer of employee - centered approach which was an outcome of an investigation conducted in the Western Electric Company in 1924. Mayo and his associates 1924 namely. Roethlisberger and Dickson had made a concerted effort under the leadership of Mayo paved the way for a movement popularly known as ‘human relation movement’. This approach spread over the world of work and was at its peak during 1930’s to 1950’s. It will be true to say that human relation movement changed the style of functioning of managers and supervisors from auto-bureaucratic approach to successively increasing democratic and humanized approach leading to congenial work culture for the utmost fulfillment of employee’s need at work.

Emergence of human relation movement changed the entire scenario of the world of work and it became instrumental for understanding human motivations in work organization. As a result, of this movement, motivational theories started pouring in after 1930s hence, the first motivational theory appeared in 1943 which is popularly known as need - hierarchy theory of motivation given by Maslow and
thereon, one after the other, job motivation theories appeared in different years. It is important to mention that all motivational theories have been used for describing job-satisfaction as job-motivation and job satisfaction are highly interrelated to each-other although motivation is a process and job satisfaction is an outcome experience and for such reasons managers, supervisors and academicians too have been using these two phenomena very interchangeable, although as mentioned above there is functional difference between the two phenomena. Motivation is a process where feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is an outcome of goal attainment after the motivational process comes to an end and thereafter, feeling of satisfaction/dissatisfaction provides a feedback whether same state of affair is adopted or course of action be changed. In a nutshell, it is imperative to mention that motivation involves a process and satisfaction is an outcome of complete motivational process. Therefore, same models and theories explain to both phenomena of job satisfaction and job motivation.

The advent of 21st century is witnessing a fast trend of increasing liberalization, globalization, and transitional invasion which has raised and set competitive standards among the productive and social organisations of all countries in general but organisations of developed nations are of much more advantage compared to developing and under-developed nations because of later's dependency on successively developing and developed nations. In wake of present modern age of global economy, Indian organizations are facing unprecedented competitive challenges. Liberalization of trade across length and breadth geographical boundaries has been instrumental for wide range economic reforms combined with revolution in communication and information technology which are considered to be the landmark for paradigm shift in strategic and sustainable business. Therefore, success is most likely to come to those business organisations that are capable in managing to adopt the virtues of conflicting paradigms rather than to simply rely on traditional approaches and principles. Such managerial approach is highly challenging but is most likely to become a tool or strategy for efficient and effective organizational functioning in the best possible manner. Hence, HRD – a most significant approach and organizational philosophy that has come up as a strategy for the most efficient means to enhance individual and organizational effectiveness. Basically, HRD focuses on maximum utilization human of resources and thereby, to effectively use financial, technical and information resources. It is imperative to mention that human
resource occupy central importance in HRD and all other resources are controlled and utilized by human resource. It needs to mention, that human resource play a key role in turning the wheels of an organization. It is therefore necessary that organization should take care of employees’ motives and subsequently their satisfaction, commitment, involvement and other work related behavioural outcomes to enhance performance in conducive and effective fashion.

Apart from the concern of individual employee’s work related behaviour, their personality patterns and attributes are also very important for creating the congenial environment at work place especially, the spirit of team work. Generally, in all sort of organizational functioning, team work is an inherent aspect giving rise to maximum use of all inputs and resources for affective organizational outcome.

In our study Perceived Organisational Culture, Upward Mobility and Organisation’s HRD practices have been taken as predictors (independent variables) whereas, perceived QWL and Work Identification as criterion (dependent) variables. The details of the various variables occupying important place in the present investigation are being presented here in the writings to follow but the descriptions of the variables will start from dependent (criterion) to independent (predictor) variables.

**Perceived Quality of Work Life (QWL)**

QWL is one of the important variables that have its beginning in the year 1972 when a term “quality of work life” was coined by Davis during his paper presentation at an international conference at Arden House, New York.

Today’s industrial management contends that employees at work should be made to experience gay and happiness which in turn is most likely to compel them for their motivation and experiencing satisfaction particularly in the work context. Hence, abundant organizational aspects like organizational structure, mode of communication, leadership behavior, job design/redesign, job enrichment etc., are being given particular attention as these are found to be the greatest source of employee’s quality of life in the work context.

The term Quality of work life has come in early 1920s by Davis but indirectly the movement had already stated in the mid of 1920s in the form of human relation movement. In fact the emergence of industrial psychology in the beginning of the 20th
century with pioneering work of Taylor in 1901 which is usually known as scientific management. The scientific management principles being proved highly effective in yielding human efficiency to unimaginative extent continued till the year 1924 when Mayo’s and in collaboration with his colleagues stated human relation movement. This was, in fact a turning point from Taylor’s management – centered approach. Inspite of the development of the later approach Taylor’s scientific – management principles never lost its importance, although employee – centered approach started dominating the word of work. It is important to mention here that employee – centered approach have become instrumental for development and coming – in the theories and approaches of motivation and satisfaction, e.g. the first motivation theory was proposed by Maslow in 1943 and thereafter scores of theories/models started pouring – in with regard to motivation and satisfaction. It will not be out of text to mention that other job related phenomena like job involvement, commitment and other approaches emerged which are liked to positively influence individual as well as organisational productive efficiency. This same evolution continued and the concept quality of work life gets introduced as has been mentioned above i.e. in the year 1972.

Quality of work life (QWL) is an important issue for both employees and employers. It is vital for employees as they spend a very note - worthy portion of their lives on the job and the quality of work life has a bearing on quality of their lives in general. On the other hand, employers consider employees’ QWL a serious issue that should appropriately be taken care of because QWL is found an effective and vital means in achieving organizational goals, and attaining organizational effectiveness. The most important resource of an organization is its employees, hence, improving QWL subsequently leads to highen motivation, satisfaction, and competence among employees. Similarly, it also helps in enhancing indirectly but very effectively organizational productive profitability.

Since, early 1970’s, psychologists and managers have become interested in studying QWL. The contributions made by (Herrick & Maccoby, 1972), (Taylor, 1974), (Davis & Chems 1975), (Emergy & Emergy 1976), (Miller, 1977), and (Carlson, 1978) are of worth mentioning. In India, the work on QWL had begun in 1970’s. The efforts made in this area by (Ganguly & Joseph, 1976), (De, 1977a,
1977b), (Mehta, 1976), (Sinha, 1977) and (Joseph, 1978), are noteworthy. In the words of De (1980) most of the work on quality of work in Indian setting is either in theoretical - descriptive framework or in an action research perspective. This mention clearly points out that area needs to be properly and empirically studied.

Now, having mentioned the significance of QWL, it seems necessary to deliberate on the meaning of QWL. In defining the term QWL, Walton (1973) defined it as a procedure by which an organization responds to the employees’ needs for developing mechanism to allow them to share in decision-making that designs employees’ work life. Walton gave eight criteria to evaluate QWL programmes which include— adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy environment, immediate opportunity to use and develop capacities, future opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and the total life space, and the social relevance of work life.

Ketzell and Yankelovich, (1975) defined QWL that it is “an individual’s evaluation of the outcomes of the work relationship”. These are experiential and witness that an employee can enjoy a high QWL when:

- Job incumbent has optimistic feelings towards his /her job and its future prospects,
- He is motivated to stay on the job and performs well; and
- Experiences and feels working life quite benefiting with his /her private life.

Spink’s (1975) viewed QWL as “a degree of excellence in work and working conditions which contribute to the over-all satisfaction of the individual and enhances both individual and organizational effectiveness”.

Hackman and Suttle (1977) opined of QWL as a industrial democracy, increased workers’ participation incorporate decision making or a culmination of the goals of human relations. From the management perspective, it relates to a variety of efforts to advance productivity by improving human potentials and skills, rather than the capital or technological inputs of production. From individual worker’s point of view, it refers to the degree to which an individual is able to satisfy significant personal needs through his experiences in the organization. Similarly, from the union employees’
perspective, it is more equitable sharing of the income and resources of the work organization, and more humane and healthier working conditions. Lippitt (1977) explained QWL as “the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs to survive with some security, to interact with other, to have a sense of personal usefulness, to be recognized for achievement, and to have an opportunity to improve one’s skill and knowledge”. Cherns (1978) considers QWL as an area focusing on to “humanization of the work place, work place democracy, work restructuring or job design”. This very aspect of QWL relates to the concept of human relation movement, i.e., Mayo’s approach to improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Even in late 1970s QWL was relatively a new term for a bundle of old issues that having long been the interest of philosophers, theologians, social scientists, workers, and employers. As a broad term, it can understand every conceivable aspect of work ethics and work conditions, workers’ experience of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concerns about productive efficiency and broaden consideration of social cohesion and stability (Menton, 1979). However, it is to say that the phenomenon of QWL even being old, is as new today as it was in its inception years.

In 1979 the American society of training and development established a taskforce of the QWL who reported it as “a process of work organizations which enables its associates at all levels to energetically participate in shaping the organizational environment, methods, and outcomes”. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin-goals, i.e., enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved quality of life at work for employees (Shrovn, 1980). This definition has clearly and precisely elaborated the objectives of QWL programmes at work that still seems to be a continuing process.

Nedler and Lawler (1983) accomplished that the definitions of QWL underwent several changes with regard to its conceptual understanding. In fact they came across numerous important stages in which the meaning of the term QWL was differently conceived and understood. The changes in defining the idea were natural which was the outcome of the demand of time and work environment. Nedler and Lawler (1983) reported that definition of the term “quality of work life” came into distinction during the period of between 1959 to 1972. In this first phase of the emergence of QWL, it
was conceived as a variable. Hence, the stress was on the individual worker's reaction to the personal consequences of the work experience as job satisfaction, job motivation, mental health, and etc. While during the period 1969 to 1974, the concept of QWL was defined as an "approach". This definition focused on the individual worker and neglected the organizational outcomes. To the present investigation this definition seems to be incomplete as for overall organizational productive efficiency both individual worker's state of living, as well as, organizational outcomes are equally important, hence, both should be equally taken care of.

During the same period between 1969 to 1974, the third definition came out and the QWL was defined as "methods". This approach of the term focused QWL as a set of methods, approaches, or technologies as well as strategies for enhancing the work environment as to make it more productive and satisfying.

Keeping in view the above definitions of QWL it is sufficiently clear that the concept covers the whole aspect of working environment that might most likely be influencing the quality of life of individual worker's in the job situation.

Carlson (1980) contends that QWL is both a goal and an ongoing process for accomplishing goals. As being a goal, he describes QWL as the commitment of any organization to work development, the creation of more involving, satisfying and effective jobs and work environment for people at all levels of the organization. As a process - QWL calls for effort to achieve the goal through the active involvement of people in the organization.

Reddy (1985) stated that the notion of QWL has been viewed differently by different countries. In U.K. QWL is viewed as "work redesigning", it is "humanization of work programme" in West Germany, and for the Japanese it is "improving the quality of products". It is interesting to mention here that Japanese appeared to initiate quality circle movements in a large way in their industries, and steadily quality circle programmes dominated the western world and the European organizations. This programme was initiated in the large interest with the objectives of humanizing the work culture thus, it contributed towards improving the quality of life of employees at work.
Nurick (1985) contended QWL as comprising of (1) philosophy with underlying values and assumption, (2) Structures and methods for organizational change, (3) human process as operating as a function of planned change, and (4) outcomes that can be monitored and assessed.

Harrison (1987) viewed that QWL is the degree to which the work in an organization contributes to the material and psychological wellbeing of its members. According to Davis (1995) QWL is the quality of associations between employees and the total working environment.

Dubey and Padam (1988) described that the term QWL tends to cover a variety of areas, such as, physical, mental, psychological, social, spiritual well being, personal functioning, and general limitations. Whereas, Yousuf (1996) viewed QWL as a generic phrase that covers a person’s feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards, benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and interpersonal relations and their intrinsic aspects.

The above detailed arguments on the notion of QWL makes it clear that it is a multidimensional approach concerned with over-all work climate, employees quality of life at both on and off-the-job situations. It is very important to note here that the approach to the QWL strategy is likely to be short of any meaning unless the regulatory concept of management is replaced by a genuinely participative concept, tyranny of technology should be tamed by the flexibility of technology in its working form the concept of hierarchical control should give away to appropriate form of self regulations and control through autonomous of semi-autonomous group working and in the end, working men and women should be measured as creators of meaningful work rather than as instruments of production is gaining acceptance as the rational for new forms of work organizations (De, 1984).

Studying QWL in Indian context is a tough job as uniform dimensions cannot be identified because of extreme diversities in socio-cultural and economic sphere. However, the pioneering work done by Ganguly & Joseph (1976), Mehta (1976), (De, 1977, 1980, 1984), (Joseph, 1978) have geared up and put momentum in understanding the phenomenon of quality of work life.
Different research studies have been carried out by investigators to measure QWL taking into consideration the situation and the overall atmosphere of the organization and employees as well. There is a considerable difference in employees' perception of QWL. Blue-collar employees prefer extrinsic motivators than intrinsic motivators where - as in case of white-collar employees, the situation is reverse. Hence, a single inventory / scale for measuring QWL of employees of different organizations and cannot be generalized because of diversities. However, in some cases where both external and internal environments of organizations coincide, the same inventory can be used for the purpose.

Better feeling of QWL leads to effective productive efficiency as healthy employees can build healthy organization. High perception of QWL by employees is definitely an important aspect. Among all QWL aspects – skill to work effectively with confidence is one of the major human resource which may only develop when continuous HRD practices are there to help the employees to cope with technological advancement In today’s work atmosphere these practices are performed under the broad heading of human resource development (HRD) practices, hence, HRD practices are important in improving QWL perception have been of considerable importance in the present scenario world of work

Having given detailed description of the importance employees’ QWL perception, there is another dependent variable under taken in the present study as that of work identification. Before going to discuss the phenomenon, it is imperative to mention that HRD practices are also important for developing the sense of identification with the work as work identification may not develop unless skilled proficiency is developed in performing the task that may only come through HRD intervention programme and strategy. The details of phenomenon of work identification are given below.

**Work Identification**

The behavioural phenomenon of identification was very much evident in psychoanalytic theory. Gautam, Dick, and Wagner (2004) stressed that Freud (1922) considered identification as ‘an emotional tie with another person’. Here, importance
is given to affective attachment of one person with others. Freud (1949) depicts identification as “the endeavour to mould a person’s own ego after the fashion of one that has been taken as a model”. From his viewpoint, it can be said that identification is a subjective experience that arise in social context, and is embedded in the individuals to change their sense of self when identified. Sanford (1955), Kagan (1958) and Kelman (1958) have highlighted that most of the personality theories emphasize identification as a process to internalize social value during the process of socialization and acculturation in childhood period as well as remain effective during the adult socialization process.

Work identification refers to the sense of attachment an individual holds pertaining to work and/or work organization. Tolman (1943) defined it as oneness between an individual and his/her work organization which has gained increasing attention in organizational behavioural science because it affects satisfaction of an individual, as well as, work effectiveness and subsequently, to organisational effectiveness as a whole.

An individual who identified strongly identifies him/herself with his/her work organization is most likely to have high motivation to strike hard in the achievement of organizational goals and sometimes some people having high bond of work identification are motivated in the accomplishment of organizational goals upto their maximum capacities. Almost the same was thought of by Katz and Khan (1978). Organizations with high levels of employees’ identification with, may have more cohesive work atmosphere and greater levels of cooperation, involvement and altruistic behavior including greater level of citizenship behavior and support. Furthermore, organization with high level of employees’ identification increases the likelihood motivation to make decisions that are in the interest of organization’s strategic, effective performance leading up to organisational growth and development. According to Ashforth and Mael (1989) and Rousseau (1998) employees can get benefit from positive self-esteem and the satisfaction of the human need to belong with work identification.

From the perspective of organizational framework, Foote (1951) for the first time used the term identification and considered identification as a foundation for motivation (Bartel, 2006). Foote (1951) also highlighted organizational identification
as ‘appropriation of and commitment to a particular identity or series of identities’ that describes human beings tends to identify with members in groups; that they categorize the social world around them in order to regularizes their doings; and that these categorizations of experiences motivate behaviour through the essential commitment of individuals in all situations.

Similarly, Brown (1969) contended identification as ‘a self-defining response, set in specific relationship between the individual and his or her organization’. On the other hand, Brown contends to view identification that focuses on four aspects of involvement: (1) attraction to the organization, (2) consistency of organizational and individual goals, (3) loyalty toward the organization, and (4) reference of self to organizational membership. These aspects constitute the basic mechanisms of organizational identification.

The phenomenon of organizational identification is also very much reflected in the social identity and self categorization theories (Tajfel, 1972; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Social identity theory (SIT), explains that the self concept comprises of two components i.e., personal identity that encompass an individual’s unique sense of self (like bodily attributes, abilities, psychological traits, interest), and a social identity that refers to “that part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership”. Therefore, according to Tajfel and turner (1985) in order to construct self concept, especially the social part, people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories (like organizational membership, religious affiliation, and gender and age cohort) and assign themselves as the member of a particular group. Tolman (1943) in the early years of introduction of this concept had already stressed upon that through categorization processes, individual identify themselves as members of a particular groups and perceive themselves as psychologically attached with the group’s fate by, sharing its common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures. This social categorization and identification is one part of the theory, the other part of the theory goes on explaining that individuals have a tendency for social comparisons in order to understand social environment. They compare themselves with others on the basis of their membership of a particular group. Additionally, theory also described that
individual do develop self esteem needs, and people try to enhance positive self image either by trying to enhance their personal identity or social identity.

It is worth mentioning here that Ashforth and Mael (1989) were the first who put forth the theory of social identity for explaining organizational identification. Social identification is the perception of belongingness to a group and a sense of oneness with the group and organizational identification is a specific form of social identification where the individual sees him or herself in terms of their membership in a particular organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Moreover, the most important social identification component as viewed by (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) refer to the idea of self-categorization. This means that higher level of organizational identification occur when members categorize themselves into social group (the organization) on the basis of distinctiveness and prestige of the organization. By identifying with an organization, employees perceive themselves as psychologically involved with the organization’s fate, sharing its common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures. Almost after three years of (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) contribution, (Meal & Ashforth, 1992) formally defined Organizational identification as ‘the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization, where the individual defines him/herself in terms of the organization(s) in which he/she is a member’. The definition of organizational identification given by (Meal & Ashforth, 1992) refer that it is organization specific, hence, most likely that employees may suffer from psychic-loss if an organization to which they identify merge into a new entity (Levinson, 1970). On the basis of their definition given in 1992, Meal and Ashforth developed a six item scale measuring organization identification.

Ashforths’ effort continued and in 2001, he on the basis of his study he optimistically associated organisational ideas, features with performance. Riketta (2005) explains that a recent metanalysis of identification research found that organizational identification has a strong positive correlation with affective commitment, occupational and work group attachment, job and organizational satisfaction and job involvement, and a strong negative correlation with turnover intention. It is very important to mention here that individuals who identify strongly with their organization experience a “Psychic loss” if they leave their organization as advocated by (Meal & Ashforth, 1992).
In addition to mere identification, organizational theorist moved beyond the organization identification to see the other forms of attachment to/with organization (Ashforth, 2001; DiSanza & Bullis, 1999; Dukerich, 1999; Pratt, 2000; Kreiner and Ashforth, 2004). The purpose behind this expansion was that identification drives a sense of self in relation to organization and highlights important outcomes. Here, focus is given on the overlapping of identities at the cost of exploring other forms of self-definition. How many individuals see themselves different from or in conflict with the organization? What and when individual defines him/herself as partially same as and partially different from the organization? And what effect would this have on individual and the organization? To answer these questions, researcher examined the “expanded model of identification” that includes multiple ways people can define themselves through organizational attachment was contended by (Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004). As a result, three new different forms were proposed. These forms include disidentification, ambivalent identification, and neutral identification (Dukerich, 1998; Ellemers, 2002; Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004; DiSanza & Bullis, 1999, Elsbach, 1999, Pratt, 2000, and Ashforth, 2001).

Among the numerous definitions of identifications, it is also defined as a perceived sense of oneness with the organization, necessarily implicating one's self concept towards the organization (Pratt, 1998; Edwards, 2005; Riketta, 2005; Ashforth, Harrison and Corley, 2008). “Organizational commitment is often associated with, ‘How happy or satisfied am I with my organization? While organizational identification is concerned with the question, ‘How do I perceive myself in relation to my organization?’” was conceived by Pratt (1998). Organizational identification is organization specific, whereas commitment may be more readily transferred, to other organization that inspires a similar positive attitude (Ashfort, 2008). Furthermore, some researchers argued that organizational identification is more strongly associated to the variables that suggest an attractive, distinctive, and internally consistent organizational identity, share fate with the organization, salient rival organizations, self-sacrifice on behalf of the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Dutton, 1994; Pratt, 1998; Gautam, 2004; Edwards, 2005; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006) and extra role performance (Riketta, 2005). Moreover, organizational commitment is observed to be more strongly related with attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction (Riketta, 2005; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Cole ard Bruch,
2006 and Ashforth, 2008), employee involvement and Quality of exchange relationships (Mowday, 1982; Eisenberger, 1986; Rousseau & Parks, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Edwards (2005) concluded that organizational commitment focuses more on what an organization does, whereas identification antecedents are more related to what the organization is. In the light of these conceptual differences, result has often illustrated strong correlations between commitment and identification (Witt, 1993; Ashforth & Saks, 1996; Siegel & Sisaye, 1997; Van Dick, 2004; Harris & Cameron, 2005; Riketta, 2005). However, some of the researchers stated that affective commitment differs from identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Pratt, 1998; Van Knippenberg Schie, 2000; Mael & Tetrick, 1992; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Van Dick, Wagner, Stellmacher & Christ, 2005).

Having given thorough description of dependent variables viz., Quality of work life as well as Work Identification now, it is essentially important to give description of the predictor i.e. independent variables as in the present investigation it was proposed to study employees’ QWL perception and Work Identification as a function of perceived Organisational culture, Upward – mobility and HRD practices. Therefore on – going description will be pertaining to the predictor variables in the same sequence as it appears in the research problem that is perceived Organisational culture, Upward – mobility and HRD practices.

**Perceived Organisational Culture**

Organisational culture has appeared as one of the vital and imperative concepts in the field of organizational behavior and human resource management in the recent past. The efforts aimed at identifying the factors accountable for various organizational outcome variables like employee’s commitment, job-satisfaction, job-performance, turnover, absenteeism etc. have already been widely studied but organizational culture still needs special attention in relation to work related outcome.

Many definition of culture have been given by people of different areas especially the behavioural/social scientists and also by others working in other disciplines such as cultural anthropology and psychology (Hamill, 1990; Craig, 1990; Frake, 1983; Hallpike, 1979; Carrol, 1982; Kroebner & Kluckhon, 1952). Hence, the
word ‘culture’ has a variety of meanings. It bears meaning synonym with the terms such as “cultivated”, “educated”, or “sophisticated”, which refer to civilized or cultured. The scientific meaning of culture refers to the whole pattern of beliefs, values, and the norms of a society that govern behaviour, most suitable in a particular group. Culture is a man made component of the environment (Herkovits, 1955). Culture existing-in-and around the work place certainly affects the working and behaviour of employees. There are two foremost sources of cultural inferences: First, the characteristics of the socio-cultural background which affect work related attitudes and behaviour of employees. Secondly, the management’s postulations about their employees and managerial behavioural style that directly contributes to the growth of the organisation’s inner work processes and culture.

An organisation function within the cultural system of the society in which it is situated is highlighted by (Longenecker & Pringle, 1981). The way the organisation functions is exaggerated not only by the powers of managers but also by underlying cultural forces. The culture controls the way in which organisational members perform their work and even the way in which managers build associations and exercise power. Organisational Culture is a artifacts of leadership styles, organisational policies, practices, systems, traditions, conventions etc. Over a period of time, these aspects become a way of life of employees in an organisation. The sum total of this entire component constitutes organisation’s culture (Bate, 1984).

Organisational Culture has been viewed a vital component from the very beginning of the break-through of the approaches of organisational behaviour which is evident from the writings of (Morey & Luthans, 1987) who stated that “the culture has been a foundation in the field of anthropology from its beginning and even was given attention in the early growth of organisational behaviour”.

Schein (1985) in his revolutionary work defines culture as a set of elemental “assumption” and “beliefs” about reality that are shared by a group of persons and are working towards a common purpose. Schein (1990) defined Organisational Culture as “(a) a pattern of essential assumptions, (b) invented, discovered or urbanized by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore. (e)
is to be taught to new members as the (f) approved way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems”.

Pettingrew (1990) on the basis of research evidence reported that variations in cultural values might have an important impact on employees’ turnover and employees’ job satisfaction. Further, (Hofstede, Neuijan, Ohayy, & Sanders, 1990) have viewed that nationality, industry and task partly determine the organisational culture.

Martin (1992) expresses her view that individuals come into contact with organisations, they come into contact with dress, norms, stories people tell about what goes on. The organisations formal rules and procedures, its codes of behaviour, rituals, tasks, pay system, jargon and jokes only understood by insiders, and so on are some of the manifestations of organisational culture. She further supplemented that when members of a particular culture interpret the meanings of these manifestations; their perceptions, memories, beliefs, experiences and values usually vary. So, interpretations of culture will vary depending upon the situations and the perceptions of employees towards these situations and conditions.

Robbins (1994) portrayed the fact that there are ten crucial characteristics that capture the essence of an organisation culture. These characteristics have been emphasized as member identity, group emphasis, people focus, unit integration, control risk tolerance, reward criteria, conflict tolerance, means-end orientation and open system. Robbins derived these characteristics from the work of (Hofstede, Neuijan, Ohayy, & Sanders, 1990) and (O’Reilly III, 1991). Similarly, Luthans (1995) has also highlighted the significant characteristics of organisational culture. These were behavioural observed regularities, norms, dominant values, philosophy, rules, and organisational climate. In the light of these characteristics, it is imperative to point out that organisational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that must be taught to a new personnel or employee to imbibe these as the way to perceive, think and act in the situation they are confronted with.

Organisational culture is largely conceptualized as an internal variable; hence, internal variable has been defined numerously by number of investigators in a way that basically suit their research approach and objectives. It has also been described as a set of assumptions (Schein, (1986); beliefs and norms of behaviour (Pettingrew,
rituals and ceremonies (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Trice & Beyer, 1984); shared managerial practices (Hofstede, 1998); ideologies and beliefs (Bate, 1984; Brown, 1998; Pascale & Athos, 1981) shared values (O'Reilly, 1991; Posner & Schmidt, 1992; Sheridan, 1992), myths (Meyer & Rowan, 1977); symbols (Dandridy; Mitroff, Joycee, 1980). Some of the initial references to the concept of culture as internal organisation variables have also been found in the literature given by some other researchers e.g., (Harrison, 1972).

Increasing, researches on organisational culture have been witnessed in the recent past but there is no agreement on the concept and definition of culture. It is because of the fact of multifaceted socio-environmental net-working. Culture related notions climate, environment, atmosphere, ethos, etc. have been used interchangeably, although an effort has been made to demarcate functional differences between these terms. Culture can be defined as the collective beliefs, values, assumptions, underlying operation with nature and imperative phenomena, e.g., collectively, environment, context, time, biological differences, power etc. Culture is reflected in the artifact-rituals, design of space, furniture, and ways of dealing with various phenomena. Allocation and attentiveness of power may be one basis of classifying culture. From this angle, organisational culture can be of four types viz; feudal, bureaucratic, technocratic and entrepreneurial or organic. The way human-resources issues are handled in the beginning sets the direction and tone for culture.

It is now clear that for growing a conducive culture in present modern era, organisational atmosphere is very vital for employees as it has direct relation with their performance which ultimately influences organisational effectiveness. Hence, it produces very congenial, suffocation-free atmosphere/environment which is now termed as “Organisational Climate”.

Modern multifaceted environment tends to create a climate that govern and shape employees' behaviour that subsequently endorse organisational culture which has been defined as a molar concept reflecting the context and strength of prevalent values, norms, attitudes, behaviour and feelings of members of a social system which can be operationally measured through the perception of system members (Payne, 1971). Organisational Climate, a constituent of organisational environment is a construct that distinguishes among organisations-specific variance (Campbell,
Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970; Forehand and Crimea, 1964; Tagiuri, 1968). Recently, (James & Jones, 1974) reported some confusion so far as the operationalization and conceptualisation of organisational culture construct is concerned.

Researches on organisational climate – a facet of organisational culture have suggested its effectiveness for investigating important aspects of organisational behaviour like performance, and effectiveness (Prichard & Karasick, 1973; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968). Organisational Climate affects not only the behaviour of persons but also to the aspect that how organisations themselves interact. Organisational Climate can have a foremost impact on motivation, productivity, and job-satisfaction. Employees' expect certain rewards, satisfaction, and frustrations based upon their perception of organisational climate (Davis, 1981) and these expectations influence motivation. Organisation Climate is beneficially related concept in considering the organisational factors connected with risk and accidents. Basically, organisational climate is the sum total of the perceptions employees has towards their organisation. This may be at the level of the organisation, or some specialized sub-units of it such as a department or plant. Climate may also be connected with a particular area of organisational functioning, one of which is security (Donald & Canter, 1994).

Organisational Climate is of different types and researchers have differentiated between holistic climate (House & Rizzo, 1972) and specific climate such as motivational climate (Litwin & Stringer, 1968), individual climate (Schneider and Barellett, 1980), or creative climate (Taylor, 1972). Perceptibly, then any given organisation creates a number of dissimilar climates and the term organisational climate may mean different things to different people unless it is prefixed with the appropriate adjective (Zohar, 1980).

Along with the changes in worldwide considerations, requirements and aspirations of employees, perception and attitude do change too. More precisely, the economic boom opened greater avenues and possibilities of employment as jobs become plenty in number and new managerial policies encouraged greater employees' participation. Participation has been developed, nurtured, and strengthened to inculcate a sense of involvement, attachment and commitment in the organisation among employees in their spheres of work so as to generate positive work
commitment and suitable work motivation for desirable and legitimate productive pursuits. People now, demand much more openness and transparency about the whole deal that help the person to progress in his/her career.

Encouraging a conducive work-culture in an organisation entails a desired transformation in the existing framework or processes. Such corporate changes can be started through total quality management (Singh, 1994). Quality is rising as a single most critical feature for business to sustain in the ever expanding and global competitive market place. Quality Circle visualized by Ishikava in 1985 which is in essence a group problem-solving concept to enhance empowerment and accelerate infusion of participatory work culture in an organisation. Quality Circle identifies, analyse, and resolve work-related problems viz., quality productivity, cost-effectiveness, safety, housekeeping etc. (Ishkava, 1985). So, it assists in improving all product related features as well as the organisation to reduce its costs, wastages, and absenteeism.

The above descriptions clearly emphasise the nature and importance of organisational culture and its relationship to identifications with work and employees' quality of work life are instrumental for enhancing employees' individual work efficiency and organisational effectiveness.

Having deliberated on organisational culture, another independent variable of HRD practices also needs its details that follow:

**HRD Practices**

It is one another independent variable which has been taken for its study as a causal factor of Work Identification and perceived Quality of work life. It is undoubtedly true that in modern era HRD practices have become pre-requisite for Total quality management of an organisation. Hence, it is being presented in exhaustive details.

Human resource development (HRD) is a current organisational strategy covering wide range of activities, practices and actions in quest of improving and harnessing skills, capabilities and abilities of human being for effective work
performance in attaining organizational goals. In the present scenario of open market, high production issues, services, quality and customers satisfaction are the most indispensable aspects that are likely to become instrumental to wide range of activities under the umbrella of HRD practices for improving employees’ motivation, satisfaction, commitment, etc. through human resource development programmes at work. Such practices do not only influence employees’ work commitment, perception of QWL but are highly instrumental in influencing organizational effectiveness, growth and development. This is not hypothetical rather the studies conducted during the last several decades have observed that successful organizations which are dominating over the globe have been emphasizing much more on human resource development rather than substantial economic or technological resources, although all are important but skill-full human capital is of utmost importance. In fact, human resource is the most precious and vital component that triggers and make use of other resources for the victorious achievement of organizational objectives. For such reasons, HRD has spread over the globe as a productive and useful strategic craze both as an academic discipline and as a significant strategy for effective management functions. Most of the emerging organizations are now setting up their separate HRD sections with the intent to get more and more benefits from its fast growing systematic strategic approach. In US, companies have implemented the philosophy of “productivity through people” as the key element for their organisational productive efficiency. Indian government, keeping in view the significance of HRD, a separate ministry of HRD created for effective use in quest of improving human capital.

In fact, work culture focuses on dynamic, competitive, creative and self-motivated work force to meet the disputes and challenges of the mega competition of products. Hence, these direct management to equip employees with more knowledge, expertise, and ability to get them able for utilizing their potentials accurately to the maximum extent. HRD is the hottest and widely used strategy that helps persons to acquire knowledge, harness, skills, capabilities, and create a sense of belongingness and these in turn keep them more involved with their work and the organisation and subsequently, employees’ motivation, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness functionally appear in general at work place to keep abreast organisational objectives. Originally the term HRD was first evolved in the class discussion at George Washington University of USA. But the first comprehensive definition of HRD was
given by Nadler in 1969 who defined HRD as “a series of organized activities conducted within a specified time and designed to produce behavioural change”. Thereafter, scores of definitions of HRD were given. Hence, Megginson (1974) defined HRD as “a total knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talent and aptitudes of an organization's work force as well as the values, attitudes and beliefs of the individual involved”.

Lippitt (1977) defined HRD as a system that depends on work itself which generates a high degree of responsibility for the employees; the individual’s personal and professional growth; the improved quality output as a result of increased responsibility, and organization as an open system.

In India, HRD functions also started dominating the work organisation. Therefore, one of the definitions that cover most of the features of HRD concept was given by Rao (1986). According to him “HRD in an organizational context is a process by which the employees of an organization are helped in a continuous and planned way, to:

• Attain or sharpen capabilities necessary to perform various functions connected with their present or expected future roles;

• Develop their universal capabilities as individuals and discover and exploit their own inner potentials for their own and / or organizational development rationales; and

• Develop an organizational culture in which supervisor subordinate association, team work, and collaboration among sub units are strong and contribute to the professional well being, motivation and pride of employee”.

Rao’s contributions have been widely appreciated and recognised by HRD practitioners throughout the work. Hence, his contribution seems to be commendable. Narayanan (1989) reported HRD as an endeavor to enable people to overcome their defects and develop their productive potentials so that they are able to contribute to the ethical and harmonious development of society, fulfill their individual needs and wants and with pleasure too.
In the words of Dayal (1994) “HRD implies that the organizations want to improve overall capabilities of its employees to expand their potential in the directions best suited to them”. He also enumerated three features that seem to be important in HRD. These are (1) ways to better adjust the personality to his job and the environment; (2) the greatest involvement of an employee in various features of his work; and (3) the greatest concern for enhancing the capabilities of the entity.

Pathania (1997) viewed HRD as “an attempt to develop capabilities and competencies among employees as well as creative organisational environment conducive to the employee’s development”.

In all definitions of HRD it is amply clear that there is only linguistic difference among the different definitions and these seems to be on the same line. The main theme of all these definitions is that HRD is a progression through which human resources are helped to harness and develop their potentials at work through training, performance appraisal, job enrichment programmes, organizational development, career development, feedback, counseling, etc. These practices, in turn, help increase employees’ capabilities, potentials, aptitude, skill, knowledge, and create a climate in an organization.

HRD process makes person aware about him-/her-self, their potentials, aptitude, talent, self, worth, and provide them possible conducive atmosphere to advance and utilize capabilities for the effective attainment of organizational objectives.

Different strategies are continually being developed by academicians, behavioural scientists, especially HRD professionals and psychologists for the growth and the maximum utilization of human resources. In the organizational context, some of the key practices that are involved in this process are being discussed in the following writings.

Forecasting human resource need is an important function of HRD personnel’s in an organization. It is long term in time planning of an organisation on the basis of which management can make assessment about the future requirements. Identification of future needs caused by retirements, promotions, accidents, deaths, etc. are important events which can be resolved by organisations futuristic vision that may
Providing periodical training is the second significant practice that comprises of the major part of HRD procedure as in HRD training possesses control and dominant role. It is a continuous process through which employees' abilities are enhanced to perform assigned job efficiently and also getting ready for future advancement. Training refers to the “organization’s efforts to advance an individuals’ ability to perform a job or organizational roles” (Dunn & Stephens, 1972). In the words of Koleker (1993) training is a prerequisite to recover performance and preparing human resource for new jobs, intra-organisational transfers, promotions, and change-over to new technology and equipment.

HRD functions keep employees (both old and new) well equipped with the new skills, knowledge, talent and the attitude in facing stiff competition in both national and global markets. Training is the finest procedure through which all these practices can be performed. According to an industry report (1993) U.S. firms as a whole, with 100 or more employees approximately spent $48 billion in a year on formal training for 47.2 million workers. One of the U.S. firm namely Xerox alone spends over $300 million per year on training and retraining its employees (Szabo, 1993). Number of Indian organizations also spends a good amount for giving training to their employees across hierarchical levels.

With regard to training, there are facts that if it is to say that if training programs are properly and correctly designed and conducted then it considerably contribute in-improving organizational productivity and profitability; reducing wastage, absenteeism, turnover and accident rates; increasing morale, trust, commitment, flexibility, and providing better promotional prospects, greater job security and moreover, organisational effectiveness (Roa & Abraham, 1986; Durra, 1990; Goss & Jones, 1992; Ashton & Green, 1994; Storey,1995; Gani & Rainayee, 1996).

HRD mechanism and strategy also involves employees’ performance appraisal to know their strength and weaknesses to design effective mechanism to cope with these. It is a significant task in the hands of superiors or HRD personnels to assess their subordinates. The efficiency of any organizations’ future plan and success
largely depends upon the proper available information about its employees’ potentials, and weaknesses and only then the correct remedial measures can be undertaken to correct weakness and strengthening / maintaining potentials. For instance, once the problems are identified, it may become easy to select different kinds of remedial measures like counseling, training, and transfer etc, to assist employees to overcome weaknesses and become more adjustive and effective in his / her job. Performance appraisal is the process by which an employee’s comparative worth or ability with respect to his / her assigned job in the organization can be judged. It also assists in decision-making process pertaining to organization’s personnel functions, such as transfer, promotion, pay increase, bonus, lay-offs, etc.

Organizations vary in their objective with regard to appraisal, however, according to Koleker (1993) there are some common purposes of appraisal that include to evaluate the performance and plan for the better performance, determine the basis for promotion, self enhancement of employees, ascertaining the employee’s difficulties on the job, identifying the men with the potential to man the positions in future, develop the personalities of the persons, identifying the training need, for improving performance on the job.

Having given the description of vital HRD practices like human resource needs, training, and employees’ appraisal mechanism to ensure uninterrupted attainment organizational task through the skill development programmes. It is essential to point out that HRD practices are not limited to these functions but other measures are also highly noteworthy to enhance motivation and will to work by developing such a culture where flexibility, competition, cooperation, recognition, etc. do play a crucial role in the maximum utilize action of human resources at work.

Winding up the discussion with regard to HRD-practices, it is to say that it is a philosophy, a plan, and a strategy to improve and maintain organizational usefulness through the management of human resources. Emerging organizations around the planet have a strong belief in the HRD philosophy as well as strategy to maximize, harness human skill and potentialities for the maximum utilization of human resources – a key to organizational success and development.
Upward Mobility

Of the various organisational success and development independent variables which are of our concern is that of ‘upward-mobility’. It is human desire that wherever they are, they want to grow; hence, the work place in firms or organizations are not the exception. In organizations where people work and render their services aspire for ‘upward-mobility’ or promotion. Employees do not wish to receive one promotion in job-life-time, but it is an unending desire that only comes to an end only with retirement.

In view to this human nature, organisations generally have very rational approach for awarding promotions to their employees which sometimes become the greatest source of job satisfaction and motivation for employees productive effectiveness and subsequently, develop willingness to be in the same company / organization. The phenomenon of ‘upward mobility’ may appear in either of the following forms, or both.

(i) Salary - progression
(ii) Career - progression

Here, we are particularly concerned to the career enhancement that involves salary progression too. It is imperative to mention here that there are some dead – end jobs which do not have any option of career - progression from one to another hierarchy. Therefore in such conditions salary progression is important to develop and maintain employees’ motivation and satisfaction.

Management policies and practices relating to employees’ promotion and growth at work contribute appreciably so far as employees’ motivation and satisfaction are concerned. Greater the chances or opportunities of upward - mobility in the organization elevate and enhance the employees’ involvement at work. It is a significant intrinsic motivator concerning individuals’ personal and social aspect of life. Upward-mobility boosts - up both economic as well as social progression because anyone’s position in the society is determined by the position the person occupying at the work. It is a process in which an employee from current job position is elevated to the higher one that generally involves higher salary, admiration and responsibilities. Monappa and Saiyadain (1979) reported that ‘promotion is an upward
relocation of an individual in an organization's hierarchy accompanied by increased responsibilities, enhanced status, and usually with increased income'. Mamoria (1987) viewed that promotion as an upward advancement of an employee in an organization to another hierarchical position which commands increased pay / wages, status, prestige, responsibility and authority improved work conditions, etc.

In view of Rudrabasavaray (1967) promotion is a type of recognition of an employee for performing job well. It is a type of reward to an employee for his years of service in a company that increases individual's effectiveness and promotes a feeling of job satisfaction.

Usually, in every organization positions remain vacant due to retirement, deaths, and growth and expansion of an organization which are filled either by recruitment and selection process of new incumbent or by internal promotional process. The internal promotion involves upgrading of employees from their existing position to higher job position that involves more responsibility, higher status, and increased pay. This internal push-up to new position is the best way of enhancing employees’ loyalty towards the organization and thereby, there is an increased sense of efficiency and commitment with the organization leading to higher productive work.

The major purpose of upward - mobility is to offer employees better chances for utilizing their abilities, skills, knowledge that can benefit the organization, as well as, help fulfill employees their own goals too. Upward - mobility also helps in enhancing morale, loyalty and a sense of belongingness that all contribute to organizational effectiveness, growth and development.

Employees’ perception towards organisational promotional policies and the chances for moving to higher ranks in the organization has an important effect on employees’ commitment towards the organization (Gaertner & Nellen, 1989).

It is witnessed from the scores of empirical evidences that upward mobility is one of the momentous dimensions leading to enhance motivation, commitment, and individual productive performance in the work situation.

An exhaustive description of the various predictor as well as criterion variables and overall picture of the research study it has become very clear that the
variables which have been studied in the work organisation as the predictor as well as the criterion variables are very appropriate that subsequently may lead for higher organisational productivity efficiency and organisational effectiveness as well. It is ‘indeed’ true that the feeling of high quality of life as well as high work identification are always conducively important for organisational development and its sustainability in the world market – major objectives of any organisation.

After giving comprehensive details of the various predictor and criterion variables, now it is warranted describe the objectives of the present study which were conceived before undertaking the present study.

**Objectives:**

The objectives of the present investigation is very much clear from the topic of research itself, however these are being given below in more clear manner.

- The first objective was to examine the impact of organisational culture on employees perceived QWL and Work Identification.
- To examine the impact of opportunities for Upward – mobility on employees perceived QWL and Work Identification, and
- Final objective of present study was to examine organizations’ HRD practices on employees QWL and Work Identification.

In the light of above aims and objectives of the present study the following hypotheses were formulated for empirical in depth investigations which are being given below:

**Hypotheses:**

**H**₁. ‘Organisational Culture’ and its various facets will significantly predict ‘Perceived QWL’ and its various dimensions.

**H**₂. ‘Upward Mobility’ will significantly predict QWL and its various dimensions.

**H**₃. ‘HRD practices and its various dimensions will significantly predict QWL and its various dimensions.
H₄. ‘Organisational Culture’ and its various facets will significantly predict Work Identification and its various dimensions.

H₅. ‘Upward Mobility’ will significantly predict ‘Work Identification’ and its various dimensions.

H₆. ‘HRD practices’ and its various dimensions will significantly predict Work Identification and its various dimensions.

The above hypotheses were framed for empirical testing, hence, steps undertaken for scientific empirical investigation will be given in the Chapter – Three meant for describing methodology opted in carrying out the present research investigation.