



## Human Resource Management

*Elixir Hum. Res. Mgmt.* 44 (2012) 7462-7470

**Elixir**  
ISSN: 2229-712X

# Quality of work life as perceived by employees in private sector manufacturing companies – a research paper

P.Aranganathan<sup>1</sup> and R.Sivarethinamohan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MIET Engineering College, Trichy, Tamilnadu, India

<sup>2</sup>OAS Institute of Technology and Management, Trichy, Tamilnadu, India.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 3 August 2011;

Received in revised form:

15 March 2012;

Accepted: 23 March 2012;

#### Keywords

Jobsecurity,  
Socialintegration,  
Constitutionalism,  
Organizational climate.

### ABSTRACT

The success of every organization is highly dependent on how it attracts recruits, motivates and retains its quality workforce. In the current scenario, the organizations need to be more proactive to ensure the development of their workforce and commitment. Hence the organizations necessitate adopting the strategy to improve the employee's Quality of Work Life (QWL) to satisfy both organizational objectives and employee needs. Quality of work life is the degree to which work in an organization contributes to material & psychological well-being of its members. The present study attempts to measure the level of level of perceived quality of work life among the employees of private manufacturing companies in the state of Tamilnadu, India. An attempt is also made to find out if the quality of work life has any significant relationship with job related variables and with demographic variables. The work related factors are combined in nine categories: Adequate & Fair, Compensation, Safe & Healthy Working Condition, Opportunity for Development, Opportunity for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work & Total Life Space, Social Relevance & Working Life, Quality of Work Life Feelings and Overall Quality of Work Life.

© 2012 Elixir All rights reserved.

### Introduction

In the current global business scenario there is a dynamic domestic and international competition among the organizations, which in turn creates a war for survival in industry. The Indian industries are in a position to think the various strategies for winning the competition to survive. Every organization faces some unique problems such as obsolete technology, poor financial strength, obsolete products, poor work environment, less job security, etc which in turn may reduce their quality of work life. Many Indian manufacturing organizations face similar situation and their performance could be improved if they try to assure a good quality of work life to their employees.

Quality of work (QWL) life refers to the quality of relationship between the employees and the total working environment. According to Harrison, "QWL is the degree to which work in an organization contributes to material & psychological well-being of its members". QWL programs are another way in which organizations recognize their responsibility to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for people as well as for economic health of the organization. The elements in a typical QWL program include – open communications, equitable reward systems, a concern for employee job security and satisfying careers and participation in decision making. High QWL is sought through an employee relations philosophy that encourages the use of QWL efforts, which are systematic attempts by an organization to give workers greater opportunities to affect their jobs and their contributions to the organization's overall effectiveness. The employees of an organization are of significant nature in attaining strategic objectives and especially blue collar workers who work tough through 8 hours for the product to go out, finished for gaining profit. So the quality of their work life is of

essential nature to the organization. The productivity and profit could be achieved only through assuring Safe working conditions, Better amenities at work place, Good supervisory relationship, Freedom at work place, Grievance redresses, Feed back of decision regarding them, Better & adequate remuneration, Task identify and significance, Scope for improving skill and ability, etc. which leads to the workers satisfaction and involvement. If any important deviation or omission is made, the company's productivity and profit get decreased due to the reduced morale of the employees.

Quality of Work Life acts as a basic concept for any commercial operations in the organization and hence the researcher had considered the quality of work life as most important and for which this study issued. The indices that may be used to judge the Quality of Work Life in an organization are adequate & fair, compensation, safe & healthy working condition, opportunity for development, Opportunity for Growth & security, social integration, constitutionalism, work & total life space, social relevance & working life, quality of work life feelings and overall Quality of Work Life

### Review of literature

In this study the researcher has attempted to find out the quality of work life among the employees in private sector manufacturing organizations in the state of Tamilnadu, India. Before resuming with objectives the researcher has gone through past studies on the topic and presented as Review of Literature.

Mirvis and Lawler (1984), suggested that Quality of Work Life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life" as; safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement.

Sirgy et al.; (2001), suggested that the key factors in quality of working life are: Need satisfaction based on job requirements, Need satisfaction based on Work environment, Need satisfaction based on Supervisory behaviour, Need satisfaction based on Ancillary programmes, Organizational commitment.

Sneha Venkatraman (2003), Level of quality of work life does not depend on the ownership, and Top management commitment of quality of work life and HRD is a very essential factor conducive to the growth of working life. These studies also suggest the importance of the work culture of the quality of work life.

Berfield, (2003), used 16 questions to examine quality of working life, and distinguished between causes of dissatisfaction in professionals, intermediate clerical, sales and service workers, indicating that different concerns might have to be addressed for different groups.

Ashok Mehta (2004), Quality of working and quality of life has a direct relationship but this relationship varies with socio-cultural effect. This implies that an individual leading a happy life will certainly have better quality of working life than an unhappy person works where life quality is not good.

#### Statement of the Problem

The quality of work life provides books to employee's job satisfaction. In manufacturing organizations, safety and healthy working conditions are undoubtedly necessary for satisfied performance. Also amenities at work place should render the employee of being closely associated with the work since those help the employees to perform error free efficient maintenance. Supervisors are the riser boss to the workers and a good relationship between them is imperative so as to not ending up in any misunderstanding. Adequate remuneration and fair compensation play a vital role in the employee delegating the responsibility entrusted to them. Physical environment of work place present a true picture of worker investigation of work. There should be adequate amount of light and air circulation. Providing quality at work not only reduces attrition but also helps in reduced absenteeism and improved job satisfaction thereby helping the organization in retaining their employees. Hence the present study attempts to measure the level of level of perceived quality of work life among the employees of private sector manufacturing companies in the state of Tamilnadu, India.

#### Objectives of the Study

- To study the socio demographic characteristics of the respondents.
- To determine how work related factors contribute better Quality of Work Life.

On the basis of objectives said above, the researcher proposes following hypotheses to identify the determinants of quality of work life on employee retention.

H0: There is no significant association between sample characteristics and descriptions of quality of work life

H1: There is significant association between sample characteristics and descriptions of quality of work life

#### Research methodology

A descriptive cum diagnostic design has been adopted for this study. The universe of the study included the employees working in private manufacturing companies in the state of Tamilnadu, India. A total number of 95 respondents were selected using stratified random sampling design method. The researchers used standard questionnaire developed by Richard E. Walton (1979) as a primary tool for data collection. The

questionnaire focuses on nine dimensions of QWL such as Adequate & Fair Compensation, Safe & Healthy Working

Conditions, Opportunity for Development, Opportunities for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work & Total life Space, Social Relevance & Working Life and Quality of Work Life Feelings consisting totally 57 questions. The reliability of the tools was tested and found to be 0.8994 after applying Spearman's brown prophecy formula. Attempt is also made to find out if quality of work life has any significant relationship with job related variables and with demographic variables. The present study suffered from some limitations like small sample size and limited area of investigation which might not be true representative of the whole population of the private manufacturing companies. So, before generalization, there is a need to conduct an in-depth study covering larger sample size and broader areas of investigation.

#### Data analysis

The primary data were analyzed to assess quality of work life provided in private manufacturing concerns. Table-1 explains the characteristics and Socio Economic status of the sample.

This sample included both male (90.5%) and female (9.5%) employees belonging to the department of Production (25.3%), Quality Control & Quality Assurance (24.2%), Design (17.9%), Welding (7.4%), Purchase & Stores, Marketing & Sales and Project (6.3%), Finance & Accounts and HR/Administration (3.2%), out of which 44.2% were Engineers, 29.5% Supervisors, 17.9% Software Professional & Designers and 8.4% Managers. Moreover 33.7 % of them were under graduated, 9.5 % post graduated, 31.6 % were diploma holders, 23.2 % have finished professional courses and then 2.1 % only completed schooling, out of which 66.3 % were unmarried 66.3% and 33.7 % were married. Also the sample includes respondents by their Age are analyzed to be 25-30 years (43.2%), below 25 years (33.7%), 30-35(8.4 %) and above 40 years (8.4%), and 35-40 years (6.3%) respectively out of which 73.7% have below 5 years work experience, 5-10 years (16.8%), 15-20 years (6.3%), above 20 years (2.1%) and 1.1% have 10-15 years experience respectively.

Further, the data were subject to simple frequency analysis, chi-square and one way ANOVA analysis.

It is inferred that there is significant association between the respondent's educational qualifications and various dimensions of Work & Total Life Space. However there is no significant association between respondent's educational qualifications and various dimensions of Adequate & Fair Compensation, Safe & Healthy working conditions, Opportunity for development, Opportunities for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Social Relevance & Working Life, Quality of Work Life Feelings and Overall Quality of Work Life.

From the Table No-3, it is inferred that there is significant association between the respondent's Age and various dimensions of Overall Quality of Work Life. However there is no significant association between respondent's Age and various dimensions of Adequate & Fair Compensation, Safe & Healthy working conditions, Opportunity for development, Opportunities for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work & Total Life Space, Social Relevance & Working Life, and Quality of Work Life Feelings.

From the Table-4, it is inferred that there is no significant difference between various designations of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Adequate & Fair Compensation,

Safe & Healthy working conditions, Opportunity for development,

Opportunities for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work & Total Life Space, Social Relevance & Working Life, and Quality of Work Life Feelings.

From Table-5, it is inferred that there is significant difference between the various departments of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Safe & Healthy working conditions. However there is no significant difference between various departments of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Adequate & Fair Compensation, Opportunity for development, Opportunities for Growth & Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work & Total Life Space, Social Relevance & Working Life, and Quality of Work Life Feelings.

From table-6, it is evident that overall Quality of Work Life has very highly significant relationship between adequate & fair compensation, safe & healthy working condition, opportunity for development, Opportunity for Growth & security, social integration, constitutionalism, work & total life space, social relevance & working life, and quality of work life feelings.

Major findings related to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life

Only less than half (44.2%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to adequate & fair compensation, and little less than half (35.8%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to adequate & fair compensation. Nearly half (41.1%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to safe & healthy working conditions and only 34.8% of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to safe & healthy working conditions. More than half (64.2%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to opportunity for development and less than half (34.7%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to opportunity for development. More than half (67.4%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to opportunities for Growth & security and less than half (30.5%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regards to opportunities for Growth & security. More than half (66.4%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to social integration, and little less than half (33.7%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to social integration. Majority (73.7%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with the quality of work life with regard to constitutionalism and one fourth (25.3%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with the quality of work life with regard to constitutionalism. More than half (65.3%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to work & total life space and nearly one fourth (24.2%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to work & total life space. More than half (56.8%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to social relevance & working life and only 40% of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to social relevance & working life. Only less than half (45.3%) of the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to quality of work life and nearly one fourth (27.4%) of the respondents are found to be undecided. More than half (54.7%) of the respondents are found to be undecided with regard to overall quality of work life and only less than half (44.3%) the respondents are found to be agreed with regard to overall quality of work life.

## Conclusion

The present study reveals that quality of work life was found to have significant relationship with work related factors. However the researcher has suggested few measures to obtain better results. Compensation structure of the employees needs to be revised periodically in time with the government pay scale according to their performance. The companies need to develop proper cleaning measures for removing scrap from the floor shops. Noise created by the machinery and other equipment need to be controlled through proper mechanism in the working premises to ensure safety. An industrial welfare officer can be appointed to look over the worker's grievances, since the management cannot directly deal with all employee grievances. To improve the quality of work life, the management could motivate the employees through appreciations, distributing prizes and recognition, etc. Counseling and orientation programmes can be conducted for the employees by the organization, in order to communicate their mission, vision, policies, procedures, norms, values, culture and employee welfare programmes to reduce the confusions in the minds of the employees regarding the Quality of Work Life. Appropriate Induction training programmes shall be given to the employees, in order to provide them a clear picture about the organizational policies, procedures, culture and the expected performance standards from the employees which could ensure them the insights of the organization and required theoretical and practical skills for doing their job.

## References

- Aswathapa (1997), Human Resources and Personal Management, New Delhi, Tata McGraw-Hill publishing company Ltd.
- Baba, VV and Jamal, M (1991) Routinisation of job context and job content as related to employees quality of working life: a study of psychiatric nurses, *Journal of organizational behaviour*. 12. 379-386.
- Cascio F. Nayne (1989), *Personal- The Management of People at work*, New York, Macmillian Publications.
- David A. Decenzo, Stephen P. Robbins [1988], *Personnel and Human Resource Management*, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Fred Luthans [1992], *Organizational Behaviour*, Mc Graw Hill International Editions
- Haque, ABMZ (1992), "QWL & Job satisfaction of industrial workers in relation to size of the organization", *Bangladesh journal of psychological studies*, 2,1, 43-45
- Hossain, J.A. (1997), "QWL of Industrial workers in Bangladesh: A case study", Monograph, Dept of Management, Islamic University, Bangladesh
- Kothari C.R [1990], *Research Methodology*, II Edition, New Delhi Vishwapanahan.
- Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984) Accounting for the Quality of Work Life. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*. 5. 197-212.
- Rahman A. (1984), "QWL as perceived by the Industrial shift workers", Thesis, Osmania University, Hyderabad
- Sinha P. & Sayeed O. B. (1980), "Measuring QWL in relation to job satisfaction & performance in two organization", *Managerial Psychology*, 2, 15-30
- Websites:  
[http://www.qowl.co.uk/qowl\\_theory.html](http://www.qowl.co.uk/qowl_theory.html)  
[http://www.mbajunction.com/career/QWL\\_sneha.doc](http://www.mbajunction.com/career/QWL_sneha.doc)  
[http://www.stat.fi/tk/el/survey\\_2003.pdf](http://www.stat.fi/tk/el/survey_2003.pdf)

**Table-1 Socio Economic status of the respondents**

Particulars	No. of respondents	Percentage (%)	Particulars	No. of respondents	Percentage (%)			
Educational Qualification	-	-	Department	24	25.3			
			Production	23	24.2			
			Quality Control & Quality Assurance					
			Welding	7	7.4			
			Purchase & Stores	6	6.3			
			Marketing & Sales	6	6.3			
			Finance & Accounts	3	3.2			
Professional	22	23.2	Design	17	17.9			
			Project	6	6.3			
Marital Status	32	33.7	HR / Administration	3	3.2			
			Married	63	66.3	Experience		
						Below 5 Years	70	73.7
			Unmarried	63	66.3	5 – 10 Years	16	16.8
						10 – 15 Years	1	1.1
15 – 20 Years	6	6.3						
Above 20 Years	2	2.1						
Sex	86	90.5	Age					
			Male	9	9.5	Below 25 years	32	33.7
						25 – 30 years	41	43.2
			Female	9	9.5	30 – 35 years	8	8.4
						35 – 40 years	6	6.3
Above 40 years	8	8.4						
Nature of work	17	17.9	Income					
			Managers	42	44.2	Below ₹ 5,000	17	17.9
						₹ 5,001 - ₹10,000	45	47.4
			Engineers	28	29.5	₹10,001 – ₹20,000	29	30.5
						₹20,001 – ₹30,000	4	4.2
			Supervisors	28	29.5	Above ₹ 30,000	Nil	Nil
Software Professional & Designers	17	17.9						

**Table-2 Association between educational qualification of the respondents and various dimensions of Quality of Work Life**

Sl.No	Variable	Degree of freedom	Pearson Chi square Value ( $\Psi^2$ )	Significance
1	Adequate & Fair Compensation	16	$\Psi^2 = 14.549$	P= 0.558, P > 0.05 Not Significant
2	Safe & Healthy Working Condition	16	$\Psi^2 = 17.277$	P= 0.368, P > 0.05 Not Significant
3	Opportunity for Development	12	$\Psi^2 = 10.097$	P= 0.607, P > 0.05 Not Significant
4	Opportunity for Growth & Security	12	$\Psi^2 = 7.118$	P= 0.850, P > 0.05 Not Significant
5	Social Integration	8	$\Psi^2 = 7.995$	P= 0.434, P > 0.05 Not Significant
6	Constitutionalism	12	$\Psi^2 = 13.476$	P= 0.335, P > 0.05 Not Significant
7	Work & Total Life Space	16	$\Psi^2 = 35.724$	P= 0.003, P < 0.05 Significant
8	Social Relevance & Working Life	12	$\Psi^2 = 8.119$	P= 0.776, P > 0.05 Not Significant
9	Quality of Work Life Feelings	16	$\Psi^2 = 13.506$	P= 0.635, P > 0.05 Not Significant
10	Overall Quality of Work Life	12	$\Psi^2 = 6.259$	P= 0.902, P > 0.05 Not Significant

**Table- 3 Association between age of the respondents and various dimensions of Quality of Work Life**

Sl.No	Variable	Degree of freedom	Pearson Chi square Value ( $\Psi^2$ )	Significance
1	Adequate & Fair Compensation	16	$\Psi^2 = 14.220$	P= 0.582, P > 0.05 Not Significant
2	Safe & Healthy Working Condition	12	$\Psi^2 = 13.476$	P= 0.335, P > 0.05 Not Significant
3	Opportunity for Development	12	$\Psi^2 = 12.081$	P= 0.439, P > 0.05 Not Significant
4	Opportunity for Growth & Security	12	$\Psi^2 = 14.342$	P= 0.279, P > 0.05 Not Significant
5	Social Integration	8	$\Psi^2 = 3.880$	P= 0.868, P > 0.05 Not Significant
6	Constitutionalism	12	$\Psi^2 = 8.991$	P= 0.704, P > 0.05 Not Significant
7	Work & Total Life Space	16	$\Psi^2 = 15.180$	P=0.511, P > 0.05 Not Significant
8	Social Relevance & Working Life	12	$\Psi^2 = 14.864$	P= 0.249, P > 0.05 Not Significant
9	Quality of Work Life Feelings	16	$\Psi^2 = 13.506$	P= 0.635, P > 0.05 Not Significant
10	Overall Quality of Work Life	12	$\Psi^2 = 23.925$	P= 0.021, P < 0.05 Significant

**Table- 4 One way analysis of variance between designations of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of quality of work life**

Sources	Dof	Mean Squares	Standard Deviation	Mean	'F' Ratio	Significance
Adequate and Fair Compensation						
Between Groups	3	0.803	G1=1.17 G2=0.95 G3=0.66	3.25 3.14 3.29	1.099	0.354 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.730	G4=0.71	3.59		Not Significant
Safe and Healthy Working Condition						
Between Groups	3	1.333	G1=0.76 G2=0.88 G3=0.77	2.50 3.24 3.18	1.846	0.144 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.722	G4=0.94	3.00		Not Significant
Opportunities for Development						
Between Groups	3	0.335	G1=0.35 G2=0.72 G3=0.50	3.88 3.79 3.61	0.877	0.456 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.382	G4=0.62	3.59		Not Significant
Opportunities for Growth and Security						
Between Groups	3	0.365	G1=0.83 G2=0.61 G3=0.57	3.88 3.67 3.61	1.018	0.389 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.359	G4=0.49	3.88		Not Significant
Social Integration						
Between Groups	3	0.485	G1=0.54 G2=0.53 G3=0.48	3.50 3.64 3.68	1.789	0.155 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.271	G4=0.56	3.94		Not Significant
Constitutionalism						
Between Groups	3	0.356	G1=0.64 G2=0.73 G3=0.65	4.13 3.83 3.86		0.523 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.473	G4=0.66	4.10		Not Significant
Work and Total Life Space						
Between Groups	3	2.047	G1=0.52 G2=0.92 G3=0.92	4.38 3.52 3.54	2.696	0.051 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.759	G4=0.78	3.88		Not Significant
Social Relevance & Working Life						
Between Groups	3	0.546	G1=0.74 G2=0.57 G3=0.56	3.63 3.33 3.36	1.325	0.271 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.412	G4=0.86	3.65		Not Significant
Quality of Work Life Feelings						
Between Groups	3	0.594	G1=1.36 G2=1.07 G3=1.03	2.88 3.21 3.39	0.509	0.677 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	1.167	G4=1.05	3.29		Not Significant
Overall Quality of Work Life						
Between Groups	3	0.196	G1=0.76 G2=0.53 G3=0.51	3.50 3.36 3.54	0.666	0.575 P > 0.05
Within Groups	91	0.295	G4=0.52	3.47		Not Significant

**Table – 5 One way analysis of variance between departments of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life**

Sources	Df	Mean Squares	Standard Deviation	Mean	'F' Ratio	Significance
<b>Adequate and Fair Compensation</b>						
Between Groups	8	1.221	G1=0.82 G2=0.82	3.36 3.13	1.777	0.093 P > 0.05 Not Significant
Within Groups	86	0.687	G3=0.95 G4=0.82 G5=0.82 G6=0.58 G7=0.71 G8=0.82 G9=1.53	3.71 3.33 3.33 2.33 3.59 2.67 2.67		
<b>Safe and Healthy Working Condition</b>						
Between Groups	8	1.718	G1=0.79 G2=0.83	3.25 3.35	2.640	0.012 P < 0.05 Significant
Within Groups	86	0.651	G3=0.49 G4=0.82 G5=0.52 G6=1.53 G7=0.94 G8=0.41 G9=0.58	3.71 2.67 2.67 2.67 3.00 2.17 3.67		
<b>Opportunities for Development</b>						
Between Groups	8	0.519	G1=0.51 G2=0.65	4.00 3.65	1.412	0.203 P > 0.05 Not Significant
Within Groups	86	0.367	G3=0.76 G4=0.52 G5=0.52 G6=0.58 G7=0.62 G8=0.75 G9=0.58	3.71 3.67 3.67 3.67 3.59 3.17 3.67		

G1-Production, G2-Quality control & Quality Assurance, G3-Welding, G4-Purchase & Stores, G5-Marketing & Sales, G6-Finance & Accounts, G7-Design, G8-Project, and HR & Administration.

Opportunities for Growth and Security						
Between Groups	8	0.634	G1=0.50 G2=0.58	3.92 3.61	1.903	0.070 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.333	G3=0.95 G4=0.75 G5=0.52 G6=0.00 G7=0.49 G8=0.52 G9=0.58	3.71 3.17 3.67 4.00 3.88 3.33 3.33		Not Significant
Social Integration						
Between Groups	8	0.294	G1=0.58 G2=0.47	3.63 3.70	1.064	0.396 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.277	G3=0.38 G4=0.52 G5=0.52 G6=0.58 G7=0.56 G8=0.55 G9=0.58	3.86 3.67 3.67 3.33 3.94 3.50 3.33		Not Significant
Constitutionalism						
Between Groups	8	0.378	G1=0.75 G2=0.82	4.04 3.70	0.790	0.613 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.478	G3=0.69 G4=0.00 G5=0.41 G6=0.58 G7=0.66 G8=0.52 G9=0.58	3.86 4.00 3.83 4.33 4.06 3.67 3.67		Not Significant
Work and Total Life Space						
Between Groups	8	0.906	G1=0.96 G2=0.90	3.96 3.57	1.147	0.341 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.790	G3=0.76 G4=0.82 G5=1.17 G6=1.16 G7=0.78 G8=0.52 G9=1.00	3.29 3.67 3.17 3.33 3.88 3.67 3.00		Not Significant
Social Relevance & Working Life						
Between Groups	8	0.518	G1=0.65 G2=0.47	3.58 3.30	1.272	0.269 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.407	G3=0.76 G4=0.75 G5=0.41 G6=0.00 G7=0.86 G8=0.52 G9=0.00	3.29 3.17 3.17 3.00 3.65 3.67 3.00		Not Significant
Quality of Work Life Feelings						
Between Groups	8	1.172	G1=1.37 G2=0.84	3.33 3.44	1.022	0.426 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	1.146	G3=0.79 G4=0.98 G5=1.17 G6=1.53 G7=1.05 G8=0.52 G9=0.58	3.57 2.83 3.17 3.67 3.29 2.33 2.67		Not Significant
Overall Quality of Work Life						
Between Groups	8	0.529	G1=0.58 G2=0.50	3.63 3.39	1.963	0.061 P > 0.05
Within Groups	86	0.270	G3=0.38 G4=0.75 G5=0.41 G6=0.58 G7=0.52 G8=0.00 G9=0.58	3.86 3.17 3.17 3.33 3.47 3.00 3.33		Not Significant



**Table - 6 Inter correlation matrix among various dimensions of quality of work life**

Subject Dimensions	Adequate & Fair Compensation	Safe & Healthy Working Condition	Opportunities for Development	Opportunities for Growth & Security	Social Integration	Constitutionalism	Work & Total Life Space	Social Relevance & Working Life	Quality of Work Life Feelings	Total Quality of Work Life
Adequate & Fair Compensation	1									
Safe & Healthy Working Condition	0.303**	1								
Opportunities for Development	0.295**	0.225*	1							
Opportunities for Growth & Security	0.408**	0.571**	0.482**	1						
Social Integration	0.305**	0.102	0.342**	0.453**	1					
Constitutionalism	0.190	- 0.161	0.512**	0.424**	0.302**	1				
Work and Total Life Space	0.427**	- 0.059	0.416**	0.527**	0.456**	0.399**	1			
Social Relevance & Working Life	0.386**	0.026	0.342**	0.544**	0.444**	0.356**	0.580**	1		
Quality of Work Life Feelings	0.156	0.487**	0.291**	0.233*	0.194	0.018	0.012	0.214*	1	
Total Quality of Work Life	0.541**	0.392**	0.555**	0.571**	0.479**	0.430**	0.466**	0.589**	0.448**	1

\* Significant at 0.05 Level \*\*Significant at 0.01 Level