

## **A Study on Effect of Age and Gender on Quality of Work Life of 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 QWL is the most important factor of the working environment because if employee has high Quality of work life they are satisfied with their work and total working environment and if employee has Low Quality of work life they are less satisfied with their work and total working environment. In particular, QWL is influenced by job satisfaction as well as factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being. The main aim of the present research to study the effect of age and gender differences on Quality of Work Life of managers in selected service sector in India. The study was conducted on 262 respondents. The primary data was collected through self-design questionnaire having 38 items. Analytical tools such as t-test and ANOVA statistics were used to analyze the data through SPSS (16.0) Software. The results show*

*that male employees has better quality of work life than female employees, while age group below 30yrs and above 50yrs employees has better quality of work life than other age group.*

**Key Words** - Quality of work life, Working Conditions, age and gender.

## INTRODUCTION

Quality of work Life is a individual's life. It is a multi-dimensional construct It covers a person's feelings about every dimension of working and non-working life including health and safety needs, economic rewards and benefits, security, well-being, work life balance, job satisfaction, working condition, Organizational and interpersonal relations in person's life. Therefore we can simply say Q.W.L. is a concern not only to improve life at work, but also life outside.

The term QWL as the effectiveness of the working environment that transmit to the meaningful organization and personal needs in shaping the values of employees that support and promote better health and well-being, job security, satisfaction, competency development and work life-balance.

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.

Some recent research observed that, work-related stress and balancing work and non-work life domains affect QWL significantly and should conceptually is considered as determinant of Quality of Working Life.

There are several approaches for achieving QWL in organization, namely job design, workers participation, welfare, and quality circles. Quality circles are one of the ways of involving employees at the bottom level of organization in decision affecting work and work related problems. The Quality Circles play an important role to achieving Quality of Work life of workers in organizations.

QWL concepts is the value of treating the worker as a human being and emphasizing changes in the socio-technical system of improvement, in physical and psychological working environment, design and redesign of work practices, hierarchical structure and the production process brought

with the active involvement of workers in decision making.

QWL contributes to a company's ability to recruit and retain quality people, and also it enhances company's competitiveness. Some important positive influence QWL has on employees is that it will positively nurture a more flexible, loyal and motivated work force, which is essential to attain company's competitiveness.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

**Hesket J.L. Sasser, W.E. Jr. Schlesing L.A. et.al (1997)** stated that QWL which is measured by the feelings that employees have toward their jobs, colleagues, and companies would ignite a chain effect leading to an organization growth and profitability in the end. To improve the QWL of the employees companies are now emphasizing on cordial employee relations and adopting a human resource strategy that place high value on employees as organization stakeholders.

**Lewis et al. (2001)** a meta-analysis has been done, suggests QWL factors include reduced work stress, organizational commitment and belonging, positive communication, autonomy, recognition, predictability of work activities, fairness, clear locus of control and organizational decisions.

**Okpara (2005)** this study indicate that a significant relationship exists between salary and gender, education and experience. These variables influence QWL has produced mixed results. Age difference has been identified as a strong predictor of QWL, with older workers generally enjoying higher quality of work life than younger workers.

**Daskalova (2009)** they conducted project of 'Quality of life in a changing Europe' aimed to review effect of gender differences on quality of work and life. They findings that men are in more privileged positions at work, while women are more committed to the company. Genders differences are concerning most of the studies indicate that work quality, including autonomy, job satisfaction, supervisor support, and job security and work-life balance.

**Desti Kannaiah<sup>1</sup> & G. Sasikumar (2014)** Study based on Quality of work life of Employees in Small Scale Industries in Tamil Nadu State in India. The study aims to analyzing the Emotional Intelligence level and the quality of work life. They analyze the qwl level between male and female worker in the Small Scale Industries.

**Jnaneswar K (2016)** Study on the Level of Quality of Work Life Experienced by the Employees of Public Sector Units in Kerala, in the study researcher study attempts to find the level of quality of work life among the employees and also finds that level of Qwl on male and female employees.

**P. Nagesh (2017)** according to his study every organization has to satisfy some of the basic needs and demands of its employees because the satisfied and motivated employees are the source of achieving the organizational goals and objectives. In order to use the maximum potential of the human resource, the organization has to provide them with the best quality of their working life. Therefore, every organization needs to update and improve the quality of work life of the employees.

## OBJECTIVE

1. To Study the quality of work life of managers in selected service sector in India.
2. To study the effect of Age differences on Quality of Work Life of managers in selected service sector in India.
3. To study the effect of Gender differences on Quality of Work Life of managers in selected service sector in India.

## HYPOTHESIS

1. **H01** = There is no significant effect of age on Quality of work life.
2. **H02** = There is no significant effect of age on Overall job and life satisfaction dimension of QWL.
3. **H03** = There is no significant effect of age on Performance appraisal & motivation dimension of QWL.
4. **H04** = There is no significant effect of age on Working Conditions dimension of QWL.

5. **H05** = There is no significant effect of age on Career development dimension of QWL.
6. **H06** = There is no significant effect of age on Organization Commitment dimension of QWL.
7. **H07** = There is no significant effect of age on stress at work dimension of QWL.
8. **H08** = There is no significant effect of age on flexible working hour dimension of QWL.
9. **H09** = There is no significant effect of age on work life balance dimension of QWL.
10. **H01** = There is no significant effect of gender on Quality of work life.
11. **H02** = There is no significant effect of gender on Overall job and life satisfaction dimension of QWL.
12. **H03** = There is no significant effect of gender on Performance appraisal & motivation dimension of QWL.
13. **H04** = There is no significant effect of gender on Working Conditions dimension of QWL.
14. **H05** = There is no significant effect of gender on Career development dimension of QWL.
15. **H06** = There is no significant effect of gender on Organization Commitment dimension of QWL.
16. **H07** = There is no significant effect of gender on stress at work dimension of QWL.
17. **H08** = There is no significant effect of gender on flexible working hour dimension of QWL.
18. **H09** = There is no significant effect of gender on work life balance dimension of QWL.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is exploratory in nature. The study helps to understand the effect of age & gender differences on Quality of work life and determinants of quality of work life of managers in selected service sector in India. For the present study primary data was collected with the help of self-design questionnaire having 38 items. Data was collected through convenience sampling technique. After collecting the data 262 respondents were taken finally having completely filled forms.. 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 secondary data was collected through various Journals, Magazines, Articles, Websites and Dissertation etc. Analytical tools such as Frequency Distribution, t-test and ANOVA statistics were used to analyze the data through SPSS (16.0) Software.

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

### 1. Reliability Analysis

In reliability analysis, No of Items was 38. Cronbach's Alpha is .708 hence the data is reliable.

(Table 1)

Cronbach's Alpha	No. Of items
.708	38

### 2. Demographic Analysis

(Table 2)

Gender	
Male	51.5 %
Female	48.5 %
Age	
Below 30yrs	61.8 %
31-40yrs	27.9 %
41-49yrs	6.1 %
Above 50yrs	4.2 %

The demographic profile of respondents is presented in table 2. As far as the gender split of the respondents is concerned, it can be seen that 51.5 percent of the respondents were male and 48.5 percent female. Coming to the age of the respondents, 61.8 percent of the respondents were age below 30yrs, 27.9 percent of the respondents were age 31-40yrs, 6.1 percent of the respondents were age 41-49yrs and 4.2 percent age of above 50 yrs.

## Independent Samples Test

		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	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
F1_tot	Equal variances assumed	4.415	.037	-.274	260	.784	-.19522	.71202	-1.59728	1.20685
	Equal variances not assumed			-.276	252.840	.783	-.19522	.70706	-1.58770	1.19726
F2_tot	Equal variances assumed	.007	.932	1.701	260	.090	.64252	.37764	-.10111	1.38615
	Equal variances not assumed			1.702	259.201	.090	.64252	.37758	-.10099	1.38603
F3_tot	Equal variances assumed	.435	.510	.301	260	.764	.07530	.25032	-.41762	.56822
	Equal variances not assumed			.301	259.992	.763	.07530	.24990	-.41678	.56738
F4_tot	Equal variances assumed	.227	.634	2.248	260	.025	.51963	.23116	.06444	.97482
	Equal variances not assumed			2.248	259.045	.025	.51963	.23116	.06444	.97482
F5_tot	Equal variances assumed	.153	.696	1.336	260	.183	.28253	.21147	-.13388	.69894
	Equal variances not assumed			1.333	255.341	.184	.28253	.21195	-.13486	.69992
F6_tot	Equal variances assumed	.022	.882	.632	260	.528	.06632	.10488	-.14021	.27285
	Equal variances not assumed			.633	259.994	.527	.06632	.10470	-.13986	.27249
F7_tot	Equal variances assumed	2.083	.150	.122	259	.903	.01587	.12975	-.23964	.27138
	Equal variances not assumed			.123	258.733	.902	.01587	.12930	-.23874	.27049
F8_tot	Equal variances assumed	2.246	.135	-.497	260	.619	-.07005	.14083	-.34736	.20726
	Equal variances not assumed			-.499	259.642	.618	-.07005	.14041	-.34653	.20643
qtot	Equal variances assumed	.713	.399	.899	259	.369	1.36402	1.51688	-1.62296	4.35100
	Equal variances not assumed			.903	258.608	.368	1.36402	1.51122	-1.61185	4.33989

Gender differences on quality of work life in the view of table 3 reported that t-test result that found male and female employees has difference of perception towards quality of work life of managers in selected service sector in India. The mean score from descriptive analysis male employees has better quality of work life than female.

## Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for		Minimum	Maximum
						Mean			
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
F1_tot	below 30yrs	162	38.9506	5.74705	.45153	38.0589	39.8423	16.00	50.00
	31-40yrs	73	37.7671	5.79876	.67869	36.4142	39.1201	21.00	50.00

F2_tot	41-49yrs	16	37.7500	7.02851	1.75713	34.0048	41.4952	23.00	50.00
	above								
	50yrs	11	39.4545	2.42337	.73067	37.8265	41.0826	36.00	44.00
	Total	262	38.5687	5.74965	.35521	37.8693	39.2682	16.00	50.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	14.4568	3.23048	.25381	13.9556	14.9580	7.00	20.00
	31-40yrs	73	14.4521	2.80892	.32876	13.7967	15.1074	6.00	20.00
	41-49yrs	16	14.5625	3.14046	.78512	12.8891	16.2359	9.00	20.00
	above								
	50yrs	11	15.0909	2.30020	.69354	13.5456	16.6362	12.00	20.00
F3_tot	Total	262	14.4885	3.06598	.18942	14.1156	14.8615	6.00	20.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	11.4444	1.91107	.15015	11.1479	11.7410	6.00	15.00
	31-40yrs	73	11.3014	2.23411	.26148	10.7801	11.8226	6.00	15.00
	41-49yrs	16	10.6250	2.30579	.57645	9.3963	11.8537	6.00	15.00
	above								
	50yrs	11	12.3636	1.36182	.41060	11.4488	13.2785	9.00	14.00
	Total	262	11.3931	2.02144	.12489	11.1472	11.6390	6.00	15.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	11.8086	1.76767	.13888	11.5344	12.0829	6.00	15.00
F4_tot	31-40yrs	73	11.8219	2.05036	.23998	11.3435	12.3003	7.00	15.00
	41-49yrs	16	12.1250	2.15639	.53910	10.9759	13.2741	7.00	15.00
	above								
	50yrs	11	12.8182	1.99089	.60028	11.4807	14.1557	9.00	15.00
	Total	262	11.8740	1.88444	.11642	11.6448	12.1033	6.00	15.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	11.9259	1.76423	.13861	11.6522	12.1997	5.00	15.00
	31-40yrs	73	11.7534	1.59671	.18688	11.3809	12.1260	7.00	15.00
	41-49yrs	16	11.8125	2.16699	.54175	10.6578	12.9672	8.00	15.00
	above								
F5_tot	50yrs	11	12.0909	.94388	.28459	11.4568	12.7250	11.00	14.00
	Total	262	11.8779	1.71325	.10584	11.6694	12.0863	5.00	15.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	3.7531	.83452	.06557	3.6236	3.8826	1.00	5.00
	31-40yrs	73	3.9315	.83879	.09817	3.7358	4.1272	1.00	5.00
	41-49yrs	16	3.6875	.87321	.21830	3.2222	4.1528	2.00	5.00
	above								
	50yrs	11	3.5455	1.03573	.31228	2.8496	4.2413	2.00	5.00
	Total	262	3.7901	.84748	.05236	3.6870	3.8932	1.00	5.00
	below								
F6_tot	30yrs	162	3.7531	.83452	.06557	3.6236	3.8826	1.00	5.00
	31-40yrs	73	3.9315	.83879	.09817	3.7358	4.1272	1.00	5.00
	41-49yrs	16	3.6875	.87321	.21830	3.2222	4.1528	2.00	5.00
	above								
F6_tot	50yrs	11	3.5455	1.03573	.31228	2.8496	4.2413	2.00	5.00
	Total	262	3.7901	.84748	.05236	3.6870	3.8932	1.00	5.00
	below								
	30yrs	162	3.7531	.83452	.06557	3.6236	3.8826	1.00	5.00



F7_tot	below 30yrs	161	3.4348	1.01724	.08017	3.2765	3.5931	1.00	5.00
	31-40yrs	73	3.4384	1.01361	.11863	3.2019	3.6748	1.00	5.00
	41-49yrs	16	3.7500	1.29099	.32275	3.0621	4.4379	1.00	5.00
	above 50yrs	11	3.0000	1.26491	.38139	2.1502	3.8498	1.00	5.00
	Total	261	3.4368	1.04552	.06472	3.3093	3.5642	1.00	5.00
F8_tot	below 30yrs	162	3.2407	1.11347	.08748	3.0680	3.4135	1.00	5.00
	31-40yrs	73	3.2603	1.17883	.13797	2.9852	3.5353	1.00	5.00
	41-49yrs	16	3.7500	1.23828	.30957	3.0902	4.4098	1.00	5.00
	above 50yrs	11	3.0909	1.04447	.31492	2.3892	3.7926	2.00	5.00
	Total	262	3.2710	1.13758	.07028	3.1326	3.4094	1.00	5.00
qtot	below 30yrs	161	99.0000	12.31361	.97045	97.0835	100.9165	57.00	130.00
	31-40yrs	73	97.7260	12.07300	1.41304	94.9092	100.5429	75.00	128.00
	41-49yrs	16	98.0625	15.75846	3.93962	89.6654	106.4596	63.00	127.00
	above 50yrs	11	101.4545	5.53830	1.66986	97.7339	105.1752	93.00	108.00
	Total	261	98.6897	12.24114	.75771	97.1976	100.1817	57.00	130.00

Anova

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
.F1_tot	Between Groups	89.890	3	29.963	.905	.439
	Within Groups	8538.373	258	33.094		
	Total	8628.263	261			
F2_tot	Between Groups	4.339	3	1.446	.152	.928
	Within Groups	2449.126	258	9.493		
	Total	2453.466	261			
F3_tot	Between Groups	20.842	3	6.947	1.714	.164
	Within Groups	1045.665	258	4.053		
	Total	1066.508	261			
F4_tot	Between Groups	11.704	3	3.901	1.100	.350
	Within Groups	915.139	258	3.547		
	Total	926.844	261			
F5_tot	Between Groups	2.072	3	.691	.233	.873
	Within Groups	764.019	258	2.961		

	Total	766.092	261			
	Between Groups	2.508	3	.836	1.166	.323
F6_tot	Within Groups	184.946	258	.717		
	Total	187.454	261			
	Between Groups	3.669	3	1.223	1.120	.341
F7_tot	Within Groups	280.538	257	1.092		
	Total	284.207	260			
	Between Groups	4.185	3	1.395	1.079	.359
F8_tot	Within Groups	333.575	258	1.293		
	Total	337.760	261			
	Between Groups	173.677	3	57.892	.384	.765
qtot	Within Groups	38786.185	257	150.919		
	Total	38959.862	260			

Age differences on quality of work life in the view of table 4 reported that on applying Anova test it was found that the mean score of age group below 30yrs and above 50yrs were greater than that of other age group. Hence it can be concluded that below 30yrs and above 50yrs age group, has better quality of work life as compare to other 31to40yrs and 41to49yrs age group.

## CONCLUSION

This study attempts to find out the age and gender differences on quality of work life of managers in selected service sector in India. The main contribution of that research was to the identification of age and gender differences issue in quality of working life. Moreover, it will provide global and regional implications for the organization to improve the employee's quality of work life. This research investigates the impact of age and gender differences on quality of work life and the determinants of quality of work life through an empirical study of the managers in selected service sector in India. The result reflect that there is no significant impact of gender differences on Quality of work life but according to mean score man employees has better quality of work life than female and there is a significant impact of age on below 30yrs and above 50yrs of quality of work life of employees. The Future research can focus on a wider sample to reach more generalized results.

## REFERENCES

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.

Daskalova, N., (2009). Gender differences in quality of work and life; Institute for Social and Trade Union Research (ISTUR), Bulgaria, Nov.

Desti Kannaiah, & Sasikumar. G., (2014). Quality of work life of Employees in Small Scale Industries (With Special Reference to Tiruvannamalai Town, Tamil Nadu State, India) *Asian Journal of Business and Management* (ISSN: 2321 - 2802) Volume 02– Issue 04, Asian Online Journals [www.ajouronline.com](http://www.ajouronline.com) 367.

Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. & Claiborne, C. B. (1991) The effects of personal alienation on organizational identification: quality-of-work life model, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 6(1), pp. 57–78.

Heskett J.L. Sasser, W.E. Jr. Schlesing L.A. et. al. (1997), “The Service Profit Chain”, The Free Press, New York. pp. 99.

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

Lewis, D., Brazil, K., Kreuger, P., Lohfeld, L., & Tjam, E. (2001). Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 14(3), ix-xv.

Okpara, J.S., (2005). The impact of salary differential on managerial job satisfaction: A study of the gender gap and its implications for management education and practice in a developing economy. *J. Bus. Dev. Nations*, 8: 66-92.

P. Nagesh (2017) Influence of Quality of Work Life on Work Performance of Employees”,  
*International Journal of Engineering Technology Science and Research*, ISSN 2394 –  
3386 Volume 5, Issue 1