

Quality of Work Life on Employees Job Involvement and Affective Commitment between the Public and Private Sector in Malaysia

P. Yukthamarani Permarupan¹, Abdullah Al- Mamun¹ & Roselina Ahmad Saufi¹

¹ Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Business, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia

Correspondence: Abdullah Al- Mamun, Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Business, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia. Tel: 60-9-771-7251. Email: abdullah.a@umk.edu.my; mamun7793@gmail.com

Received: March 18, 2013 Accepted: April 16, 2013 Online Published: June 1, 2013

doi:10.5539/ass.v9n7p268

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n7p268>

Abstract

This study is designed to examine the relationship between the quality of work life (QWL), employees' job involvement and affective commitment among the employees of the public and private sector organizations in Malaysia. A total of 334 middle management level employees were selected to participate in this study. QWL was measured with five dimensions which are 'fair and appropriate salary', 'working conditions', 'capacities at work', 'opportunities at work' and 'organization climate'. The intervening and dependent variables are job involvement and affective commitment respectively. The results indicated that working conditions, opportunities at work and climate organization had a relatively higher impact on 'job involvement' and 'affective commitment'. Findings of this study contributed to the knowledge and understanding of the effect of the selected factors, which leads to better understanding among the practice for both public and private organizations in Malaysia towards attainment of a superior level of efficiency to thrive in an ever competitive business world.

Keywords: quality of work life, job involvement, affective commitment, public and private organizations

1. Introduction

In today's world of business, it is unavoidable for organizations to be free from various forms of malice and competition. This scenario has been an impetus for many organizational researchers to study specific employee intentions in joining an organization (Ali, 1996). At present, there is a vast sectional difference between the public and private sector management. The significant difference between the two sectors is the income factor. Money, returns and profits have always been the key elements in the private sector. This aspect has only recently been receiving attention from the public sector. Possibly the former relatively more customer and human touch oriented. However, both sectors are highly concerned with the employee's involvement and commitment to the organization in order to ensure the organization is operating and managing effectively. To address this issue, quality of work life (QWL) needs to be a focal discussion point.

The concept Quality of work life (QWL) was first coined in 1962. The concept of QWL attracted a lot in the United States, Japan and other industrialized countries. Specifically QWL has always been a focal point in healthcare management besides other safety and health conscious work environment. QWL is multi dimensional; it indicates the overall satisfaction in an individual's work life which leads to a balanced work-life. It gives a sense of belonging to the organization, a sense of being their-self and includes a sense of being worthy and respectable (Morin et al., 2003). QWL techniques can satisfy the psychological needs of the staff in an organization (Pluck, 1993: 36-42)

Through various research and studies, Walton (1974) was able to design an 8-dimensional scope of study to be tested at various outfits. Human beings are highly associated with emotion and intelligence. Therefore, the requirement to fulfil human need hierarchy is a rather important aspect especially on satisfaction and motivation. Ironically, by providing QWL, organizations are keen on tapping employees' job involvement. Job involvement by an employee is seen as an indicator of high performance and an organization's return on investment. Developing and providing excellent QWL has a financial impact on an organization as well.

Upon providing QWL, the expected output is employee's job involvement which focuses on a task or job and the following expectation will be Organizational Commitment (OC). Organizational commitment indicates the intensity of an employee's involvement and how strongly they relate to the organization (Hellrigel, Slocum &

Woodman, 1998). Organizations with high OC are perceived to have lower turnover rates and absenteeism. Organizational commitment (OC) has been a vital area of study among researchers for past decades. Various outcomes of research have been produced with various interpretations of organizational commitment. In addition, most research was also able to assist organizations determine the employee's level of performance, and tenure with the organization (Malloy, 1996). Thus, the focus of this study is to examine "The importance of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and the conviction of Quality of Work Life's on employees' Job Involvement and Affective Commitment. The study is conducted based on 5 dimensions of QWL pertaining to Job Involvement and Affective Commitment which will be moderated by age and the working experience of the employee". This research will act as a platform for organizations to recognize the extent of their employees' job involvement and affective commitment through the practices of quality of work life.

2. Literature Review

An effective Quality of Work Life (QWL) is basically a tool to improve working conditions (an employee's perspective) and greater organizational efficiency (mainly from an employer's perspective). Positive results of QWL have been supported by a number of previous studies, among which is reduced absenteeism, lower turnover rate, and improved job satisfaction eg: (Havlovic, 1991; Cohen et al., 1997; King and Ehrhard, 1997). Apart from that, organizational development towards low level of organizational hierarchy is a contribution of QWL (Asgari et al., 2011). QWL does not only contribute to an organization's ability to recruit quality human capital, it also enhances an organization's competitiveness. Schurman (1998) reviewed employee satisfaction is an important management goal in job design and developing human resource policies.

The traditional job design of scientific management focuses mostly on division of labour, hierarchy, close supervision and the one best way of doing work. This has brought several benefits to society but the disadvantage has been cited is the high human cost involved. This tends to create stress for the employees; stress is a major and expanding problem that ends in substantial cost to both employees and work organizations around the world (Hart & Cooper, 2001). Job stressor factors are divided into three main parts. Firstly is a job factor, second are individual factors and the third is organizational factors. The cost of stress at work for health care and treatment cost, absenteeism and turnover is in the range of 20 billion Euros in the European Union and more than 150 billion dollars in the US (Daniels, 2004). It is evident that high turnover, absenteeism and tension are positively related to occupational stress (Van de Ven, 2002).

There is an all round demand for developing the humanised jobs which can satisfy the higher needs of workers. The traditional job design needs to be replaced by an enriched job design. This request for redesigning of job is to enhance Quality of Work Life (QWL). The main paradox is for the management or an organization to treat employees as human capital that needs to be developed and appreciated rather than simply being utilized for the organization gains and operations.

After years of economic development and income growth, compensation and benefits are no longer the only goals that employees pursue. Taylor and Cosenza (1998) mention that while money is still important, it is not sufficient to inspire employees' involvement or commitment to the organization. There is a changing value of the workforce indicating that employees today are more interested in elevating both their quality of life and quality of work life.

Beyond salary, employees expect to gain benefits from their work such as appreciation towards achievement, career development and growth, and harmonious organizational climate and supportive managerial style to name a few for consideration for them (employees) to remain with the organization. It is suggested that companies offering better quality of work life and supportive working environments will likely be at an advantage when it comes to hiring and retaining valuable people (May, Lau & Johnson, 1999). This is supported by Steers and Mowday (1981) who opine that better job characteristics and work environments will lead to high organizational commitment, in turn reducing the intention to resign. An IBM workforce survey indicated that decision of the highest performers on whether or not to stay with the organization is most likely depends on their ability to balance work and personal responsibilities (Landauer, 1997).

Besides employees, employers commitment impacts on organizational operations, the practices of QWL also appear to contribute to business performance. Organizations that have been identified as the "best organizations to work for", Lau and May (1998) have found that these companies were companies where employees enjoyed a high quality of work life which translated in to exceptional growth and profitability.

Job involvement is a descriptive belief of the present job and tends to be a function of how much the job can satisfy one's present needs (Kanungo, 1982). The concept of job involvement was first introduced by Lodahl and Kejiner in 1965. It has a direct correlation with job satisfaction and also influences the work performance, sense

of achievement and unexplained absenteeism (Robinowitz and hall, 1977). Job involvement has been linked to job related behaviour as well as being a subsequent predictor of job related outcomes such as “intentions to leave an organization, professional commitment and ethical behaviour, psychological ownership for ownership and performance, lower role of conflict and role ambiguity and an employee’s readiness to change” (Freund, 2005; Clinebell and Shadwick, 2005; Van Dyne and Pierce, 2004; Leong et al., 2003).

Employees do not get involved in the job because they let their emotions play a role. Being highly involved in the job is often a response to emotional rather than rational needs. Fine’s (1998) quotes of a cook discussing the centrality of being emotionally involved in the job: I just love the activity...I concentrate totally, so I do not know how I feel....it is like another sense takes over. People are social creatures where, through job involvement they experience emotional attachment. A managerial job is often complex and challenging and most of the times they are extremely involved in task performed, where they remain beyond the required working hours.

There are many organizational behaviour studies which have examined an individual’s psychological attachment to their work organizations. Most studies use *organizational commitment* (OC) to examine the relationship of employees to their firms. The bond or link that an employee has with his/her organization is called organizational commitment (Lambert and Paoline, 2008; Mathieu et al., 1990). QWL and OC are multidimensional and is an outcome of one’s evaluation of his/her work place (Normala, 2010). Most researches has shown a positive relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Garland et al., 2009; Lambert and Hogan, 2009; Markovits et al., 2007) and organizational commitment acts as a variable and provides useful information regarding planning, organizing, increasing, performance and reducing absences for managers. Employees who are committed to an organization will see themselves a part of the organization and remain loyal to it (Asgari et al., 2011). Managers can keep their employees committed to the organization by having employees participate in decision-making and by providing an adequate level of job security (Moorhead, Translated by Alvani and Memarzadeh, 1995: 75).

Most research focuses mainly on antecedents and consequences. Allen and Meyer (1990) have indentified three types of OC which are: affective, continuance, and normative. Most public organizational studies indicate the existence of affective and continuance commitment (Kalbers & Fogarty, 1995; Ketchand & Strawser, 2001).

Most of the research on antecedent OC were oriented to job characteristic and work experience on various variables like work design, job challenge, autonomy, skills and feedback on task (Bamber and Iyer 2002; Dunham, Grude and Castaneda, 1994), and decision making participation and support from management (Zaffane, 1994). Konstans (1988) concluded that the commitment of employees was influenced by the organization’s ability to meet employee expectations. Apart from that organizational tenure is also always positively associated with organizational commitment, this is because of the general assumption that the more years employees are with a company the more benefits they get (Pare, Temblay & Lalonde, 2001). It is very important to have committed employees for the existence of both the private and public sectors; it is both a basic activity and final aim governing survival of an organization to survive. This is because individuals who are organizationally committed are more adaptable, productive, work with a sense of responsibility and are not financial liabilities to the organization (Demir, 2012). Committed employees will remain in the organization compared to non-committed employees (Meyer et al., 2002). But an absence of alternatives can lead to weaker affective and normative commitment into a strong continuance commitment (Ceylan & Bayram, 2006) and the common point in organizational commitment is that employees continue to remain in the organization whether they feel positive or negative (Ozdevecioglu, 2003).

The present study defines QWL as providing a good compensation package, favourable conditions and environment, fair capacities of authority, rewarding potential growth and a supportive organizational climate. An excellent work environment is seen as nurturing to an employee’s affective commitment. In order to improve the job satisfaction and commitment of employees determining the QWL is an important consideration for employers (Normala, 2010). There is a substantive list of studies pertaining to QWL, which asserts that QWL has a positive and significant relationship to organizational commitment (Ashoob, 2006); is positively and significantly correlated to a manager’s profile (Ali Nataji, 2006); and is significantly related to performance of staff (Fallah, 2006).

Recent research included the perspective of employees and the fulfilment of their needs and with that, Sirgy et al. (2001) and Lee, Singhapakdi and Sirgy (2007) describe QWL as “a construct which deals with the wellbeing of employees” and defines it as “employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace”. Employees who perceive their QWL positively and are satisfied with their work and organization have higher wellbeing because an individual’s QWL influences

his/her health and psychological well-being. QWL also significantly influences the non-working life of an individual and is also a major predictor of psychological, health wellbeing and also for life satisfaction (Martel & Dupuis, 2006; Sirgy et al., 2001; Srivastava, 2008; Wilson et al., 2004).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that an increasingly important step towards attracting and retaining quality employees is to improve the quality of the organization's work life. There are six critical factors to be considered in retaining employees which are compensation, job characteristics, training and development opportunities, supervisor support, career opportunities and work/life policies (McNee et al., 1998; Dockel, 2003).

Jeffrey Swartz, president and CEO of consistently ranked Timberland, admits that his company has an "obligation to continue to earn" its status as a great place to work. There are many ways to do this. For example, a company might introduce flexible scheduling to attract and retain employees who might otherwise leave.

For example, in a 1998 Harvard Business Review article titled, "Work and Life: The End of the Zero-Sum Game," which Stewart Friedman, Perry Christensen, and Jessica DeGroot describe how structuring work environments can benefit employees' needs and increased an employer's return. The authors examine several case studies and conclude that successful work and life balances increases employee loyalty and productivity. They recommend that organizations follow three important principles in developing such a balance, i.e. (a) clearly emphasize the overall business priorities and objectives of the organization, (b) recognize and support employees as 'whole people', and (c) acknowledging and even celebrating the fact that they have roles outside the office.

3. Research Method

The Walton's (1974) QWL model was modified and adopted in this study. There are five dimensions namely a) fair and appropriate salary, (b) working conditions, (c) employees capacities at work, (d) opportunities that employees have at work and (e) organizational climate. Partial implication of the Allen and Meyer's (1997) dimension of organizational commitment were adapted in this study by focusing on the affective commitment of the employee towards their organization.

The Kanungo's (1982) job involvement 10 item study was adapted and modified as well. The research setting was conducted at public and private organizations in Malaysia. The unit of analysis were middle management employees. This is a cross sectional research as the study is based on a snapshot of one point in time. The predictors used in this study were adopted from a few researchers. QWL was adapted from Walton's (1974) however it only on focused on four dimensions out of the eight dimensional study; organizational climate was adapted from Hay Group. The response for this section was measured using the 4-point Likert scale (1=highly dissatisfied to 4= highly satisfied). The job involvement questionnaire was developed by Kanungo (1982) and the measurement used is the 6-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree to 6=strongly disagree), whereas for affective commitment, precisely focusing on Affective Commitment was measured adapting Allen and Meyer's (1997) questionnaire which is also a 6-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree to 6= strongly disagree).

Purposive sampling design was applied in this study. The total population in Sabah is 2,468,246 and specifically Kota Kinabalu being the city, accommodates 355,435 of the population. From this total population there are 1,264,100 eligible labours for labour force. Total labour force being employed is 1,190,700 and the unemployment rate of 5.8% rate of unemployment is equivalent to 73,500. Despite this data, according to the Ministry of Human Resource, there are 7,999 positions vacant in both the public and private sectors. The employed population within Kota Kinabalu equals 126,506 employees. Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) that was introduced by Krejcie, (1970), which stated that the target group for a sample that consists of 1,000,000 requires the proportion of 384 persons. The sample size was derived using the total number in employment totalling 126,506 and according to the table by Krejcie (1970), the respondent sample was 384 people; however the researcher sent out 400 questionnaires taking into account the feedback rate of the respondents. The study received 334 responses from middle level managers. Responses from the public sector numbered 173.

3.1 Operational Definitions

Quality of Work Life (QWL): QWL is viewed as perceived working conditions in an organization. An average human capital spends a minimum of eight hours of daily time at work undertaking diligent performance of tasks. Carlson (1980) has viewed QWL as: (a) a movement; (b) a set of organizational interventions and (c) a type of working life experienced by employees.

Job Involvement: Employees whom are involved are more psychologically present, more attentive and display greater connection to their work. Through this involved employee, it is easy for an organization to access the inaccessible part of them (Kahn & Kram, 1994). Therefore, an employee who is highly motivated towards the

job renders better involvement to the organization than those who are not (Kanungo, 1982).

Affective Commitment: According to Allen and Meyer (1997), there are three components of organizational commitment: (a) affective commitment (AC), which relates to an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization; (b) continuance commitment (CC), which relates to the cost the employee associates with leaving the organization; (c) normative commitment (NC), which relates to the employee's feelings of obligation to remain with the organization.

3.2 Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis one (H_1): The higher the satisfaction with QWL, the higher the Employee's Job Involvement.

Hypothesis two (H_2): The higher the satisfaction with QWL, the higher the Affective Commitment.

Hypothesis three (H_3): There is a positive relationship between Employee's Job Involvement and Affective Commitment.

Hypothesis four (H_4): The Employee's Job Involvement is significantly intervened the relationship between QWL and Affective Commitment.

Hypothesis five (H_5): There is a significant difference in QWL between Public Sector employees and Private Sector employees.

4. Analysis of Results

4.1 Reliability of Measure

Reliability analysis is conducted to ensure that the measurements used in the questionnaires are reliable. The variables of Quality of Work Life (QWL) - Fair Compensation, Working Conditions, Capacities at work, Opportunities at work and organization climate, as well as Employee Job Involvement (JI) and Affective Commitment (AC) are checked and assessed using the Cronbach's alpha test to determine their reliability. According to Uma Sekaran (2011), reliabilities less than 0.60 are considered poor, those in the 0.70 range are acceptable, and those over 0.80 are good. Table 1 shows the Cronbach's Alpha for the independent variables and dependent variables in this research. From the analysis, all variables can be considered as possessing high reliability between 0.799 and 0.933.

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha value for variables

Variables/ Factors		Total Number of Items	Total Numbers of of Items Deleted	Cronbach's Alpha
Total Quality of Work Life (TQWL)	(TQWL)	20	None	0.933
<i>Sub variable under QWL</i>				
A fair and appropriate salary	(QWL 1)	3	None	0.799
Regarding your working conditions	(QWL 2)	4	None	0.853
The use of your capacities at the work	(QWL 3)	5	None	0.809
Opportunities that you have at work	(QWL 4)	3	None	0.836
The organization climate at your work	(QWL 5)	5	None	0.801
Job Involvement (JI)		10	None	0.834
Affective Commitment (AC)		6	None	0.918

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship between the five dimensions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) which is QWL 1 (Fair and Appropriate Salary), QWL 2 (Working Conditions), QWL 3 (Capacities at Work), QWL 4 (Opportunities at Work), QWL 5 (Organization Climate) and intervening/dependent variable (Job Involvement).

4.2 Testing Hypothesis One

The analysis presented in Table 2 indicates that 27.4 percent of the variance of Total Quality of Work Life (TQWL) explained the significant influence on Job Involvement. At 5 percent significant level, with $F=11.203$;

Sig.=.000, the F value shows that the QWL dimension which is QWL 1 (Fair and Appropriate Salary) , QWL 2 (Working Conditions), QWL 3 (Capacities at Work), QWL 4 (Opportunities at Work), QWL 5 (Organization Climate) contributed positively to dependent/intervening variable (Job Involvement). Adjusted R Square is .274 and the Durbin-Watson value is 1.494, therefore there is no strong evidence of the model experiencing the difficulty of autocorrelation.

Table 2. Model summary of simple regression analysis between TQWL and job involvement

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig. (F)	Durbin-Watson
1	.524	.274	.272	11.203	.000	1.494

a. Predictors : (Constant) Quality Of Work Life (QWL1,QWL2,QWL3,QWL4,QWL5)

b. Dependent Variable :Job Involvement

As presented in Table 3, the relationship between QWL 1 and JI scored a beta of .035 and significant of .538, QWL2 has a beta of -.211 and significant of .021, QWL 3 has a beta of .022 and a significant of .858, QWL 4 has a beta of .172 and significant of .020 and QWL5 has a beta of .554 and significant of .000. From this analysis, only three dimensions of the Quality of Work Life that are positively and significantly related to JI which are Working Condition (QWL 2), Opportunities at Work (QWL 4) and Organizational Climate (QWL 5). Out of these three dimension, the Organizational Climate (QWL 5) has the strongest impact ($\beta = 0.55, p > 0.000$) on Job Involvement. Nevertheless, Compensation (QWL 1) and Capacities at Work (QWL 3) do not play a significant role towards JI.

Table 3. The linear regression between QWL and job involvement

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized		Collinearity Statistics		
		Coefficients		Coefficients				
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.397	.260		5.373	.000		
	QWL1	.051	.082	.035	.617	.538	.654	1.529
	QWL2	-.300	.130	-.211	-2.317	.021	.249	4.012
	QWL3	.040	.223	.022	.179	.858	.138	7.264
	QWL4	.219	.094	.172	2.338	.020	.380	2.630
	QWL5	1.041	.292	.554	3.569	.000	.086	11.681
a. Dependent Variable:			JI					

4.3 Testing Hypothesis Two

The analysis in Table 4 indicated, that 21.4 percent of the variance of Total Quality of Work Life (TQWL) explained the significant influence on Affective Commitment. With the $F=90.229$; Sig.=.000, the F value shows that the QWL dimension which is QWL 1 (Fair and Appropriate Salary) , QWL 2 (Working Conditions), QWL 3 (Capacities at Work), QWL 4 (Opportunities at Work), QWL 5 (Organization Climate) contributed positively to dependent variable (Affective Commitment). Adjusted R Square is .211 and the Durbin-Watson value is 1.480, therefore there is no strong evidence of autocorrelation problem in the model.

Table 4. Model summary of simple regression analysis between TQWL and affective commitment

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig. (F)	Durbin-Watson
1	.462	.214	.211	90.229	.000	1.480

a. Predictors : (Constant) Quality Of Work Life (QWL1,QWL2,QWL3,QWL4,QWL5)

b. Dependent Variable :Affective Commitment

Table 5 shows the relationship between QWL 1 and AC scored a beta of .246 and significant of .000, QWL2 has a beta of -.192 and significant of .046, QWL 3 has a beta of -.014 and a significant of .915, QWL 4 has a beta of .226 and significant of .004 and QWL5 has a beta of .284 and significant of .082. From this analysis, only three dimensions that are positively and significantly related to JI which is Fair and Appropriate Salary (QWL 1), and Opportunities at Work (QWL 4) and slight significant from Working Conditions (QWL 2). Out of these three dimensions the Opportunities at Work (QWL 4) has the strongest impact ($\beta=.266$, $p=0.004$) on Affective Commitment. Nevertheless, Capacities at Work (QWL 3) and Organization Climate (QWL 5) do not play a significant role towards AC. Therefore, the hypothesis 2 which stated the higher the satisfaction with QWL, the higher the Affective Commitment is partially supported.

Table 5. The regression between QWL dimensions and affective commitment

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Tolerance VIF
1	(Constant)	1.073	.372		2.886	.004	
	QWL1	.490	.118	.246	4.164	.000	.654 1.529
	QWL2	-.371	.185	-.192	-2.003	.046	.249 4.012
	QWL3	-.034	.319	-.014	-.107	.915	.138 7.264
	QWL4	.390	.134	.226	2.917	.004	.380 2.630
	QWL5	.726	.417	.284	1.742	.082	.086 11.681

Dependent Variable: AC

4.4 Testing Hypothesis Four

Based on the Coefficient Table 6, analysis shown that the model is fit to be used as Durbin Watson analysis is at the value of 1.343. However, with this Durbin-Watson value of 1.343, it implied that the model has room for improvement. The analysis also shows that the independent variables effects the dependent variable at 42.9percent with the R2 value of .429. For significant test based on regression analysis, it was found that the significant value is .000 which is less than 0.05; does shows that there is positive relationship between Employee's Job Involvement and Affective Commitment. Hereby, hypothesis 3 is supported.

Table 6. Linear regression between job involvement and affective commitment

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Sig. (F)	Durbin-Watson
1	.655	.429	.427	249.479	.000	1.343

a. Dependent Variable: AC

Table 7 noted that Employee's Job Involvement does intervene the relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Affective Commitment (AC). The Beta value of QWL's relationship with AC, is 0.462 and QWL's relationship with JI has a Beta value at .524. For testing whether employee's Job Involvement significantly intervene the relationship between QWL and Affective Commitment is by comparing the difference between the

beta (β). The difference between .462, .524 and .655 is 0.193 which indicated high moderating effect and the significant value is at .000 which is low than 0.05. Therefore the hypothesis 4 which states the employee's, job involvement significantly intervene the relationship between QWL and Affective Commitment is supported.

Table 7. The hierarchical regression between QWL, JI and AC

	Beta	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Quality of Work Life and Affective Commitment	.462	.000	1.000	1.000
Quality of Work Life and Employee's Job Involvement	.524	.000	1.000	1.000
Employee's Job Involvement and Affective Commitment	.655	.000	1.000	1.000

4.5 Testing Hypothesis Five

From the Table 8, the mean for public sector is at 2.9326 with standard deviation at .39618, while for the private sector employees the mean is at 2.5810 with standard deviation at .39527. Hereby, the respondents from the public sector scored higher mean value on their quality of work life. The Levene's Test for Variance indicates significant value at .219 which is higher than 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis 5 was then rejected.

Table 8. T-test for TQWL

EmptySec of respondent		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		
QWL	Public	173	2.9326	.39618	.03012		
	Private	161	2.5810	.39527	.03115		
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
F		Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
QWL	Equal variances assumed	1.516	.219	8.114	332	.000	.35163
	Equal variances not assumed			8.115	330.390	.000	.35163

The result of Linear Analysis showed that there is a significant relationship between QWL and Employee's Job Involvement. The initial hypothesis was accepted fully when the QWL has a beta of .655 with a significant at .000. This directly indicates that employer whom provides high Quality of Work Life ensures high job involvement from their employees. However, based on the individual QWL dimensions; only Organizational Climate (QWL 5) scored a $\beta = 0.554$ and sig. at 0.000.

The result implies that it is congruent with "Duetsch and Shurman" findings which stated that there is newer strategy to increase employee's participation. Besides, Job Involvement scored a mean of 4.37 which indicates employees are strongly involved with their job from the likert scale of 1 to 6. Besides, this research also supported the motion of Ballou and Godwin (2007) that higher salaries does not necessarily appear to be an answer, as the data output indicates Fair and Appropriate Salary (QWL1) $\beta = .035$ and $p = .538$ is more appropriate.

High job involvement is related to job efficiency and work effectiveness. The differences among the respondents from the public and private were significant towards their job involvement. Public sector employees whom were perceived to be inefficient was proven wrong through this relationship with the effect of Quality of Work Life.

Public sector respondents have a stronger Job Involvement and perhaps the target group of this study plays the middle level management role and above. The differences between the two sectors scored $p = 0.013$. The notion of “when the cat is away, the mice are at play” used towards public sector employee should be observed closely.

Employee's Job Involvement has a positive relationship with Affective Commitment. The beta is at .655. Therefore, when an employee is involved with the assigned task or job; the higher the Affective Commitment they have towards their organization. An employee who is happy with the job and tasked assigned will be higher involved with their job. In relation to this, the affective commitment will be stronger too. Osterman(1995) and Lawler and Hall (1970) through their study also indicated the same findings. Employees whom are emotionally attached to the organization indicate higher involvement towards their task.

5. Conclusion

Quality of Work Life does have a significant relationship to Affective Commitment. From the analysis, if the employees are relatively satisfied with the quality of work life provided by the organization, the stronger the commitment will be to the organization. Affective Commitment is highly related to “I want to be” with the organization. The positivity and willingness is important towards achieving an organization's mission, vision and objective. Employees who display a high degree of Affective Commitment are deemed to be loyal and satisfied with the organization's management and tasks assigned. This finding is supported by the $\beta .462$; and by the previous studies done by Raduan et al (2006).

However through the multiple analyses; the dimensions which are important towards achieving affective commitment among employees apart from Compensation are Working Conditions and Opportunities at Work. Capacities at Work and Organization Climate do not significantly impact upon the relationship among the variables. Affective Commitment towards an organization enhances job performance.

The research also contributed to a new perspective of Quality of Work Life in the Malaysian context. Previous studies commonly focused on the outcomes or the importance of Quality of Work Life. However in this paper, the framework is new which addressed the employee's satisfaction of Quality of Work Life in relation to Job Involvement and Affective Commitment among the middle management employees. Hence, the findings have sought to demonstrate the importance of dimension of QWL from a new perspective.

The following contributions are the improvements that can be made by the respective organizations which were studied or the sector per se in designing an effective Quality of Work Life. Although the variables are grouped into five dimensions, the organization as a whole may adapt and improvise the current work system within the organization to enhance employee job involvement and affective commitment. Especially among the private sector which is usually perceived as the provider of better human touch services. In the course of research, the public sector has shown a demarcation of better employee job involvement towards the job or assigned task.

It is not an easy task for management and the organization to design and adapt Quality of Work Life effectively without the support and dedication from the employees themselves. However, both management and the organization can plan and design the best fit approach for the benefit of all. . It is not just the monetary based benefits that human capital seeks today; there are other aspects that motivate and enhance their job involvement and affective commitment such as opportunities at work.

In conclusion, the research findings presented have demonstrated that satisfactory qualities of work life enhance job involvement which relates to affective commitment. Therefore, organizations should strive to provide good Quality of Work Life to obtain the best results from their employees. The paper has also conclusively demonstrated that by way of comparison, the public sector employees' have higher job involvement towards their task and job.

References

- Ali, S. (1996). Organizational Development in the Arab World. *Journal of Management Development*, 15(5), 4-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621719610117213>
- Allen, J., & Meyers, J. P. (1997). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Asgari, H., & Dadashi, M. (2011). Determining the Relationship between Quality of Work. *International Journal of Sport Studies*, 2(4), 193-197
- Ashoob, T. (2006). Study of the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment of The High Schools of Gonbad-e- Kavus City. Master's dissertation.

- Ballou, B., & Godwin, N. H. (2007, October). Quality of "Work Life": Have You Invested in Your Organization's Future? *Strategic Finance; HR Resource*, 42-44.
- Bedeian, A. G., Kemery, E. R., & Pizzolatto, A. B. (1991). Career commitment and expected utility of present job as predictors of turnover intentions and turnover behaviour. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 39(3), 331-343. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(91\)90042-K](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(91)90042-K)
- Ceylan, C., & Bayram, N. (2006). Mesleki Bağlılığın Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütten Ayrılma Niyeti Üzerine Etkilerinin Düzenleyici Değişkenli Çoklu Regresyon ile Analizi. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 105-120.
- Clinebell, S., & Shadwick, G. (2005). The importance of organizational context on employees' attitude: an examination of working in main offices versus branch offices. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 11(2), 89-100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107179190501100209>
- Cohen, D., & Prusak, L. (2001). *In Good Company: How Social Capital Makes Organization Work*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Daniels, K. (2004). Perceived risk from occupational stress: a survey of 15 European countries. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 61, 467-470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/oem.2003.009142>
- Davoodi, S. M. R. (1998). Study of The Impact of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction among The Staff of Mobarakeh Steel Complex. Master's dissertation, Tehran, Islamic Azad University.
- Demir, H. (2012). Sport managers' organizational commitment levels. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(22), 6511-6515.
- Döckel, A. (2003). The effect of retention factors on organisational commitment: An investigation of high technology employees. Unpublished MCom dissertation (Human Resources Management), University of Pretoria.
- Dunham, R. B. (1984). *Organizational behavior: people and processes in management*. Michigan: Irwin.
- Fallah, M. (2006). Study and Analysis of the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Performance of Kosar Economical Organization Staff. Master's dissertation.
- Freund, A. (2005). Commitment and job satisfaction as predictor of turnover intentions among welfare workers. *Administration in Social Work*, 29(2), 5-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J147v29n02_02
- Garland, B. E., Mccarty, W. P., & Zhao, R. (2009). Job Satisfaction and organizational commitment in prisons, An Examination of Psychological Staff, Teachers and Unit management staff. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 36(2), 163-183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854808327343>
- Hafer, J. C., & Martin, T. M. (2008). Job Involvement or Affective Commitment : A sensitivity Analysis Study of Apathetic Employee Mobility. *Journal of Institute of Behavioural and Applied Management*, 8(1), 2-19.
- Hart, P. M., & Cooper, C. (2001). Occupational Stress: Toward a More Integrated Framework, Handbook of Industrial. *Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2, 93-114.
- Hoonakker, P., Marian, A., & Carayon, P. (2006). The Relation between Job Characteristic and Quality of Work Life: The Role of Task Identity to Explain Gender and Job Differences. ACM SIGCPR/SIGMIS 2003 Conference.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 341-449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.341>
- Lambert, E., & Hogan, N. (2009). The Importance of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Shaping Turnover Intent A Test of a Causal Model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0734016808324230>
- Lambert, E., & Paoline, E. A. (2008). The Influence of Individual, Job and Organizational Characteristics on Correctional Staff Job Stress, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33(4), 541-564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0734016808320694>
- Landauer, J. (1997). Bottom-line benefits of work/life programs. *Human Resource Focus*, 74(4), 3-4.
- Lau, R. S. M. (2000). Quality of Work Life and Performance, an ad hoc investigation of two key elements in the service profit chain model. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11(5), 422-437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09564230010360164>
- Lee, D., Singhapakdi, A., & Sirgy, M. J. (2007). Further validation of a Need-based Quality-of-work-life (QWL) Measure: Evidence from Marketing Practitioners. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2(4), 273-287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11482-008-9042-x>
- Leong, L, Huang, S. Y., & Hsu, J. (2003). An empirical study on professional commitment, organizational commitment and job involvement in Canadian accounting firms. *Journal of American Academy of Business*,

2(2), 360-370.

- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 44, 24-33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0021692>
- Markovits, Y., Davis, A. J., & Dick, R. (2007). Organizational Commitment Profiles and Job Satisfaction among Greek Private and Public Sector Employees. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(1), 77-99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470595807075180>
- Martel, J. P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of Work Life: Theoretical and Methodological Problems, and Presentation of a New Model and Measuring Instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77(2), 333-368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-5368-4>
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>
- McNee, B., Morello, T., Zidar, E., & Smith, C. (1998). Strategic human resources management: Addressing a critical problem for the information systems organisation. Gartner Group Strategic Analysis Report, September 28.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Najafi, A. (2006). Study of The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Profiting of Middle Managers of Iranian Gas Company. Master's dissertation, Tehran, Allameh Tabatabaei University.
- Normala, D. (2010). Investigating the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment amongst Employees in Malaysian Firm. *International Journal of Business Management*, 5, 10-14.
- Özdevcioğlu, M. (2003). Algılanan Örgütsel Destek İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *D.E.Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 18(2), 113-130.
- Paré, G., Tremblay, M., & Lalonde, P. (2001). The role of organisational commitment and citizenship behaviours in understanding relations between human resources practices and turnover intentions of IT personnel. Scientific Series #2001s-24, CIRANO, Montreal, Canada.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 265-288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.84.2.265>
- Rethinam, G., & Ismail, M. (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *European Journal of Social Science*, 7(1), 226-233.
- Schurman, S. J. (1998). Invited reaction: comments on Lau and May's research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3), 227-234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920090303>
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A New Measurement of Quality of Work Life (QWL) based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241-302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1010986923468>
- Van de Ven, A. H. (2002). *Professional Science*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitude and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25(4), 439-459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.249>
- Walton, R. E. (1974). QWL Indicator: Prospect and Problems. *Harvard Business Review*, 63, 77-84.
- Willis et al. (2008). Preregistration trainees' quality of working life. *The Pharmaceutical Journal*, (279), 42-55.
- Wilson, M. G., DeJoy, D. M., Vandenberg, R. J., Richardson, H. A., & McGrath, A. L. (2004). Work Characteristics and Employee Health and Well-Being: Test of a Model of Healthy Work Organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(4), 565-588. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/0963179042596522>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).