

# Organization Related Factors and QWL Dimensions – An Empirical Study

Dr. D. Porkalai

Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Christ College of Engineering and Technology, Moolakulam, Pondicherry (India)

---

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 09 March 2019

### Keywords

Quality of work life, Work and total life space, manufacturing industries

### \*Corresponding Author

Email: porkalai.mba[at]gmail.com

---

## ABSTRACT

Human resource plays the most critical and significant role in achieving organizational goals and objectives. Human capital is recognized as the organization's 'lifeblood' which needs to be developed continuously in keeping pace with the development in all other areas of today's dynamic world. QWL is one of the vital elements of HRM which leads to better conducive atmosphere for employees. Better quality of work life leads to an environment with friendly relations and extremely provoked employees who strive for their progress. This study examines the impact of organisation related factors on various QWL dimensions in medium and large scale manufacturing industries. The research design adopted for the study is descriptive in nature. Samples used were 354. One-way ANOVA is the tool used for analysis to achieve the objectives and Duncan Post Hoc test was applied to know the difference among the groups. Findings of the study is that the organisation related factors such type of industry, year of establishment and number of employees differs significantly with the specific QWL dimensions. The success of an organisation depends on the well being of its employees' and not merely profit maximisation. QWL denotes all organizational inputs which aim at employees' satisfaction and enhancing organizational effectiveness.

---

## 1. Introduction

Human resource is sentient, dynamic, and existing since the time man started to feel, think, imagine and nurture, shows contentment or discontent, umbrage or enjoyment, confrontation or recognition for all types of managerial procedures. They are the most complex and unpredictable in its behavior as a manager is able to acquire the employee's time, his physical presence at a given place and his trained powerfully built motions per hour or day, but it is difficult to buy his enthusiasm, initiative, loyalty and his attachment. Human resource plays the most critical and significant role in achieving organizational goals and objectives. Human capital is recognized as the organization's 'lifeblood' which needs to be developed continuously in keeping pace with the development in all other areas of today's dynamic world. The rise of labor organizations and various regulations, like the Factories Act, Employees' State Insurance Act, and the Workmen's Compensation Act has been passed to ensure certain minimum standards of treatment, also increased the importance of human resource.

HRM is characterized as a set of strategies put into practice and programmed, designed to make the most of both personal and managerial targets. It is the progression of fastening people and companies as one so that the purpose of each is achieved. One of the important trends in HRM is Quality of Work Life (QWL). Having commenced in the seventies QWL, in the next two decades managed to gain constellation of principles and methods. It is a broad phrase covering an enormous range of programme, methods, theories, and management styles throughout which institutions and works are crafted so as to provide workers more independence, accountability, and influence that are usually done.

QWL encompasses different aspects connecting to work atmosphere, employee stimulus, technology amenities, value and humanism of managerial care and supervision, management – union relations and so on. The level of economic development considerably determines people's quality of life. QWL has no specific theory or technique based on which it works, instead it is highly concerned about the overall work atmosphere of an organization. Quality of work life as a concept can be seen in two aspects. First deals with set of managerial objectives and practices, encompassing job enhancement, self-governing supervision, safe and healthy work atmosphere and employee involvement in decision making. The other way is from the employees' perceptions that they are secure and can nurture and cultivate good qualities to grow as better human beings.

Various factors have been found in the past two decades to determine the quality of work life. Diversified research taken up by researchers in this aspect came up with a variety of criteria which are not completely different from each other. Saklani found thirteen variables of QWL which is considered as the broadest criterion of QWL dimension. The 13 point criterion of Saklani to measure quality of work life includes sufficient compensation, fringe benefits, secured job, conducive work environment, work load, utilizing and developing human capacity, chances for continued development and security, relational aspects of life, contribution in making decision, recognition and punishing system, impartiality and complaints handling procedure, work and family life space and reflection of organisation in the society.

## 2. Literature Review

The QWL is a "broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories and management styles through which organization and jobs are designed so as to

grant workers more autonomy, responsibility and authority than is usually done". A review of previous studies on quality of work life is essential to know the areas already covered and also the areas to be covered.

Allenspach. H. (1975) report on flexible working hours based on experiments in Switzerland, discusses its advantages and disadvantages including its effect on job satisfaction and employee attitude. From the study of Cherisilicheer (1975) regarding working conditions and job satisfaction, it is clear that work cannot be considered merely from the point of view of productivity and that the improvement of working conditions must cater to the satisfaction of workers needs. According to Trist (1975), the quality of working life is both an end and a means. It is an end in itself because it is a highly significant component in the quality of life in general and it is a means to experience concern with improving working life, which may help employees acquire the civic competencies and skills.

According to Suttle (1977), the quality of working life aims at healthier, more satisfied and more productive employees and more efficient, adaptive and profitable organizations. Sayeed and Sinha (1981) examined the relationship between QWL, job stress and performance. The results indicate that higher QWL leads to greater job satisfaction and better performance. Ghosh and Kalra (1982) found that QWL is influenced by age, income, qualification, experience, etc.

Rahman (1984) in his study on the industrial workers of India found that subjects having low educational background and lower income had better perception of QWL than those having higher education and higher income. Levine, Taylor and Davis (1984) suggested that the construction of quality of working life should be specific and concrete. QWL has been found to be important for job performance, job satisfaction, labour turnover, labour management relations and such other factors which play a crucial role in determining the overall well-being of any industrial organization (Hoque & Rahman, 1999). Hossain and Islam (1999) found that there existed a positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction among government hospital nurses in Bangladesh. In another study, Hussain (2000) found that public sector bank employees were in a better position in terms of their job satisfaction than private sector bank employees.

Patiraj Kumari and Pooja khanna (2007), designed their study to investigate the quality of work life (QWL) in relation to mental health of bank employees. A total number of 200 bank employees were selected from banks of Haridwar and Dehradun (Uttanchal) comprising 150 employees from public and 50 employees from private sector banks. The result revealed significant positive correlation between QWL and mental health. Private sector bank employees were found to be more mentally healthy than the employees of public sector banks. Significant difference between the quality of work life of the employees of public and private sector banks was reported. The study also revealed significant difference between the mental health of high and low quality of working life groups. In public sector banks social integration in the work organization and in private sector banks safe and healthy

working condition has the highest contribution towards mental health.

Hanitha Sarah Saad, Ainon Jauhariah Abu Samah and Nurita Juhdi (2008), explored in their study ten variables to measure Quality Work Life (QWL) namely support from organization, work family conflict, relationship with peers, self competence, impact on job, meaningfulness of job, optimism on organizational change, autonomy, access to resources and time control among the employees of private higher learning institution and the relationship of all these variables with job satisfaction were tested. The test indicated that each of the QWL variables on its own is salient predictor of job satisfaction. However, 7 QWL variables were no longer significant predictors for job satisfaction when all the 10 QWL variables are entered in to the regression equation. Using multiple linear regressions, only 3 QWL variables (Meaningfulness of job, Optimism on organizational change and Autonomy) are significantly related to job satisfaction.

Meenakshi Gupta and Vikas Sharma (2009), undertook a study to determine whether and how the quality of work life affects the satisfaction level of employees of banks in Jammu region. The study found that among the independent demographic variables, the best predictor was annual income followed by marital status, sex, education, family size and job experience. Opportunities for personal encouragement was found as primary factor contributing for quality of work life and also perceived as more satisfied factor by the employees from banks. However factors as participation in decision making and rewards were found to have a significant impact on employee's satisfaction.

Prachi Bhatt (2011), concluded in his study that the public sector employees are relatively more satisfied with their working conditions, their job, relations with the peers etc. and thus find it easy to balance their work life than the private sector employees and the same in the case of Job satisfaction level which is more in public sector employees than private sector.

Mohammad Baitul Islam (2012) attempted to identify the factors that influence quality of work life among 100 employees from private limited companies of Bangladesh. It was found that factors work load, family life, transportation, compensation, policy and benefits, working environment, working condition and career growth have significant impact on quality of work life.

Sorab Sadri1 and Conrad Goveas (2013) conducted a study among employees in freight forwarding and clearing house business and identified important QWL factors by studying employee perceptions on satisfaction towards certain quality of work life parameters. The study reveals that QWL is highly prevalent as per the views of employees. It was also found that safe and healthy working conditions, adequate and fair compensation, opportunity to utilize individual skills and talent, develop human capabilities and provide career and growth opportunities were important factors influencing quality of work life.

Mohammad Hossein Nekouei, Mumtazah Bt Othman, Jariah Bt Masud and Aminah Bt Ahmad (2014) determined the effect of managerial, structural and social dimensions of quality of work life on job satisfaction among employees in government organisations in Iran. The results reveal that quality of work life significantly influences job satisfaction and in addition managerial dimensions of quality of work life was found to be the major predictor of job satisfaction.

### 3. Objective Of The Study

The aim of the study is to examine the impact of organisation related factors such as type of industry, year of establishment and number of employees on QWL dimensions among the employees at manufacturing industries.

### 4. Methodology

Research design adopted for the study is descriptive, which is chosen based on the objective of the study (i.e) to investigate and explain the existing nature of manufacturing industries with regards to quality of work life and psychological well being context.

A field survey was conducted for data collection from a sample size of 354 employees from medium and large scale manufacturing industries in Puducherry. Through simple random sampling, 5 per cent of employees from each companies and totally 354 employees' from both sectors, covering 189 from medium and 165 from large scale companies are considered for the study. Therefore the sample size for the study has been determined as 354, using formula given by Cochran, 1963.

For the research work both primary and secondary data has been used. Primary data pertaining to the profile of manufacturing firms, quality of work life related variable has been gathered using the survey method by giving a well structured questionnaire to the employees of the manufacturing firms located in the Puducherry. Questionnaire includes questions related to socio-economic profile of employees, quality of work life which includes 13 broad dimensions containing 63 items developed by Saklani, D.R. which is based on Richard E. Walton with five point Likert scale where the respondents were asked to give their agreement or disagreement towards the statement. A pilot study was conducted to check the validity of the questionnaire and to verify the possibility of the study. Thus the questionnaire was distributed among 50 employees working in medium and large scale manufacturing industries to perform the pilot test. Cronbach's Alpha test was performed to check the reliability. The value obtained is 0.843 thus proves the reliability of the instrument.

Secondary data pertaining to the break up details of number of manufacturing industries, production index in the UT of Pondicherry and India have been collected from India statistics, Central Statistical Organization, National Statistical Survey Organization, Department of Industries and commerce, Government of Pondicherry and Pondicherry Economics and Statistics department.

### 5. Statistical Analysis

354 samples were used for the study. Respondents were lower level employees from medium and large scale manufacturing industries. Demographic profile of the respondents is given in the table 1.

**TABLE 1**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS**

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	196	55.4
Female	158	44.6
Age ( in years)		
21-30	64	18.1
31-40	85	24.0
41-50	107	30.2
51-60	98	27.7
Education		
Below SSLC or SSLC	57	16.1
HSC	94	26.6
Diploma/Certificate	89	25.1
Graduate	75	21.2
Post graduate	39	11.0
Work experience(in years)		
1-10	72	20.3
11-20	110	31.1
21-30	92	26.0
More than 30	80	22.6
Income (in Rupees)		
Below 10,000	104	29.4
10,001-15,000	95	26.8
15,001-20,000	77	21.8
More than 20,000	78	22.0

Statistical tools used for the study is One-way ANOVA, chosen based on the hypothesis framed and for testing the same. Hypothesis for the study is as follows.

H<sub>1</sub>: Employee's opinion about QWL dimensions has no significant difference based on the type of industry in medium and large scale manufacturing industries.

**Table 2 Employee's perception about QWL dimension Vs Type of Industry**

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Adequate and fair compensation	Between Groups	19.705	10	1.970	1.162	0.320
	Within Groups	306.197	343	0.893		
	Total	325.902	353			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	18.402	10	1.840	1.382	0.192
	Within Groups	216.896	343	0.632		

	Total	235.298	353			
Job security	Between Groups	17.542	10	1.754	2.359	<b>0.010*</b>
	Within Groups	255.013	343	0.743		
	Total	272.555	353			
Safe and healthy work environment	Between Groups	12.984	10	1.298	0.701	0.337
	Within Groups	268.314	343	0.782		
	Total	281.298	353			
Work load	Between Groups	7.086	10	0.709	0.826	0.604
	Within Groups	228.102	343	0.665		
	Total	235.188	353			
Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	Between Groups	21.593	10	2.159	4.132	<b>0.000*</b>
	Within Groups	179.245	343	0.523		
	Total	200.838	353			
Opportunity for career development	Between Groups	11.249	10	1.125	1.268	0.117
	Within Groups	162.063	343	0.472		
	Total	173.311	353			
Human relations and social aspect of life	Between Groups	16.808	10	1.681	1.640	0.099
	Within Groups	198.733	343	0.579		
	Total	215.542	353			
Participation in decision making	Between Groups	11.404	10	1.140	1.952	<b>0.038*</b>
	Within Groups	200.416	343	0.584		
	Total	211.820	353			
Reward and penalty system	Between Groups	19.446	10	1.945	2.308	0.114
	Within Groups	184.478	343	0.538		
	Total	203.923	353			
Equity, justice and grievance handling	Between Groups	6.815	10	.682	1.559	0.117
	Within Groups	149.966	343	0.437		
	Total	156.781	353			
Work and total life space	Between Groups	13.004	10	1.300	0.923	0.513
	Within Groups	232.366	343	0.677		
	Total	245.370	353			
Image of organization in the society	Between Groups	17.051	10	1.705	3.522	<b>0.000*</b>
	Within Groups	155.792	343	0.454		
	Total	172.843	353			

\*Significant at 5% level

From the above table 2 it can be inferred that in large scale the significance value for the dimensions of QWL such as job security (0.010), opportunity to use and develop human capacity (0.000), participation in decision making (0.038) and image of the organisation (0.000) are less than 0.05 which means significant difference exist between the groups and for other dimensions like compensation (0.320), fringe benefits (0.192), work environment (0.337), work load (0.604),

opportunity for career development (0.117), human relations and social aspect of life (0.099), reward and penalty system (0.114), grievance handling (0.117) and work and total life space (0.513) the significance value are greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is rejected (i.e) type of industry has significant difference with employee's perception about QWL dimensions. Post hoc test is applied to find the significant difference between the groups.

Table 2.1 Duncan's Post Hoc Test for QWL dimensions with type of industry

Type of industry	Job security (Mean)	Image of organization in the society (Mean)	Opportunity to use and develop human capacity (Mean)	Participation in decision making (Mean)
Agriculture	2.57 (I)	2.56 (I)	2.70 (I)	2.06 (I)
Automobiles	3.12 (III)	3.94 (III)	3.61(III)	3.80 (III)
Food	2.57 (I)	2.72 (I)	3.58 (I)	2.72 (I)

Furniture	2.33 (I)	2.55(I)	3.71 (I)	2.70(I)
Electronics	3.21 (III)	3.55 (III)	3.73 (III)	3.92(III)
Plastics	3.16 (III)	3.59 (III)	3.71 (III)	3.83(III)
Chemicals	3.07 (II)	3.18 (II)	3.55 (II)	3.61(II)
Textile	2.77 (I)	2.57(I)	2.78 (I)	2.76(I)
Building material	3.46 (IV)	4.48(IV)	3.94 (IV)	3.98(IV)
Metal	3.55 (IV)	4.48(IV)	3.88 (IV)	3.88(IV)
Pharmaceutical	2.88 (II)	3.08 (II)	3.54 (II)	3.76(II)

Post Hoc result shows that groups form two subset where one subset grouped into chemical, automobile, textile and food industry and remaining are grouped into another subset which includes building material, metal, electronics and plastics.

H<sub>2</sub> : Employee's perception about QWL dimensions has no significant difference with the year of establishment in medium and large scale manufacturing industries.

**Table 3 Employee's perception about QWL dimensions Vs Year of establishment**

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Adequate and fair compensation	Between Groups	1.307	3	0.436	4.071	<b>0.007*</b>
	Within Groups	324.595	350	0.927		
	Total	325.902	353			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	11.389	3	3.796	5.934	<b>0.001*</b>
	Within Groups	223.909	350	0.640		
	Total	235.298	353			
Job security	Between Groups	9.190	3	3.063	.470	0.704
	Within Groups	263.365	350	0.752		
	Total	272.555	353			
Safe and healthy work environment	Between Groups	7.875	3	2.625	3.360	<b>0.019*</b>
	Within Groups	273.423	350	0.781		
	Total	281.298	353			
Work load	Between Groups	3.856	3	1.285	7.574	<b>0.000*</b>
	Within Groups	231.331	350	0.661		
	Total	235.188	353			
Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	Between Groups	12.243	3	4.081	3.994	<b>0.008*</b>
	Within Groups	188.595	350	0.539		
	Total	200.838	353			
Opportunity for career development	Between Groups	5.737	3	1.912	3.540	<b>0.015*</b>
	Within Groups	167.574	350	0.479		
	Total	173.311	353			
Human relations and social aspect of life	Between Groups	6.347	3	2.116	1.945	0.122
	Within Groups	209.194	350	0.598		
	Total	215.542	353			
Participation in decision making	Between Groups	4.947	3	1.649	0.576	0.632
	Within Groups	206.872	350	0.591		
	Total	211.820	353			
Reward and penalty system	Between Groups	12.083	3	4.028	2.596	0.054
	Within Groups	191.840	350	0.548		
	Total	203.923	353			
Equity, justice and grievance handling	Between Groups	3.530	3	1.177	2.110	0.100
	Within Groups	153.251	350	0.438		
	Total	156.781	353			
Work and total life space	Between Groups	8.905	3	2.968	0.839	0.474



	Within Groups	236.465	350	0.676		
	Total	245.370	353			
Image of organization in the society	Between Groups	9.135	3	3.045	1.570	0.198
	Within Groups	163.708	350	0.468		
	Total	172.843	353			

\*Significant at 5% level

In medium and large scale, significance value for dimensions of QWL such as compensation (0.007), fringe benefits (0.001), work load (0.000), work environment (0.019), utilizing and developing human capacity (0.008), career development (0.015) are less than 0.05 and for the other dimensions like job security (0.704), human relations (0.122), sharing in decision making (0.632), rewarding and punishing

system (0.054), grievance handling (0.100), work and family life (0.474) and reflection of organisation in the society (0.198) the significance value are greater than 0.05. Therefore the hypothesis is rejected (i.e), year of establishment has significant difference with employee's perception about QWL dimensions. Post Hoc test applied to find significant difference among the groups.

**Table 3.1 Duncan's Post Hoc Test for QWL dimensions with year of establishment**

Year of establishment	Adequate and fair compensation (Mean)	Fringe Benefits (Mean)	Safe and healthy work environment (Mean)	Work load (Mean)	Opportunity to use and develop human capacity (Mean)	Opportunity for career development (Mean)
5 – 10 years	2.15 (I)	2.79 (I)	2.39 (I)	2.58 (I)	2.37 (I)	2.63 (I)
11 – 15 years	2.36 (I)	3.06 (I)	2.79 (I)	2.85 (I)	2.84 (I)	2.98 (I)
16 – 20 years	2.44 (II)	3.43 (II)	2.91 (II)	3.00 (II)	3.16 (II)	3.08 (II)
More than 20 years	3.49 (II)	3.51 (II)	3.05 (II)	3.29 (II)	3.22 (II)	3.23 (II)

Duncan's post hoc result shows that the significant difference among employees in companies more than 15 years with the companies less than 15 years.

H<sub>3</sub>: Employee's perception about the dimensions of QWL and psychological well being has no significant difference with number of employees in an organisation among medium and large scale manufacturing industries.

**Table 4 Employee's perception about QWL dimensions Vs Number of employees**

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Adequate and fair compensation	Between Groups	2.577	3	0.859	2.653	<b>0.041*</b>
	Within Groups	323.325	350	0.924		
	Total	325.902	353			
Fringe Benefits	Between Groups	10.435	3	3.478	5.414	<b>0.001*</b>
	Within Groups	224.863	350	0.642		
	Total	235.298	353			
Job security	Between Groups	10.889	3	3.630	4.855	<b>0.003*</b>
	Within Groups	261.666	350	0.748		
	Total	272.555	353			
Safe and healthy work environment	Between Groups	9.196	3	3.065	3.943	<b>0.009*</b>
	Within Groups	272.102	350	0.777		
	Total	281.298	353			
Work load	Between Groups	2.573	3	0.858	2.996	<b>0.032*</b>
	Within Groups	232.615	350	0.665		
	Total	235.188	353			
Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	Between Groups	14.419	3	4.806	2.067	0.106
	Within Groups	186.419	350	0.533		
	Total	200.838	353			
Opportunity for career development	Between Groups	5.782	3	1.927	1.458	0.228
	Within Groups	167.529	350	0.479		

	Total	173.311	353			
Human relations and social aspect of life	Between Groups	9.663	3	3.221	0.472	0.702
	Within Groups	205.878	350	0.588		
	Total	215.542	353			
Participation in decision making	Between Groups	5.699	3	1.900	0.737	0.531
	Within Groups	206.120	350	0.589		
	Total	211.820	353			
Reward and penalty system	Between Groups	14.018	3	4.673	2.623	0.152
	Within Groups	189.905	350	0.543		
	Total	203.923	353			
Equity, justice and grievance handling	Between Groups	4.240	3	1.413	2.173	0.093
	Within Groups	152.541	350	0.436		
	Total	156.781	353			
Work and total life space	Between Groups	10.470	3	3.490	1.129	0.339
	Within Groups	234.900	350	0.671		
	Total	245.370	353			
Image of organization in the society	Between Groups	10.311	3	3.437	1.836	0.142
	Within Groups	162.532	350	0.464		
	Total	172.843	353			

\*Significant at 5% level

From the above table 4 it can be inferred that in large scale the significance value for the dimensions of QWL such as compensation (0.041), fringe benefits (0.001), job security (0.003), work environment (0.009) and workload (0.032) are less than 0.05 and for other dimensions like utilizing and developing human capacity (0.106), career development (0.228), human relations (0.702), sharing in decision making

(0.531), rewarding and penalty system (0.152), grievance handling (0.093), work and family life space (0.339) and reflection of organisation in the society (0.142), the significance value are greater than 0.05, hence the hypothesis is rejected (i.e) number of employees has significant difference with employee's perception about QWL dimensions and post hoc test is applied.

**Table 4.1 Duncan's Post Hoc Test for QWL dimensions Vs Number of employees**

Number of employees	Adequate and fair compensation (Mean)	Fringe Benefits (Mean)	Job security (Mean)	Safe and healthy work environment (Mean)	Work load (Mean)
501 – 750 employees	2.12 (I)	2.82 (I)	2.38 (I)	2.33 (I)	2.65 (I)
751 – 1000 employees	2.36(I)	2.10(I)	2.88 (I)	2.84 (I)	2.85 (I)
More than 1000 employees	3.46(II)	3.46 (III)	3.24 (II)	3.94(II)	3.06(II)

Post Hoc test reveals that significant difference exist between employees working in highly employed and less employed.

## 6. Findings

*QWL dimensions Vs Type of industry:* Analyzing type of industry, there is significant difference with job security, opportunity to use and develop human capacity, participation in decision making and image of organisation in the society and there is no significant difference with compensation, fringe benefits, work environment, work load, career growth, human relations, reward and penalty system, grievance handling and work and total life space. The significant difference exists between four groups such as agro based companies, electronics and automobiles, chemicals and metal and building

materials. Type of industry doesn't have any significant influence on psychological well being.

*QWL dimensions Vs Year of establishment:* Studying year of establishment, the significant difference exist with compensation, fringe benefits, safe and healthy work environment, work load, opportunity to use and develop human capacity, opportunity for career development and there is no difference with job security, human relations, sharing in decision making, reward and penalty system, grievance handling, work and family life, and image of organisation in the society. If the year of establishment is more means the employer is in the industry for more years and he knows how to handle his employees. The significant difference exists between companies established below 15 years and more than

15 years. In case of psychological well being year of establishment doesn't have any significant influence.

*QWL dimensions Vs Number of employees in an organisation:* With respect to number of employees, the significant difference exists between compensation, fringe benefits, job security and work environment and there is such difference with utilizing and developing human capacity, career growth, human relations, sharing in decision making, rewards and penalty system, grievance handling, work and family life space and image of organisation in the society. The reason because employer concentrates on above said factors when the employee is high which will have impact on various parameters. The significant difference exists between companies with less than 500 employees and more than 500 employees. In case of psychological well being number of employees doesn't have any significant influence.

## 7. Suggestions and Conclusions

Quality of work life is found to be average in the medium sector enterprise. The cause for such a result is due to various

factors like inadequate and irregular payment system, restrictive and personalized superior – subordinate relations, anxiety, stress, feeling of insecurity, alienation, life dissatisfaction, inadequate safety and welfare facilities, duration of working hours and unhealthy working conditions. These limitations limits the employees' to fulfill his expectations based on his ambitions and eventually exposed to high tensions, poor performance and even resulting in mental imbalance.

The success of an organisation depends on the well being of its employees' and not merely profit maximization. Today's organisation is in need of fast, flexible, dynamic, enthusiastic, motivated, creative and fully self expressed employees' marching at the forefront and record growth with excellence. In such a context employee satisfaction of job through better QWL is an essential factor. An employee-centered organisation will maintain better quality of work life.

## References

- Allenspach, H. (1975). Flexible Working Hours. International Labour Office, Geneva, 64.
- Ghosh, S., & Kalra, S.K. (1982), Perceptual Differences in QWL Factors. *Indian Journal of Training and Development*, 12(3&4), 10-12.
- Hackman, J. R., & Suttle, J. L. (1977). Improving life at work. IL:Scott, Foresman, Glenview.
- Haniitha Sarah Saad, Ainon Jauhariah Abu Samah & Nurita Juhdi, (2008). Employees Perception on Quality of Work Life, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4(3), 23 - 34.
- Hoque, M.E., & Rahman, A. (1999). QWL and Job Behaviour of Workers in Bangladesh: a comparative study of Private and Public sectors. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35, 3.
- Hossain, M..E., & Islam, M.T. (1999). Quality of Working Life and Job Satisfaction of Government Hospital Nurses in Bangladesh. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 34, 292 – 302.
- Hossain, Md. Mosharraf. (2000). Job Satisfaction of Commercial Bank Employees in Bangladesh: A Comparative Study of Private and Public Sectors. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 347-361.
- Meenakshi Gupta and Vikas Sharma. (2009). Quality of Work Life – A study of bank employees in Jammu Region. *AJBMR*, 4(2), 1-8.
- Mohammad Baitul Islam. (2012). Factors affecting quality of work life: An analysis on employes of private limited companies in Bangladesh. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(18), 23-31.
- Patiraj Kumari & Pooja Khanna. (2007). The Quality of Working Life in relation to Mental health of Bank employees, *Global Journal of Business Management*, 1 (1), 68.
- Prachi Bhatt.. (2011). Quality of Work Life in changing Business Dynamism – A study on perceptual differences in public and private sector. *Vishwakarma Business Review*, 1(2), 1-8.
- Rahman, A. (1984). QWL as Perceived by the Industrial Shift Workers, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Osmania University, Hyderabad India.
- Sayeed, O.B., & Sinha, P. (1981), QWL in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Performance in Two Organisation, *Managerial Psychology*, 2, 15-30.
- Sorab Sadri1, & Conrad Goveas. (2013). Sustainable Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction :An Indian Case Study. *Elite Research Journal of Education and Review*, 1(5),. 48 – 54.
- Trist, E. (1975). Planning the first steps towards QWL in a developing society. In L.E.Davis and A.B Cherns (eds), *The quality of working life; Problems prospects and the state of the art* (Vol.1), New York: Free Press.