

## **Factors Affecting Quality of work life: An investigation on Managers in Selected Service Sector in India**

**\*Antimbala Prajapat**

Institute of Management Studies  
Devi Ahilya Vishwavidhyalaya, Indore (M.P.)  
Email - prajapat.antim04@gmail.com

**\*\*Dr. Sangeeta Jain**

Professor, Institute of Management Studies  
Devi Ahilya Vishwavidhyalaya, Indore (M.P.)  
Email - sangeetaims@gmail.com

**\*\*\*Dr. Vivek Sharma**

Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Studies  
Devi Ahilya Vishwavidhyalaya, Indore (M.P.)  
Email -drvivekims@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

The current study aims to explore the concept of quality of work life. This study shows the factors of quality of work life. The QWL of an individual is influenced by their direct experience of work and by the direct and indirect factors that affect this experience. The study focused on exploring the factors of Quality of Work Life with reference to banking, IT, health care and education institutions employees in India. The study was conducted on 400 respondents. The primary data was collected through self-design questionnaire having 38 items. The factor analysis was used to analyze the data through SPSS (16.0) Software. The findings of the study provide an insight into various aspects of work and working conditions that contribute significantly towards an employee's quality of work life.

**Key Words** - Quality of work life, Working Conditions, Motivation, Job Satisfaction.

## INTRODUCTION

Human resources management play a significant role in success of an organization. In Present Era Organizations are continuously looking for new ways of doing business in order to meet the challenges of today's dynamic business environment. In that case Work life Balance and Quality of Work Life (QWL) are the major factors that affect the employees working style and its directly affect the organizations image A mismatch between family and work roles can be disadvantageous for both employees and employers. Organizations are trying to work on work life balance for the betterment of organization as well as employees. In fact as early as 1960's researchers had begun to study and connect the dots between work and family. Western researchers have done a considerable work on this concept of work-family balance (Berg et al., 2003; Frone, 2003; Rossi, 2001; Marcinkus et al., 2007; Young, 1999).

The Quality of Work Life (QWL) has gained importance in all the countries of the World. It is significant in the context of commitment to work, motivation and job performance. It also means to facilitate the gratification of human needs and goal achievement.

QWL is a multi-dimensional construct usually referring to overall satisfaction with working life and with work life balance. According to Nadler and Lawler III (1983), QWL refers to an individual's perception of, and attitude towards, his or her work and the total working environment. In simple words, QWL can be defined as an individual's evaluative reactions to, and satisfaction with, his/her work and the total working environment.

Quality of Working Life (QWL) as a theoretical concept aims to capture the essence of an individual's work experience in the broadest sense. The QWL of an individual is influenced by their direct experience of work and by the direct and indirect factors that affect this experience. From organizational policies to personality, from feelings of general well-being to actual working conditions, an individual's assessment of their Quality of Working Life is

affected as much by their job as what the individual brings to the job. In particular, QWL is influenced by job satisfaction as well as factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

QWL as “a process by which an Organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.”

Quality of work life can improve the quality of life through the provision of resources and sufficient work in accordance with the expectations of employees reduce conflict within and outside of work and increase the value of the employee's identity. In addition, they also believe that the quality of work life programs significantly role in life satisfaction, happiness and subjective well-being of workers.

## **FACTORS OF QWL**

**Career Development & Growth-** Gallie (2003) suggests that there is a comparison of employees' perceptions of the quality of working tasks, the degree of involvement in decision making, career opportunities, and job security to see whether the Scandinavian countries have a distinctive pattern from other European Union countries. Another empirical study was done to predict QWL in relation to career-related dimensions (Aduan Che Rose et al. 2006).

**Communication** - communication plays an important role to achieve results. (King 1992) proposed that organizations could improve the quality of work life through improving the nature and quality of communication.

**Flexible Working** - Flexible scheduling is their strong and positive contribution to the quality of work life to understand the employees attitudes towards flexible schedules and quality of work life. (Pierce et al., 1989). Employee can easily manage their working schedule according to his/her comfortability.

**Health & Well Being** - Qwl significantly influence the non-working life of an individual. A large body of evidence in industrial/organizational psychology indicates that qwl is an important predictor of life satisfaction, health and psychological well-being of employees (e.g. Martel and Dupuis 2006 , Sirgy et al. 2001).

**Job Satisfaction** - QWL has been strongly associated with job satisfaction, and job satisfaction has been strongly associated with reduced turnover, reduced absenteeism, reduced lateness, reduced complaints, lower rate of complaints, lower rate of thefts, higher social citizenship (willingness to help other employees and customers, and being more cooperative (Cohen et al., 1997, Yolder, 1995; MacRobert et al., 1993; Luthans,1992:115). Moreover, job satisfaction may affect quality service and organizational commitment (MacRobert et al., 1993; Joseph and Deshpande, 1997).

**Organizational Commitment** - Organizational Commitment as an effective dimension to improve Qwl. (Hosseini and Musavi 2009). The underlying belief is that a more committed employee will perform better at their job (Walton, 1985).

**Productivity** - (Ghasemi 2000) found that significant relationship between qwl and productivity. If organization create attention or invest on qwl system they can improve productivity system.

**Work Life Balance** - It is a major component of QWL, which is important for both the employees and the employers. In the competitive environment, it is difficult to separate home and work life. Today employees are more likely to express a strong desire to have a harmonious balance among career, family life and other activities (Bailey, 2006).

**Work and Time Pressure** - (Van Eerd 2002) mentioned that having high levels of time pressure can endanger the loss of enthusiasm and an ability to act high levels of time pressure produce stress, which in turn lead to passivity and avoidance may occur. Work force affects the employees working style and it is affect the overall employees' quality of work life also.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

**Louis Davis (1972)** in his study QWL states that it is an attempt to establish that performance is linked to involvement and satisfaction of employees at work places. QWL is the overall quality of human experience at the work place. It measures the way participants in a system respond to the socio-technical aspect of that system.

**Walton (1975)** proposed eight factors which relating to QWL - 1) adequate and fair compensation.2) safe and healthy working conditions.3) immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities.4) opportunity for growth and security.5) social integration in work organization.6) constitutionalism in the work organization.7) work and total life space and 8) social relevance of work life.

**Warr and colleagues (1979)** in an investigation of Quality of Working life, considered a range of apparently relevant factors, including: work involvement, job motivation, higher order need strength, perceived job characteristics, job and life satisfaction, happiness and anxiety. They found correlations between work involvement and job satisfaction, job motivation and job satisfaction, and perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction.

**Carter et al., (1990), Efraty & Sirgy (1990-91)** QWL affect employees' work responses in terms of organizational identification, job involvement, job satisfaction, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation.

**Baba and Jamal (1991)** listed factors what they described as typical indicators of Quality of Working Life, including: job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment and turn-over intentions. They also explored reutilization of job content, suggesting that this facet should be investigated as part of the concept of Quality of Working Life.

**Cohen et al. (1997)** regarding self-management leadership and its relationship to QWL and work group effectiveness, a combination of the following dimensions was used to measure QWL: Organizational commitment, group satisfaction, growth satisfaction, social satisfaction and job satisfaction.

**Danna & Griffin (1999)** according to them QWL is a hierarchy that includes non-work variables such as life satisfaction (at the top), job satisfaction (at the middle) and work-specific facets as co-workers, and supervisor (lower in the hierarchy). Although QWL originated over three decades ago, the interest in the construct has not waned entirely.

**Wyatt and Wah (2001)** examined four dimensions, which according to them constitute the QWL of employees. These include: (i) a favorable working environment, (ii) personal growth and autonomy, (iii) rewarding nature of the job, and (iv) perception of stimulating opportunities and co-workers.

**Sirgy et al. (2001)** developed a new measure of QWL based on the notion of need satisfaction and bottom-up spillover theory proposing that QWL can be measured in terms of satisfaction of employees' needs. He suggested 7 dimensions which he categorized as lower- and higher-order needs. Lower-order needs are (1) Health and safety needs (2) economic and family needs (3) social needs (4) esteem needs (5) actualization needs (6) knowledge needs and (7) aesthetic needs.

**Islam Mohammad Baitul (2012)** evaluated the quality of work life on the basis of work load, family life, transportation, compensation policy and benefit, working environment and working condition and career growth.

Some of the Research has shown that QWL is a significant determinant of various organizational outcomes such as increased task performance, lower absenteeism and turnover rate, lower tardiness frequency and has a significant impact on employee behavioral responses such as organizational identification, organization and career commitment, turnover intention, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation.(Sirgy et al., 2001),(Wright & Cropanzano, 2004), (Donaldson et al., 1999), (Huang et al., 2007), (Ballou & Godwin, 2007), (Kaushik & Tonk, 2008), (Kerce & Booth-Kewley 1993), (Koonmee et al., 2010), (Lee et al., 2007), (Srivastava 2008), (Wilson, DeJoy, Vandenberg, Richardson & McGrath, 2004) & (Wright & Bonett, 2007)

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is exploratory in nature. The study helps to understand the Quality of work life and its dimensions on different service sectors in India. For the present study primary data was collected with the help of structured questionnaire having 38 items in them 12 are from demographic variables and 26 are from Qwl. The scores were measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is 'Strongly Disagree' and 5 is 'Strongly Agree'. This represents higher and lower degree of Quality of work life respectively. The primary data was collected through various banks, health care centers, IT companies and education institutions. The secondary data was collected through various Journals, Magazines, Articles, Websites, and Dissertation etc. Convenience random sampling was used for data collection. The sample size was 400 managers from different service sectors, comprise service sector- Banking, Health, IT and Institutions. Statistical tool factor analysis used for the Data analysis & Interpretations.

## RESULT AND INTERPRETATION

### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.875
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2609.928
	Df	325
	Sig.	.000

The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-olkin) measures the sampling adequacy, which should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. KMO Bartlett Value is 0.875 representing that data are accepted for factor analysis.

**Communalities**

	Initial	Extraction
q1	1.000	.601
q2	1.000	.693
q3	1.000	.735
q4	1.000	.618
q5	1.000	.607
q6	1.000	.729
q8	1.000	.470
q11	1.000	.701
q13	1.000	.686
q14	1.000	.754
q15	1.000	.646
q16	1.000	.657
q17	1.000	.687
q18	1.000	.682
q21	1.000	.621
q22	1.000	.633
q24	1.000	.557
q25	1.000	.711
q26	1.000	.625
q7r	1.000	.596
q9r	1.000	.615
q10r	1.000	.670
q12r	1.000	.629
q19r	1.000	.638
q23r	1.000	.669
q20r	1.000	.794



Extraction Method: Principal

Component Analysis.

The 38 statements regarding Table 1 were factor-analysed using principal components analysis and the varimax rotation method to determine the underlying dimensions. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were also implemented to test the fitness of the data.

The results of the KMO measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity clearly indicate the appropriateness of the use of factor analysis. The factor loadings of all accepted statements are greater than 0.5, and the Eigen values of all dimensions/factors are higher than 1.

### Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.126	31.254	31.254	8.126	31.254	31.254	4.021	15.464	15.464
2	1.687	6.487	37.741	1.687	6.487	37.741	2.952	11.353	26.817
3	1.547	5.950	43.691	1.547	5.950	43.691	2.030	7.809	34.625
4	1.302	5.009	48.701	1.302	5.009	48.701	1.907	7.335	41.960
5	1.262	4.855	53.556	1.262	4.855	53.556	1.887	7.256	49.217
6	1.057	4.066	57.622	1.057	4.066	57.622	1.558	5.994	55.211
7	1.034	3.978	61.600	1.034	3.978	61.600	1.359	5.227	60.438
8	1.007	3.874	65.474	1.007	3.874	65.474	1.309	5.035	65.474
9	.910	3.500	68.973						
10	.843	3.244	72.217						
11	.786	3.023	75.240						
12	.706	2.717	77.956						
13	.659	2.536	80.492						
14	.583	2.243	82.735						
15	.547	2.104	84.839						
16	.520	1.998	86.837						
17	.472	1.815	88.652						
18	.440	1.691	90.344						
19	.432	1.663	92.007						
20	.371	1.428	93.435						
21	.330	1.268	94.703						
22	.304	1.168	95.871						
23	.298	1.147	97.018						

24	.291	1.120	98.137						
25	.272	1.048	99.185						
26	.212	.815	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

### Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
q3	<b>.807</b>	.047	.198	.178	.019	-.062	.038	.073
q11	<b>.769</b>	.089	-.105	.142	.183	-.050	.176	.050
q2	<b>.643</b>	.053	.363	-.002	.068	.069	-.127	.345
q26	<b>.564</b>	.227	.201	.026	.265	.364	.055	.095
q1	<b>.545</b>	.222	.232	.219	.176	.296	-.179	.029
q8	<b>.542</b>	.273	.200	.108	.057	-.106	.158	.102
q22	<b>.485</b>	.385	.014	.237	.201	.366	.137	-.017
q21	<b>.435</b>	.398	.057	-.072	.306	.415	.001	.003
q4	<b>.419</b>	.133	.391	.321	.005	.168	.354	-.124
q24	<b>.409</b>	.237	.113	.049	.258	.345	-.014	.364
q23r	.138	<b>.777</b>	.077	.040	.107	.059	-.046	.146
q12r	.154	<b>.716</b>	.120	.217	-.034	-.009	.154	.082
q10r	-.006	<b>.612</b>	.130	.316	.038	-.026	.387	.164
q15	.473	<b>.576</b>	.160	-.098	.193	.107	-.012	-.077
q6	.199	.154	<b>.776</b>	-.033	.045	-.060	.233	-.056
q5	.219	.095	<b>.601</b>	.307	.203	-.081	.063	.205
q19r	.091	.385	<b>.499</b>	.012	.120	.296	-.299	.204
q9r	.087	.189	-.108	<b>.719</b>	-.121	-.001	-.003	.169
q18	.217	-.042	.219	<b>.700</b>	.295	.062	-.036	-.062
q16	.171	.200	.358	<b>.533</b>	.344	-.021	-.064	-.229
q14	.137	.072	.192	.235	<b>.736</b>	-.035	.048	.304
q25	.247	.085	-.009	.058	<b>.625</b>	.173	.454	-.112
q13	.340	.471	.152	-.131	<b>.503</b>	-.206	-.075	.090
q17	.037	.055	.067	-.007	.078	<b>-.814</b>	-.080	-.056
q7r	.068	.094	.126	-.082	.098	.062	<b>.719</b>	.172

q20r	.203	.235	.043	.042	.111	.076	.201	.797
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 17 iterations.

### Results of Factor Analysis

Factor	Q. No. Items Sub factors	Item Load	Factor Load	% Variance
1- Overall job and life satisfaction	3 - working Environment 11 - healthy working 2 - safe work place 26 – overall satisfaction 1 - job satisfaction 8 – respect and dignity 22 – enthusiasm 21- inspiration 4- ability & skills 24- personal harm	.807 .769 .643 .564 .545 .542 .485 .435 .419 .409	5.618	31.254
2-Performance appraisal & motivation	23r- feedback 12r- work recognition 10r- working challenges 15- support & guidance	.777 .716 .612 .576	2.681	6.487
3-Working Conditions	6 – decision making 5- responsibility 19r- security	.776 .601 .499	1.876	5.950
4-Career development	9r- work involvement 18-job commitment 16-challeneges	.719 .700 .533	1.952	5.009
5-Organization Commitment	14- goals & aims 25- intensive working 13- communication	.736 .625 .503	1.864	4.885
6- Stress at work	17- repetitive work	.814	.814	4.066

<b>7- Flexi working</b>	<b>7r- flexi time</b>	<b>.719</b>	<b>.719</b>	<b>3.978</b>
<b>8-Work life balance</b>	<b>20r-home-work interference</b>	<b>.797</b>	<b>.797</b>	<b>3.874</b>

The responses of sample were subjected to SPSS for factor analysis through which Eight factors emerged. These factors were:

### **Factor 1- Overall job and life satisfaction**

Ten items loaded on to factor 1 (5.618). It is clear from table that these ten items all relate to Quality of work life. These factors include overall employees' satisfaction and working satisfaction and how employees manage their working facilities to enhance Quality of work life at work place. The factor consists of ten sub factors viz. Working Environment (.807), healthy working( .769), safe work place( .643), overall satisfaction (.564), job satisfaction(.545), respect and dignity(.542), enthusiasm(.485), inspiration(.435), ability & skills(.419) and personal harm(.409). This factor was Labeled "Overall job and life satisfaction".

### **Factor 2- Performance appraisal & motivation**

Four items loaded on to factor 2 (2.681). It is clear from the table that these four items all relate to appraisal system and motivation. These factors help to employees to understand their performance level and create motivation level according to their job challenges. The factor consists of four sub factors viz. feedback (.777), work recognition (.716), working challenges (.612) and support & guidance (.576). This factor was Labeled "Performance appraisal & motivation".

### **Factor 3- Working Conditions**

Three items loaded on to factor 3(1.876), which shows that how working environment can boost up the performance of employees and helps to understand the organization facilities. The factor consists of three sub factors viz., decision making (.776), responsibility (.601), security (.499).This factor was labeled "Working Conditions".

**Factor 4- Career development**

Three items loaded on to factor 4(1.952). These factors help to understand that proper goals and aim helps to enhance the skill development & employees opinions to increase Qwl level of employees. The factor consists of three sub factors viz., work involvement (.719), job commitment (.700) and challenges (.533). This factor was labeled “Career development”.

**Factor 5-- Organization Commitment**

Three items loaded on to factor 5(1.864).which is related to Organization Commitment. If employees totally committed and involve in their job and use their skills so they can improve their Quality of work life. The factor consists of three sub factors viz., goals & aims (.736), intensive working (.625) and communication (.503). This factor was labeled “Organization Commitment”.

**Factor 6- Stress at work**

One item loaded on to factor 7 (.814).These factor related to stress at work. Repetitive work increases the stress level of employees. Organization has to rotate their job and work. The factor consists of one sub factors viz., repetitive work (.814). This factor was labeled “stress at work”.

**Factor 7- Flexible working hours**

One item loaded on to factor 7 (.719).These factor related to flexi time. Flexible working is a practice as a way to develop organizational commitment associate with the work-life balance improvement. The factor consists of one sub factors viz., flexi time (.719). This factor was labeled “Flexible working hours”.

**Factor 8- Work life balance**

One items loaded on to factor 8 (.797).which is related to work life- balance. Home and work interference imbalance the working conditions if organization provide flexi time to the employees so increase their level of Quality of work life. The factor consists of two sub factors viz. home-work interference (.797). This factor was labeled “Work life balance”.

This study shows that Factor 1 Overall job and life satisfaction has highest factor load. It is clearly indicated that job satisfaction and healthy working environment are the major factor to increase the level of Quality of work life of the employees.

## CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Findings of this research showed that type of working sectors has different working conditions and policies so employee's quality of work life affected in different service sectors.

Eight factors each have been identified regarding quality of working life experiences. The study exploring the factors of Quality of work-life and personal life of employees, observed employees are likely to perceive their workplace in a positive way. QWL is a significant determinant of various enviable organizational outcomes such as increased Job performance, lower absenteeism and turnover rate and has a significant impact on employee behavioral responses such as organizational commitment, job involvement and career development, turnover intention, job satisfaction, job involvement.

This research investigates study of quality of work life of managers in different service sector and exploring the determinants of quality of work life through an empirical study of the employees at banking, health care , IT and education service sector India. The result reflects that the Overall job and life satisfaction are the major factors that affect the employees' quality of work life. Concerning factors characteristics, the statistics show that the Factor 1- Overall job and life satisfaction has highest factor load 5.168 responsible to influence the employee Quality of work life. (Carter et al., 1990; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Efraty et al., 1991) Qwl is found to affect employees' work responses in terms of work pressure, job satisfaction, job involvement, job stress, job performance, and organizational turnover. Hence, Qwl has the potential to affect the personal life of an individual if organizations are concerned about

developing their human resources for gaining a competitive advantage in the marketplace organization should provide some facilities to employees to reduce work stress and turnover for better results.

## REFERENCES

- Baner.(1966), “International Journal of working with Emotional Intelligence”. Volume 14, issue 9, pp.451- 465.
- Carter, C., Pounder, F., Lawrence, F. & Wozniak, P. (1990) Factors related organizational turnover intentions of Louisiana extension service agents, in: H. Meadow & M. Sirgy (Eds) Quality-of-Life Studies in Marketing and Management, pp. 170–181 (Blacksburg, VA: International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies).
- Cole, D. C., Robson, L. S., Lemieux-Charles, L., McGuire, W., Sicotte, W., & Champagn, F. (2005). Quality of working life indicators in Canadian health care organizations: a tool for healthy, health care workplaces? *Occupational Medicine*, 55, 54–59
- Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25, 357-384.
- Jnaneswar K., (2016). A Study on the Level of Quality of Work Life Experienced by the Employees of Public Sector Units in Kerala. The Journal of Institute of Public Enterprise, Vol. 39, No. 1 2016, Institute of Public Enterprise A Study on the Concept of Quality of Work Life with Respect to Jute Industry - A Literature Review <http://www.iaeme.com/IJCIET/index.asp> 607 [editor@iaeme.com](mailto:editor@iaeme.com)
- Lewis, S. and Cooper,C.L. (1999), The work-family research agenda in changing contexts. *J. Occupat. Health Psychol.*, 4: 382-393.

- Losocco and Rochelle. (1970) "Influence on the Quality of work and non work life : Two Decades in Review", *Journal of vocational Behavior*, 39, pp. 182-225.
- Loscocco, K. A. and Roschelle, A. N. (1991), "Influences on the Quality of Work and Non work Life: Two Decades in Review", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, pp. 182-225.
- Prem Singh Khetavath.,(2015). An Empirical Analysis of Quality of Work Life of Employees in Indian Private Sector Organizations. International Conference on Trends in Economics, Humanities and Management (ICTEHM'15) March 27-28, Singapore.
- Sirgy, J.M., Efraty, D, Siegel, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A new Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241-302.
- Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. & Bradshaw, A. (2012). *Anonymous Medium University Staff Survey. Unpublished Research Report*. Portsmouth: QoWL Ltd.
- Van Laar, D.L., Edwards, J., & Easton, S. (2007). The Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale for Healthcare Workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 60(3) 325-333.
- Walton, R. E. 1985. From control to commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(2): 77-84.
- Warr, P, Cook, J and Wall, T (1979) .Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 52, 129-148.
- Wyatt, T. A. & Wah, C. Y. (2001). Perceptions of QWL: A study of Singaporean Employees Development. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 9(2), 59-76.