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Abstract
This research study aim to assess the demands at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect (for ex; burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms and job satisfaction) faced by the railway drivers (loco-pilots) in India using the COPSOQ (Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire). Moderating effects of personality trait (in this study it is core self evaluation) between demands at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect also find out. Burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms and job satisfaction are projected as intended outcomes of demand at work, work-family conflicts and family-work conflicts.
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Introduction
The railway driver is exposed to a demanding psychosocial work environment, which includes solitary work, limited opportunities for social contact and a heavy responsibility for operating the train (in terms of both safety and adhering to the timetable) (Ranjan& Prasad, 2013). The reasons for stress could be long working hours, irregular eating, sleepless nights, poor living conditions, ill treatment by seniors (Deb et al., 2005). Stress among railway drivers would evident in the form of fatigue, depression, chronic headaches, irritability, swings in mood, inability to concentrate and impulsive behavior.

Demands at Work (Job Demands): Job demands have been one of the most important factors in the assessment of the psychosocial work environment. Generally, quantitative demands refer to the amount of work that needs to be done and is seen as a source of stress if there is not enough time available to complete it (Helle, 2014). Job demands have been defined as those aspects of work that require sustained physical or psychological effort or skills (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Cross sectional studies have consistently identified a positive relationship between job demands and burnout (Bakker et al., 2005; Hakanen et al., 2006).

Work-Family Conflict and Family-Work Conflict: Work-family conflict defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which the general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the job interfere with performing family-related responsibilities” (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Family-work conflict is defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which general demands of, time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities” (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Work-to-family and family-to-work conflict is defined as “a form of friction in which role pressures from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respects” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research has linked work-to-family and family-to-work conflict lowered work and family satisfaction (Byron, 2005; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Both work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict have been linked to decreased satisfaction in the particular domain in which the interference is experienced (Adams et al., 1996).
**Job Stress:** Wheeler & Riding (1994) argued that job stress is a contributing factor to organizational inefficiency, high staff turnover, absenteeism because of sickness, decreased quality and quantity of service, increased costs of health care, and decreased job satisfaction. Jamal (1985); Leveck & Jones (1996); Westman & Eden (1996) have investigated the relationship between job stress and job performance and results have been reported high job stress leads to low job performance. Quick et al., (1997); Wright & Smye (1996) found negative effects of job stress include impaired performance or a reduction in productivity, diminishing levels of service, health problems, absenteeism, turnover, industrial accidents, and purposefully destructive behaviors.

**Burnout:** Evidence provides support for the relationships between demanding aspects of the job, such as a high workload, role conflict, lack of role clarity and burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Work-family conflict has also been linked to burnout (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Heavy workload is strongly and consistently related to the exhaustion component of burnout (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach et al., 2001). Researchers propose that where employees are consistently overloaded, this may reduce their ability to recover and restore balance, and lead to burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2008).

**The Moderating Variable: Personality Traits**

**Core Self Evaluation:** Those with positive CSEs are predisposed to perceive aspects of work and family domains in a positive manner. They may view life events more positively and seek situations that enhance positive role fulfillment and may work to minimize negative situations (Judge et al., 2000). Judge et al., (2002) argue that CSE predicts positive outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction) and negative outcomes (e.g., strain). Individuals with high CSE should be able to successfully manage high demand levels in work and family domains. Therefore, individuals with high CSE should experience less conflict in both work and family domains (Bono & Judge, 2003).

**Objectives**

The broad objective of this research study is to understand the demands at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect (for ex; burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms and job satisfaction) faced by the railway drivers (loco-pilots) in India using the COPSOQ (Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire). Moderating effects of personality trait (in this study it is core self evaluation) between demands at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect also find out.

**Proposed Model**

![Proposed Model](Source: Prepared by the author)
Karasek (1979), notified job demands as a division of all potential work stressors, particularly ‘psychological stressors involved in accomplishing the work load, stressors related to unexpected tasks and stressors of job related personal conflict’. According to Karasek & Theorell (1990), psychological demands have both a quantitative and a qualitative component. The psychological demands as a matter of “workload”, or how “hard, fast and much” an employee works. This work includes, deadlines, productivity (units per hour), reporting (number per week), as well as conflicting demands.

Personality traits (self efficacy and core self evaluation) are found to be a moderator between demands at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect. It was suggested that individuals with higher self efficacy and core self evaluation will be able to cope up with obstacles in a better way as compared to those who have lower self efficacy and core self evaluation. So it can be assumed that individuals with higher self efficacy and core self evaluation will be able to handle demands (job and family) in a better way.

Methodology
This study uses descriptive survey design. Data was collected by using “Copenhagen psychosocial Questionnaire-II” (long version) and Judge et al., (2003) scale of CSE (Core Self Evaluation).

Sampling Design
This study adopted a cluster-random sampling approach. The samples for this study were Indian railway’s drivers working in Gaya under Mughalsarai Division, Sonpur under Sonpur Division, ECR-Hajipur, Chhapra under Varanasi Division, NER-Gorakhpur and CSTM under Mumbai Division, Central Railway-Mumbai. Questionnaire was personally distributed among them. Researcher approached 435 Loco-pilots; out of which 397 (91%) Loco-pilots (railway drivers) responded.

Analysis
The statistical analysis was carried out with the help of SPSS-programme (Statistical Package for Social Science). The demographic data was displayed and Pearson correlation was performed to identify the relationship between variables.

Demographic Variables
The demographic questions were used to understand the characteristics of the participants. Participants were asked to report demographic information including age, designation, education, salary, duration in present job, place of posting, marital status, time spent in work and household tasks per week etc.

Researcher approached 435 Loco-pilots; out of which 397 (91%) Loco-pilots (railway drivers) responded. All the participants of this study are male, as very few females are employed as railway’s drivers in India. Out of 397 railway drivers, 51 (12.8%) respondents are Assistant Loco Pilot Goods, 57 (14.4%) respondents are Assistant Loco Pilot Passenger, 90 (22.7%) respondents are Loco Pilot Goods, 48 (12.1%) respondents are Loco Pilot Passenger, 59 (14.9%) respondents are Loco Pilot Mail, 87 (21.9%) respondents are Loco Pilot Shunting and 05 (1.3%) respondents are Crew-controller. Amongst the respondents 86 (21.7%) are in between age group 26-30 years, 90 (22.7%) are in between age group 31-35 years, 56 (14.1%) are in between age group 36-40 years, 76 (19.1%) are in between age group 41-45 years, 41 (10.3%) are in between age group 46-50 years and 48 (12.1%) are in between age of >50 years. Out of 397 respondents, 06 (1.5%) are working as railway driver in between from 0-5 years, 111 (28.0%) are in between from 6-10 years, 76 (19.1%) are in between from 11-15 years, 50 (12.6%) are in between from 16-20 years and 154 (38.6%) are from more than 20 years. Amongst the respondents, 117 (29.5) are completed ITI, 07 (1.8%) are completed both ITI and Intermediate, 117 (29.5) are completed Diploma in Engineering, 19 (4.8%) are completed both ITI and Diploma in Engineering, 08 (2.0%) are completed Graduation, 115 (29.0%) are completed both ITI and Graduation, 05 (1.3%) is completed Post-Graduation and 09 (2.3%) are completed both ITI and
Post-Graduation. All the 397 respondents (100%) are found to be married. Amongst the respondents, 73 (18.4%) are told they always miss out quality time with family and friends because of pressure of work, 62 (15.6%) respondents are told they often miss out quality time with family and friends because of pressure of work, 147 (37.0%) response as sometimes miss out quality time with family and friends because of pressure of work, 103 (25.9%) response as rarely miss out quality time with family and friends because of pressure of work and 12 (3.0%) response as never miss out quality time with family and friends because of pressure of work.

Descriptive Statistics of the Variables

The filled questionnaire data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 20 version) software. The mean score and standard deviation for different variables under study was done (N=397). Table 1 & 2 explores the descriptive statistics of different variables under study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Quantitative Demands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td>72.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Work Pace</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>37.03</td>
<td>73.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Work-family conflicts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>114.55</td>
<td>92.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Family-work conflicts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>69.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Sleeping Troubles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>104.72</td>
<td>77.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>121.91</td>
<td>89.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>101.95</td>
<td>69.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Depressive symptoms</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>49.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>367.13</td>
<td>66.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Core self evaluation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56.02</td>
<td>5.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author’s own findings)

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Grouping variables (Factors)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Demand at work (two scales- 1.1- quantitative demands;; and 1.2-work pace).</td>
<td>128.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Work-individual interface (two scales- 2.1-work-family conflict and 2.2-family-work conflict).</td>
<td>82.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author’s own findings)

It can be inferred from table 1, that the mean value of quantitative demands is 35.96, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be low quantitative demands. The mean value of work pace is 37.03, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be low work pace. It can be inferred from table 2, that the mean value of demands at work (two scales- quantitative demands, and work pace) is 128.14, which indicates that most of the respondents are experiences high demands at work.

It can be inferred from table 1, that the mean value of work-family conflicts is 114.55, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be medium work-family conflicts. The mean value of family-work conflicts is 51.32, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be low family-work conflicts. It can be inferred from table 2, that the mean value of work-individual interface (two scales- work-family conflict and family-work conflict) is82.88, which indicates that most of the respondents are experiences low (good) work-individual interface.

It can be inferred from table 1, that the mean value of sleeping troubles is 104.72, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be some sleeping troubles. The mean value of
burnout is 121.92, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be some burnout. The mean value of stress is 101.95, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be some stress. The mean value of depressive symptoms is 83.10, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be some depressive symptoms. The mean value of job satisfaction is 367.13, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be higher job satisfaction.

It can be inferred from table 1, that the mean value of core self evaluation is 56.02, which indicates that most of the respondents are found to be very high core self evaluation.

**Correlation Analysis between Variables**

Table 3: Correlation Matrix with Significance Level (N=397)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quantitative Demands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work Pace</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work-family conflicts</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family-work conflicts</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sleeping Troubles</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Depressive symptoms</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Core self evaluation</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sig. p=0.05) (Source: Author’s own findings)

**Correlations between Quantitative demands and other variables**: The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals positive correlation between quantitative demands, and work pace, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms with coefficient value of r = .62, .61, .49, .51, .50, .59 and .50 respectively. It indicates that, when quantitative demands increases or more then work pace, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms also increases or more. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between quantitative demands and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value r = -.45 decreases the quantitative demands and hence decreases the work pace, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms,. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between quantitative demands and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between quantitative demands and work pace, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms.
The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals negative (inverse) correlation between quantitative demands and job satisfaction with coefficient value of r = -.55. It indicates that, when quantitative demands increases or more then job satisfaction decreases. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between quantitative demands and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value r = -.45 respectively decreases the quantitative demands and hence increases the job satisfaction. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between quantitative demands and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between quantitative demands and job satisfaction.

**Correlations between Work Pace and all other variables:** The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals positive correlation between work pace and quantitative demands, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms with coefficient value of r = .62, .61, .48, .47, .60, .59 and .49 respectively. It indicates that, when work pace increases or more then quantitative demands, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms also increases or more. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between work pace and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value r = -.43 respectively decreases the work pace and hence decreases the quantitative demands, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between work pace and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between work pace and quantitative demands, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms.

The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals negative (inverse) correlation between work pace and job satisfaction with coefficient value of r = -.64. It indicates that, when work pace increases or more then job satisfaction decreases. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between work pace and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value r = -.43 respectively decreases the work pace and hence increases the job satisfaction. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between work pace and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between work pace and job satisfaction.

**Correlations between Work-family conflicts and other variables:** The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals positive correlation between work-family conflicts and quantitative demands, work pace, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms with coefficient value of r = .61, .61, .81, .63, .60, .74 and .51 respectively. It indicates that, when work-family conflicts increases or more then quantitative demands, work pace, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms also increases or more. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between work-family conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value of r = -.42 respectively decreases the work-family conflicts and hence decreases the quantitative demands, work pace, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms. Whenever work-family conflicts increases or becomes high, negative (inverse) correlation between personality traits (core self evaluation) and work-family conflicts decreases the work-family conflicts and hence decreases the quantitative demands, work pace, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between work-family conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between work-family conflicts and quantitative demands, work pace, family-work conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms.

The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals negative (inverse) correlation between work-family conflicts and job satisfaction with coefficient value of r = -.64. It indicates that, when work-family conflicts increases or becomes high then job satisfaction decreases. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between work-family conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) with coefficient value r = -.42 respectively decreases the work-family conflicts and hence
increases the job satisfaction. It indicates that negative (inverse) correlation between work-family conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between work-family conflicts and job satisfaction.

**Correlations between Family-work conflicts and other variables:** The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals positive correlation between family-work conflicts and quantitative demands, work pace, work-family conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms with coefficient value of $r= .49, .48, .81, .68, .60, .76,$ and $.54$ respectively. It indicates that, when family-work conflicts increases or more then quantitative demands, work pace, work-family conflicts, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms also increases or more. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between family-work conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between family-work conflicts and job satisfaction.

The Pearson correlation value shown in above table 3 reveals negative (inverse) correlation between family-work conflicts and job satisfaction with coefficient value of $r= -.55$. It indicates that, when family-work conflicts increases or becomes high then job satisfaction decreases. At the same time negative (inverse) correlation between family-work conflicts and personality traits (core self evaluation) worked as moderator between family-work conflicts and job satisfaction.

**Discussion**

The findings of this study reveal that correlation exists in between demand at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect (for ex; burnout, stress, sleeping troubles, depressive symptoms and job satisfaction). Moderating effects of personality trait (in this study it is core self evaluation) between demand at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect also exists.

The current study found evidence supporting the negative impact of increased job demands, work-family conflicts and family-work conflicts in reducing loco-pilots wellbeing. The results suggest that work family conflict and family work conflict was a significant stressor to loco-pilots. In the current study, the majority of respondents were married or had children which raised the responsibility for juggling the demands from both family and work domains. Employees in the current study might feel some conflict between work and family duties such as managing their work demands while feeling guilty for not spending more time with their families, and vice versa-thus affecting their wellbeing.

This study confirmed the effect of personality trait (core self evaluation) in moderating the negative consequences of job demands, work-family conflicts and family-work conflicts on wellbeing. When working in a workplace where loco-pilots experience high levels of work demands, work-family conflicts and family-work conflicts, but with high core self evaluation, loco-pilots were found to be less likely to report low job satisfaction, sleeping troubles, burnout, stress and depressive symptoms.

The findings of this study reveal that correlation exists in between demand at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect (for ex; burnout, stress, sleeping troubles,
depressive symptoms and job satisfaction). Moderating effects of personality trait (in this study it is core self evaluation) between demand at work, work-family conflicts, family-work conflicts and its various effect also exists.

The findings from this study suggest that contending with stressful situations in the workplace is a common occurrence for the Indian loco pilots (railway drivers) leading to deterioration in their quality of work and life. These are the important reasons to assume that sleepiness and stress reduce a railway driver’s mental capacity when work load reach its peak. In this context, it was found that railway drivers are exposed to a range of stressors such as the poor ergonomic cab conditions, distressful noise, uncomfortable climate conditions, and work scheduling, resulting in poorer health and work performance. In particular irregular and night work is a further stress factor for the loco-pilots due to its negative effects on various aspects of their lives, in particular as concerns:

I. Disturbances of the normal biological rhythms, beginning with the sleep/wake cycle;
II. Negative effects on health and well-being, including troubles with the digestive function, nervous system (sleep deficit, anxiety, depression) and cardiovascular systems (heart diseases);
III. Social problems, resulting from difficulties in maintaining the usual relationships both at the family and social levels.

**Suggestions and Recommendations**

Following points are concluded from this paper. The aim of these points is to suggest possible solutions and tools how to improve work environment of loco pilots (railway drivers) in India, in order to reduce the stress caused by different factors.

I. It is suggested that the management of organization must undertake stress audit at all levels of the organization to find out stressful areas of job to take necessary action for their elimination or overall improvement of job.
II. Ergonomics of the driver’s cabin, with particular reference to the position and adjustment of the seat.
III. Provide psychological training (for ex; general and special relaxation, focusing, concentration training, how to cope with stress).
IV. By increasing employee control over their work and participation in decision-making, and with flexible working practices.

**Conclusion**

This study predicts employee wellbeing by looking at job demands, work-family conflict and family-work conflict. This study involved 397 railway drivers employed in different zone of Indian railway. In regard to methodological limitations, this study employed a cross-sectional design with all the data gathered from surveys of respondents within a limited period of time.

Overall, the work environment is satisfactory, and the employees acknowledge and appreciate the effort made by management regarding this. But, there are certain areas that can be improved, for example communication and information between the management and loco-pilots. To deal with this problem, most of the loco-pilots agree on the need of having regular meetings with the management.

Overall, the loco-pilots seem to enjoy their work and have a great sense of responsibility of what they do. The respondents agree that they have good colleagues and working community. There seems to be a will and loyalty among the loco-pilots to help form and expand the Indian railway. They want to be a part of the Indian railways’ result and future development, which indicates a positive trend. It is strongly suggested that make the management more visible to all employees, and that they make an effort to improve communication among the different levels in the hierarchy.

**Limitations and Future Research Directions**
There are a few limitations and suggested future directions to this study. This study focused solely on the Indian railway drivers which may also limit the generalisability of its findings to employees in all sectors. Therefore, further research should expand beyond the Indian railway drivers. It is recommended that further research employ a cross-cultural study that expands the strength of the current study including comparisons between Indian railway drivers and some other running group. The next step of this study would involve collecting data from a larger sample of Indian loco pilots (railway drivers) and then test the proposed conceptual model of this study.
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