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ABSTRACT

Much attention has been given to the explosion in ITES operation in India. Little concern, however, has been paid to the performance of Indian service workers in the fast paced and sometimes turbulent environments. Information processing and call center activities of manufacturing, financial and service organisations have moved offshore to Asian countries in record numbers. India, with its ready source of English-speaking, highly educated and technologically trained workers, has become the location of choice for ITES functions of multinational clients. The article is based on the survey results of 561 ITES employees in Coimbatore city to understand whether Quality of Work life has an impact on Organisational Commitment. A Regression model has been created to evaluate the influence of Quality of Work Life (QWL) on Organisational commitment. The findings have given insights in efforts to improve the QWL to mould employees with right form of commitment and increase the level of commitment. The results provide valuable information about how employees in different forms of commitment feel about their work environment.
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INTRODUCTION

In today’s global economy, organisations face various HR challenges as in recent times there is increasing importance given to human resources. HR departments pay more attention to the aspiration of every employee and evolve strategies to constantly discover their true potential. One of the core objectives of the organisation is to increase the efficiency by getting maximised productivity at the minimum cost. Today's organizations need to be more flexible so that they are equipped to develop their workforce and enjoy their commitment. Therefore, organizations are required to adopt a strategy to improve the employees ‘quality of work life'(QWL) to satisfy both the organizational objectives and employee needs. The present article discusses the survey results of 561 employees in ITES sector in Coimbatore with the objective to understand the influence of Quality of Work life on organisational commitment (OC).

ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE – AN OVERVIEW

In the last two decades, OC has received special attention and has grown in acceptance in the literature of industrial and organisational psychology, and organisational behaviour. Organisational commitment is the subject of a number of organisational behaviour studies and is considered an important variable in understanding the employee behaviour and attitudes (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Meyer and Allen, 1984).

Meyer and Allen (1997) present the three approaches and define their three dimensional constructs as Affective, Continuance and Normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to the employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation based on positive feelings, or emotions, toward the organisation. Continuance commitment refers to commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organisation [due to the high cost of leaving]. Normative commitment refers to an employee's feeling of obligation to remain with the organisation [based on the employee having internalised the values and goals of the organisation].

Historically, work has occupied an important place in the life of human beings. How people have thought and felt about the working experience has also been an age old concern for both workers and managers. The term Quality of Work Life (QWL) was probably coined originally at the first international conference on QWL at Arden House in 1972 (Davis and Cherns, 1975).

According to Chan, and Einstein, (1990) people conceive QWL as a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment and high involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers. QWL reflects a concern for people’s experience at work, their relationship with other people, their work setting and their effectiveness on the job. With the increasing levels of development, the working environment has also become more competitive.

Thomas Wyatt and Chat Yue Wah (2001) examined the perception of QWL with a sample size of 332 managerial executives. Results from Factor analysis suggest four dimensions which are named Favourable Work environment, Personal growth and
Autonomy, Nature of job and Stimulating opportunities and Co-workers. The overall findings support the conceptualisations of factors involved in perception of QWL.

The Walton’s (1975) theoretical framework was used to measure QWL which includes elements like - Safe and healthy Working Condition, Opportunity for continuous growth, defining the reward system, Social relationships with organisations, Fair payment, Balance role of work, Social coherence, Decision participation, Restructuring nature of the work, Enhancing the work environment, Regulations and Rule orientation and Developing human capabilities. There are statements pertaining to the elements of Walton’s framework to measure QWL in the present research also.

Such employees in return also look for enabling work environment to ensure best contribution towards achievement of the goals. The present research has taken organisational commitment as an intervening variable with QWL as an influential factor. The studies that correspond to the antecedents and related factors of OC are enumerated include research by Emanuel Camilleri (2002), Wasti (2005). Consolidating the views of various researchers on the dimensions of performance constructs, the present research has developed a multidimensional construct. Knowing QWL in an organisation will clarify weak and strong points in the interface between that organisation and its employees.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research design is descriptive in nature. The data was collected through non probability purposive sampling among the employees of ITES in Coimbatore. After cases with missing data were eliminated, the final sample consisted of 561 useable responses which yielded a response rate of 62%. The terminologies and indicators used in this research are:

ITES for the purpose of research is defined as the organisations carrying out the operations and responsibilities of specific business functions (or processes) of non-voice nature and registered with the Registrar of Companies, Coimbatore district.

For this research, QWL is defined as the perception of the employees on organisational environment that meets the needs for their well being at work and it is measured across 25 statements adopted from the instrument of Russell Consulting Inc. named Quality of Work Life Assessment survey. It covers broadly: (a) Participative Decision Making (4 statements) (b) Nature of Work (4 statements) (c). Rewards and Recognition (5 statements) (d) Work environment (4 statements) (e) Supervisory relationship (5 statements) (f) Performance enhancements (3 statements).

Commitment is defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in a particular organisation. The researcher adopted Meyer and Allen’s (1990) three forms of commitment namely Affective, Continuance and Normative. The questionnaire is designed with the statements related to OC measured using 24 item scale which comprises of Affective commitment (8 items), Continuance Commitment (8 items), Normative commitment (8 items).

In order to evaluate the reliability level of the data, Cronbach alpha test is conducted. Only elements with alpha value of 0.70 or above are considered (Nunnally, 1978). For all the variables of QWL and OC, alpha value is above 0.70 which shows the internal consistency of
The relationship between Quality of Work life and Organisational commitment is established using Regression and Correlation.

RESEARCH OUTCOME AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

1. Extraction of QWL factors using Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation

A number of researchers and theorists have been interested in QWL and have tried to identify the kinds of factors that determine such an experience at work (Kalra and Ghosh, 1984). QWL is identification of those aspects of jobs and work environments that strongly impact the job satisfaction, job performance and lifelong well being of those who are employed (Seashore, 1975). There are 25 statements in the instrument to assess the Quality of Work Life experience of the respondents. To reduce into major dimensions, factor analysis using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation is applied.

In order to examine the suitability of the data for factor analysis, the following steps are considered:
1. The correlation matrices are computed and examined. It reveals that there are enough correlations to go ahead with factor analysis.
2. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy for the individual variables is studied. The KMO calculated is found to be 0.954. This score indicates that the sample is good enough for sampling.
3. The overall significance of correlation matrices is tested with Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity which proved to be highly significant. It indicates valid inter correlations between the items and proved goodness of fit to the data.

The factor loading with Varimax Rotation for QWL was done to investigate the underlying relationships of a large number of items and to determine whether they can be reduced to a smaller set of factors. This analysis has a high potential to inflate the Component loadings. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity are used to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis. Eigen values greater than one is considered significant. All the factors with latent root less than 1 are concluded to be insignificant and ignored. The four dimensions of QWL are identified and labelled as Reward system, Managerial style, Organisational support and Job itself. The Eigen values for the four factors were 1.272, 1.345, 1.176 and 1.064 respectively. The total variance of the QWL factors explained is 60.43%. The Cronbach Alpha for the four factors are Reward System (0.895), Managerial style (0.843), Organisational Support (0.820), Job itself (0.831). The Alpha of a scale more than 0.70 is acceptable. The forthcoming Table 1 showcase the results of extraction of QWL factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Factor 1 Reward system</th>
<th>Factor 2 Managerial style</th>
<th>Factor 3 Organisational support</th>
<th>Factor 4 Job itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My accomplishments are recognised by my superior.</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table.1

Extraction of QWL factors using Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Factor 1 Reward system</th>
<th>Factor 2 Managerial style</th>
<th>Factor 3 Organisational support</th>
<th>Factor 4 Job itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am given a real opportunity to improve my job skills.</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas of the organisation support me in my work by giving timely responses to my request, sharing information with me, etc.</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who work hard here are rewarded (e.g. promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m encouraged to use the new ideas and approaches learned in the training program that I attended on my job.</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company is making the kind of changes it needs to make to stay competitive.</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel pride and a sense of accomplishment in the work that I do.</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job has enough variety to be interesting.</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ideas and suggestions for improving the work that I do are valued by the people with whom I work.</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor supports me when I take appropriate risks- even those that fail.</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When making decisions, setting policy, making changes there is a sufficient effort made to get the opinions and thoughts of the people who work in the here.</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the authority to make the decisions that improve my quality of work.</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a good communication about the work related issues within my work area.</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to approach my superior with my work related questions and concerns.</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received the training that I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The quality of the service I provide to my customer is an important part of how my performance is evaluated. 0.605
My supervisor has the skills he or she needs to lead my work area well. 0.594
The amount of work that I have to do at any one time allows me to do a good job. 0.575
My work area has clear goals that guide me in my decisions. 0.542
The managers in my area have taken to ensure that my job related skills are updated 0.496
My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work. 0.488
I have the information I need to do my job well. 0.773
The work that I do is important and adds value to the company service 0.771
My job makes good use of my skills and abilities. 0.670
I find the work that I do for the company to be personally satisfying and rewarding. 0.575

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Factor 1 Reward system</th>
<th>Factor 2 Managerial style</th>
<th>Factor 3 Organisational support</th>
<th>Factor 4 Job itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the service I provide to my customer is an important part of how my performance is evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor has the skills he or she needs to lead my work area well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of work that I have to do at any one time allows me to do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work area has clear goals that guide me in my decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managers in my area have taken to ensure that my job related skills are updated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My physical work environment enables me to perform well and do quality work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the information I need to do my job well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work that I do is important and adds value to the company service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the work that I do for the company to be personally satisfying and rewarding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of variance | 17.4447 | 14.763 | 14.191 | 14.026 |
Cumulative %   | 17.4447 | 32.210 | 46.40  | 60.426 |

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) = 0.954
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity = approximate chi-square = 7658.52, df=300 and significant at 0.000

The forthcoming paragraphs would discuss the different dimensions of QWL extracted.

**Reward System**

Reward system is essential in promoting a climate of involvement and career satisfaction. The components in Reward system are designed, developed and maintained on the basis of reward strategies and policies. Reward system enhances OC that will lead employees to remain as members, develop a strong belief in and acceptance of the values and goals of the organisation and willing to exert considerable efforts (Dhileep Kumar M., 2006). The first factor extracted is Reward system which has substantial evidences to prove that it is
the foremost factor to develop enriching QWL. The sub factors extracted are as follows: Reward for Good and hard work, Interesting Job, Information Sharing, Pride and sense of accomplishment in job, recognition by supervisor, opportunity to improve skills, changes in work environment to stay competitive, Encouragement to use new ideas and approaches. QWL is a comprehensive construct that includes an individual’s job related well being and the extent to which work experiences are rewarding and fulfilling. QWL can rightly create an environment in which commitment can flourish (Walton R.E, 1975).

Managerial Style

Managerial style strengthens the path goal relationship and also enhances the work environment that offers morally attractive solutions to many problems of the employees. The operational concept of Managerial style is found to incorporate 6 sub factors as follows: Participative Decision making, Authority to make Decisions, Easy accessibility to supervisor, Ideas and suggestions valued by peers, Supervisor’s encouragement to implement risk prone decisions, Good communication in work area.

Workers respond best not when they are tightly controlled by management but instead when they are given broader responsibilities and encouragement to participate. Participation is widely recognised as a means of improving the QWL and thereby aims to increase performance. High levels of social interaction between leader and subordinates have been equated with higher levels of Organisational commitment (Meyer and Allen, (1997).

Pfeffer and Viega (1999) believe that allowing employees the opportunity to make and take responsibility to decision that affect their work should increase their sense of responsibility to stimulate more initiativeness and effort on the part of employees.

Organisational Support

Organisational studies argue that employer and employee exchange not only impersonal resources as money but also socio emotional resources such as approval, respect, recognition and support (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch and Rhoades, 2001). In line with this, the third factor extracted is named as organisational support with the sub factors as Updation of Job related skills, Clear goals to guide, Enabling physical environment, Skilled supervisors to lead, Training to accomplish task, Compatible time frame for completion of the task, Service quality as evaluation criteria.

Organisational support refers to the extent to which the organisation values their employees’ contributions and cares about their well being. Organisational support was also found to have a impact on Affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1986, (Fasolo and Davis-Lamastro, 1990).In addition higher levels of organisation create a sense of felt obligation to reciprocate the organisation’s support by caring about the organisation’s well being and help achieve its objectives (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Employees who have high levels of organisational support are likely to be more committed more willing to engage in extra role behaviours (Organ, 1988).
Job itself

Work has occupied an important place in the life of human beings. QWL is a term that had been used to describe the broader job-related experience an individual has. In ITes sector, the nature of job demands more humanised work environment. The major determinant of QWL is Job itself and hence the fourth factor extracted is titled Job itself with the following sub scales: Challenging Job, Skills and abilities match the job, Adequate information, Task significance.

Herzberg (1964), in his motivation – hygiene theory mentioned that management not only provide hygiene factors to avoid employee dissatisfaction but also provide factors intrinsic to the job itself for employees to ensure their satisfaction with their jobs. The level of motivation and commitment increases from having a strong emotional interest in an activity and a sense of freedom and autonomy related to it. (Mausner and Snyderman (1959))

The factor Job Itself is significant for employees in ITes in comparison to the traditional manufacturing and service sector.

A clearer understanding of the inter relationship of the various facets of QWL offers the opportunity for improved analysis of cause and effect in the work place.

With the increasing levels of development, the working environment has also become more competitive. Employers now demand for more skilled, trained and qualified workforce since the organisational output and productivity is highly dependent on the employees’ performances (Currell et al., 2005). Such employees in return also look for enabling work environment to ensure best contribution towards achievement of the goals.

Hence the four factors extracted fit in well to exemplify QWL as the base factor of the research. Thus, the four factors measurement model for QWL is confirmed and the examination of the best fitting is valid and justified.

2. Canonical Correlation between QWL and OC

The research focused on identifying factors that affect the strong desire of employees to be a member of the organisation. Over recent years, QWL and OC are increasingly being identified as key determinants related to the function and sustainability of business organisations. The forthcoming tables present the results of Canonical correlation between QWL and OC followed by the tests of significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Canonical R</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>% trace</th>
<th>Chi- square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>94.845</td>
<td>321.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.a: Canonical Correlation between QWL and OC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Approx. stat</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>321.720</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley Trace</td>
<td>F-test</td>
<td>35.195</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>F-test</td>
<td>24.443</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s largest root</td>
<td>F-test</td>
<td>103.513</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.b: Overall Tests of Significance between QWL and OC**
A research by Huang, Lawler and Lei (2007) found QWL has a significant impact of OC. If a person is happy with the job, he/she also enjoys his/her Quality of Work Life (Tang, 2007). From the table, it is understood that the correlation (0.652) between QWL and OC is on the higher side which is proved to be significant. All the tests of significance prove that Canonical R (0.652) is reliable and there is high association between OC and QWL. It is evident that commitments together are strongly correlated with the QWL dimensions of reward systems, Managerial style, and organisational support and job itself. Employees in ITes work for continuous hours involve in speedy task, achieve results on hand; hence the work environment to be compatible for them to ensure effective results becomes imperative.

The research results project that QWL plays a predominant role in strengthening the relationship between the organisation and its employees. This is supported by Chandrasekar's (2009) statement that management decisions and actions that are promulgated would affect the level of commitment and subsequently impact the growth of the company itself.

QWL consists of opportunities for active involvement in group working arrangements and it is conceived a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment and high-involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers. It requires employee commitment to the organisation and an environment in which this commitment can flourish (Walton, R.E., 1975). Thus, QWL is a comprehensive construct that includes an individual’s job related well-being and the extent to which work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences (Shamir, B. and Salomon I., 1985). The respondents belong to ITes sector wherein work environment influence their productivity.

To aim for increase in productivity employee’s commitment to the organisation and an environment in which this commitment can flourish to be given mush impetus. In ITes sector where the employees tend to be two income households, concern for employee’s QWL is heightening. Work place wellness is crucial in promoting healthier working environments.

3. Regression Model - Effect of QWL on OC

The improvement of quality at the work place has captured the imagination of managers and workers alike. The issues of work life quality have become crucial due to increasing demands of today’s business environment and family structure.

Caldwell (1990) suggests that OC is largely determined by the rewards offered by the organisation particularly financial rewards. Better work experience may nurture employees’ commitment to their organisations. From the Correlation results it is known that there is a strong positive and highly significant relationship between QWL and OC, meaning to say the higher the QWL the stronger will be the OC of employees. The following table displays the results of Regression analysis of QWL factors on the three dimensions of OC.

Meyer et al., (2002) had demonstrated that positive aspects of the work place would be positively related to Affective and Normative commitment and negatively related to Continuance commitment. The results of the present research display the same results. The following table depicts the Multiple Regression results of QWL on OC.
Table 3: Multiple Regression model of QWL on OC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sig</strong></td>
<td><strong>β</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sig</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward system</td>
<td>1.419E-02</td>
<td>-4.240E-02</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial style</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
<td>0.317**</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support</td>
<td>0.314**</td>
<td>0.331**</td>
<td>0.272**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job itself</td>
<td>0.321**</td>
<td>0.193**</td>
<td>0.293**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj R²</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 0.01 level * Significant at 0.05 level

Reward system, Managerial style, Organisational support and Job itself are posited to have a positive relationship with Affective commitment, Continuance commitment and Normative commitment. All the values of adjusted R² are significant as indicated by the F-values.

Each component of commitment has its own behavioural consequences to the individual employee or the organisation. Mostly, outcomes for Affective commitment is seen positively for all parties involved, Continuance commitment negatively, and Normative commitment in between these two. The mostly studied consequence of commitment is employee retention. It has been found that each form of commitment is negatively correlated with employees’ search intention, turnover intention and actual turnover (Allen and Meyer, 1996) although correlations are strongest in case of Affective commitment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

**Affective Commitment (AC)**

It is observed that the QWL variables account for about 71% of the total variance in Affective commitment (R² =0.714). The R² measures signify about the extent of impact that QWL creates on Affective commitment. As shown in the coefficients table, the estimates of the model coefficients for

\[ \beta_0 \text{ is } -0.186, \beta_1 \text{ is } 1.419E-02, \beta_2 \text{ is } 0.382, \beta_3 \text{ is } 0.314, \beta_4 \text{ is } 0.321. \]

Therefore, the equation may be presented as follows-

\[ AC= (-0.186) + (0.001) \text{ Reward System} + (0.382) \text{ Managerial Style} + (0.314) \text{ Organisational support} + (0.321) \text{ Job Itself} \]

**Four QWL factors are significant except one factor: Reward system (β=0.001). It is clearly depicted that Managerial style impact nearly 38% of difference in Affective commitment.** There is an argument that more flexible and participatory Managerial style can strongly and positively enhance Organisational commitment.

Organisation need to ensure that their Managerial style is aimed at improving employee commitment rather than just compliance. Job itself also has shown nearly 32% of
variance in Affective commitment. Baron and Greenberg (1990) state that higher the level of responsibility and autonomy connected with a given job, the lesser repetitive and more interesting it is and higher the level of commitment expressed by the people who are involving in their job. Organisational support has shown 31% variance in this form of commitment as evidence that the contribution of organisational support towards increased commitment cannot be ignored.

The Managerial style includes Participative decision making, Authority to make decisions, Easy accessibility to superior, Ideas and suggestions valued by Peers, Encouragement of supervisors and Good communication. The respondents had expressed that Managerial style (38%) has got more influence towards Affective commitment but closely followed by Managerial style. The other factors that impact Affective commitment are Job itself (32%) and Organisational support (31%). Reward system had only a negligible level of influence in creating Affectively committed employees. The organisations in ITes sector require employees with Affective commitment, so that employees turnover reduces and accrue the benefits of retaining trained employees for a long period of time.

Organisational commitment becomes operationalised through QWL initiative which is proved to be a highly influential factor creating 71% variance in Affective commitment.

Continuance Commitment (CC)

The influence of QWL on Continuance commitment as shown in table 4.4.1 makes it clear that Reward system is not significant in determining Continuance commitment. Organisational support (33%) and Managerial Style (32%) have major influence on Continuance commitment. The R² stands at 52% which implies that QWL influence Continuance commitment to the extent of 52%. The Continuance commitment makes an individual committed to the organisation because he/she perceives high cost of losing organisational membership including economic cost (such as pension accruals) and social costs (friendship ties with co-workers) that would be incurred. Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organisation in conscious psychological state that is shaped by environmental conditions.

As shown in the Coefficients table 4.4.1 indicates that the estimates of the model coefficients for β₀ is 0.599, β₁ is -4.240E-02, β₂ is0.317 , β₃ is 0.331, β₄ is 0.193. Therefore, the equation may be presented as follows-

\[ CC= (0.599) + (-0.00424) \text{ Reward System} + (0.317) \text{ Managerial Style} + (0.331) \text{ Organisational support} + (0.193) \text{ Job Itself} \]

Organisational support becomes pivotal to make employees feel happy and productive while at work. Organisational support has been portrayed which ensures updation of job related skill, training programs, goal clarity, enabling physical environment, time frame to complete task, service quality as evaluation criteria. Owing to advancement and changing face of ITes sector, organisational support is to be returned to synchronise with the level of commitment of employees. It is known from the equation that organisational support take a lead in developing Continuance commitment. The employee with this kind of commitment
stays in the organisation because of the support given. If there is a no support, then employees are sure to move to other organisations leaving the current organisation at lurch.

The other two QWL factors of equal magnitude are Job itself (32%) and Managerial style (32%). The nature of job performed is purely back end operations and demands job specific skills. The jobs are generally considered as monotonous and highly repetitive. Since employees’ works on routine basis to a particular client, a change in job element can create positives changes in the results produced by that particular individual. The Job itself includes challenging nature of job, adequate information, task significance and skills and abilities to match the work allotted.

It is proved that there is a positive and significant correlation between Managerial Style and Organisational Commitment (Mmakgomo Roseline Laka Mathebula, (2004). Managerial Style can influence commitment level of employees. Koopman (1991) studied how Managerial Style affected employees and found those employees who favoured their Managerial Style also favoured the organisation. Since the ITes sector provides wider choices, the employees tend to hop often from job to job. The organisations can try to retain the employees with Continuance commitment through unmatched Organisational support, Managerial style and enriched job elements.

The overall impact of QWL on this type of commitment itself is low. There are other environmental factors that contributed to influence this level of commitment rather than internal factors like Reward system, Managerial style, Organisational support and Job itself.

It is found that QWL variables account for about 52% of the variance in the Continuance commitment \( (R^2=0.522) \). Only three QWL variables have significant effects on Continuance commitment: Organisational support \( (\beta=0.331) \) Managerial style \( (\beta=0.317) \) and Job itself \( (\beta=0.193) \) and Reward system is found to be not significant with negative beta value.

**Normative Commitment (NC)**

It is examined that the QWL variables account for 61% of total variance in Normative commitment \( (R^2=0.612) \). Normative commitment is based on an obligation to remain with the organisation. Mannari (1977) described the employee with “lifetime commitment” as one considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives over the years. This count is the totality of internalised and suggested that individual exhibit these behaviours solely because they believe it is the right and moral thing to do (Wiener, 1982).

As shown in the Coefficients table, the estimates of the model Coefficients for \( \beta_0 \) is 0.589, \( \beta_1 \) is 3.417E-02, \( \beta_2 \) is 0.226, \( \beta_3 \) is 0.272, \( \beta_4 \) is 0.293. Therefore the equation may be presented as follows:

\[
NC = (0.589) + (0.003) \text{Reward System} + (0.226) \text{Managerial Style} + (0.272) \text{Organisational support} + (0.293) \text{Job Itself}
\]

Three factors are significant on Normative commitment: Job itself \( (\beta=0.293) \), Organisational support \( (\beta=0.272) \), and Managerial style \( (\beta=0.226) \), Reward system is
found not to be significant. The contribution of QWL in total is also comparatively low. Job itself is a major influential element of QWL to create Normative commitment. Organisational support also has a say in developing this form of commitment.

Normatively committed respondents opine that Job itself (29%) is a major factor to remain obligatory to their respective organisation. Such respondents experience Normative pressure to act in a way which meets organisational goals and interest. Job itself constitutes challenging assignments, skills and abilities appropriate to perform jobs, significant towards achieving organisational goals and adequate information to produce what is required by the organisations. The respondents engage in a job which is almost repetitive and remain competent to complete additional tasks and work for extended hours.

The respondents serve as cross functional teams for completing short assignment in other areas and sometimes to work outside their area of expertise. It is for the employers to create jobs or redesign existing ones to make them more challenging and likeable. This can be done by improving the utilisation of professional Knowledge and skills by increasing individual responsibility and influence. There are evidences which proves that changes in work characteristics improve the quality of employee tasks to give a feeling of being empowered to overcome changes in their environment.

The results by Badran Mohga A., Kafafy, Jihan H., (2008) reveal that the change in job characteristics as independent variables in general had a positive significant effect on dependent variables like job satisfaction, commitment and flexibility. It is pointed out that Organisational support (27%) and Managerial style (23%) also have a say in developing Normative commitment. Such respondents feel morally obligated to be with current organisation as the organisations have taken efforts to professionally develop them and to build an OC wherein Continuous growth becomes an integral part of it.

Normative commitment is influenced to the extent of 61% with major contribution from the QWL dimensions Organisational support and Job itself.

CONCLUSION

It is also found through regression analysis that set of job variables positively affect the levels of change in commitment. The relationship between perceived organisational support and the various forms of commitment are examined. Individuals who felt valued and supported by their organisations were more emotionally attached to the organisation. Each Organizational commitment component ties employees with their organization but the nature of the "psychological-bonding" is different. Affective commitment (AC) ties people grounded on attachment, involvement, and identification. The findings have given insights in efforts to improve the QWL to mould employees with right form of commitment and increase the level of commitment. The results provide valuable information about how employees in different forms of commitment feel about their work environment.
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