ABSTRACT

1.1 Introduction of the Topic

The process of liberalization, privatization and globalization and its consequent competition upshot a tough circumstances for public sector organizations in India. To remain competitive in the market public sector organizations have to devise competitive strategies. For acquiring a competitive edge in such a situation employee, the most important amongst all the factors of production with positive attitude is a vital factor. Success of every business organization depends on their pool of able and willing human resources, which is able to produce an output greater than its input, than material and financial resources, whose value depreciates as time goes on.

Human Resources are critical to organizations and with better quality of work life they give better results which further provide competitive advantage to organizations. For gaining competitive advantage organizations need to create conducive work environment which will result in employee well being. It involves creating systems at workplace which will create value from human resources. One such initiative which is part of creating value cycle for human resources is enhancement of quality of work life. It involves identification, assessment, and enhancement of factors which lead to quality of work life of human resources. The QWL can be assessed and enhanced which lead to effectiveness of organizations.

Rationale of the Study

Human resource is animate, active, and living since man alone has the ability to feel, think, conceive and grow, shows satisfaction or dissatisfaction, resentment or pleasure, resistance or acceptance for all types of managerial actions. They are the most complex and unpredictable in its behaviour as a manager is able to acquire the employee’s time, his physical presence at a given place and his skilled muscular motions per hour or day, but it is difficult to buy his enthusiasm, initiative, loyalty and his devotion. Each individual has his own distinct background and psychological framework which cannot be interchanged with others.

In employing and supervising people a manager must follow tailor made approach based on his understanding of the actions, attitudes, needs and urges of the employee
concerned which is a challenging task. The present industrial and economic scenario shows that managers’ are confronted with the challenging task of raising the productivity and profitability of their organizations in the face of global competition.

A good number of theories and approaches have appeared over the years in the literature of management for dealing with the intractable problems of motivation, performance, productivity and quality which have a far reaching impact on the ultimate success of an organization.

The quality of work life is a very broad concept focusing on the working conditions and has been developed to cope with the changing values of the new generation workers. By and large the studies in this area show the effect of organization and individual driven factors on satisfaction and commitment of employees’ to their jobs. QWL has been recognized 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 and Rahman, 1999) Several researches have been conducted in the field. Haque (1992) examined the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction and found that QWL led to greater job satisfaction.

Hossain and Islam (1999) found that there existed a positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction among government hospital nurse in Bangladesh. Wadud (1996) found that QWL was significantly higher among the private sector women employees’ than their counterparts in the public sector.

Statement of Problem
In recent years industries in India have registered tremendous growth. Industries occupy an important place in our economy both in view of the employment they generate and the contribution they make to the national product. A nation’s overall economic performance is enhanced or inhibited by the performance of individual industrial sectors. In the Indian context,

Manufacturing has been recognized as the main engine of economic growth and creation of wealth. There is no denying that India comparatively enjoys an advantage in many respects.
Literature review shows that there is a need to dig deep in the area of QWL of employees in public sector organizations in India. Role analysis, interviewing employees across various levels will give an insight into the QWL of MSEDCL employees in pune city. This will guide public sector organizations and their management on factors which are of key importance for QWL and its assessment. Further this will lead to action plan for improvement of QWL. There is need to systematically identify constructs which lead to enhanced QWL so following research questions were considered for the study.

- Which are the “constructs of QWL” required by employees across levels in MSEDCL in pune city?
- What is “level of awareness” of employees for the identified constructs of QWL in MSEDCL in pune city?
- How is QWL of MSEDCL employees in pune city?
- Are there any improvements needed as far as QWL of MSEDCL employees in pune city are concerned?
- How enhancement in QWL of MSEDCL employees in pune city can be done?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present research are as follows-

1. To study the concepts of Quality of Work life (QWL).
2. To study employee awareness related to Quality of work life.
3. To assess quality of work life of the employees in the organization.
4. To devise ways and means to enhance QWL in MSEDCL.
5. To study the reasons of work life imbalance.
6. To propose various measures to overcome work life imbalance.

1.5 Hypotheses of the Study

H1: MSEDCL ensures quality of work life for its employees.

H2: Quality of work life of MSEDCL employees leads to work life imbalance.

The hypotheses was tested by testing following sub hypothesis.
1) There is significant difference between male and female participants’ Quality of Work Life Score.

2) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Quality of Work Life Score.

3) There is significant difference among different levels of experience of participants about Quality of Work Life Score.

4) There is significant difference among different levels of Monthly Income of participants about Quality of Work Life Score.

5) There is significant difference between Single and Married participants’ Quality of Work Life Score.

6) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Quality of Work Life Score.

About MSEDCL:
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. Pune(Pune Municipal Corporation) is supplying electricity to 16,02,734 no. of consumers of various categories in Pune city. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. has 2 Circle Offices, 7 Division Offices, 29 Subdivision Offices and 113 Section Offices. There are 1467 employees of all Pay-groups (Pay-group I to IV) working in various offices in Pune city. Electricity is Feed and distributed to various Feeders in Pune city from total 247 Sub-Stations.

Review of Literature:
Organizations are giving emphasis on the quality of work life (QWL) its employees has. For managing its talent and retaining its human resources QWL plays a crucial role. For gaining competitive edge the organizations have shifted their focus to differentiating themselves rather than competing with others. And in this context employees play a major role being patrons for organizations in which they work. It is advantageous for organizations to retain its human resources that will see them through critical times. One of the important way to create differentiation is to retain, develop and nurture the human resources which are unique and of utmost importance in knowledge economy.
An exhaustive literature review was conducted in the time frame of year 1950 to year 2014. Details are as follows-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Nature of literature</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research Papers</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doctoral Thesis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapter has been divided into following parts as mentioned below, in order to establish a flow of concepts-

- Quality of work life: an overview
- Historical Development of QWL
- Quality of work life definitions and related aspects
- Measurement of Quality of work life
- Development of QWL

**Quality of worklife: an overview**

The development of any organization lies in the development of the quality of life of its employees. All Human resource related activities are aimed at enhancing quality of life. Employees spend a majority part of their life while being on the job. The total life span of an employee can be classified into three family life, working life and social life. These three areas are related to each other and they constantly affect each other. So the total quality of life of the employees depends on the kind of family life, work life and social life which they have. In order to make the total quality of life of the employees better a balance between family life, work life and social life is necessary.

The productivity of each employee depends on the quality of work life of that employee as well. Human resources are critical to any organization. Human beings with their ability to think, feel, inspire, control and motivate can give organizations differentiation advantage. For achievement of objectives human resources play a vital role and nurturing human resources is of immense importance. The quality of the work life has huge impact on quality of life of employees. A high quality of work life leads
to a better quality of life of the employees. In this chapter an attempt has been made to present the theoretical background of the concept of QWL. Employees these days expect much more than money from their job. They are concerned about the overall quality of their working experience and what job has to offer them in return.

Data Collection
Data collection is very important part of any research as it involves collecting of a relevant primary as well as secondary data from various sources related to research.

Primary Data
Primary data was important since it meant getting the first hand information from employees about their perception of QWL. Researcher was keen on checking the QWL.

The researcher has conducted extensive literature review and interviews with ten top level management in order to arrive at QWL constructs and their views were noted.

1) For collecting primary data self-administered questionnaire was distributed across all levels of employees in MSEDCL. Simple random sampling was used to collect the primary data. The distribution of the questionnaire was done on the basis of suitability mostly by personal contact, e-mail. The concerned person was contacted through phone or email before sending the questionnaire. As the questionnaire was self explanatory, the respondents were asked to respond as per the instructions given in the questionnaire and were assured of confidentiality. The first portion of the questionnaire was about the personal information of the respondents. Data was collected from 382 employees from various levels of MSEDCL in pune city.

Employees were contacted personally by snowballing method as well. As per the time schedule given by the employees the researcher distributed the questionnaire personally and through email. Researcher made the follow up calls and ensured return of the questionnaires. The questionnaires were checked for completeness and correctness of the data. In some cases discussions were carried out by the researcher with the respondents and help was provided to respondents who had difficulty in
filling up the questionnaire by explaining them the questions. Once Total 382 valid questionnaires from MSEDCL employees in Pune city were collected.

Secondary data has been gathered from various research articles, books, magazines, reports, extensive use of library and online research database has been done for referring various research articles. Researcher has also referred variety of job descriptions and organizational analysis as well as organizational functioning to get information about QWL constructs. Various Websites related to the human resources, QWL were referred by the researcher.

Data Analysis:

Categorization of the data
For the purpose of analysis, the variables of the study were categorized in a structured way. The categories crafted for the various variables are given below
1 Gender
2 Age
3 Educational qualification
4 Marital Status
5 Monthly income

Similarly categories considered for various QWL variables i.e. (adequate & fair compensation, Safe & healthy working conditions, Opportunities to use and develop capacities, Opportunity for continued growth and security, Social Integration in the work organization, Social relevance of work life, Work and the total life space, Superior subordinate relationship, Welfare facilities, Constitutionalisation in the work organization. The data classification, coding and tabulation was done systematically and the data was processed further.

Statistical Analysis
The data was analyzed using IBM SPSS i.e. the statistical package for social sciences, 19.0. Data was analyzed using descriptive as well as inferential statistics for the purpose of hypothesis testing and drawing inferences.
Descriptive Statistics
The data was analyzed for the following information. Personal profile of respondents includes gender, age, educational qualification, marital status and monthly income.

Inferential Statistics
Statistical analysis was carried out to assess the QWL by using advanced statistical techniques.

Limitations of the study
1) The method used for assessing QWL is self assessment method.
2) During data Collection unwillingness on the part of employees to participate in the study from the fear of being quoted and identified.
3) The generalizations occurring from the study were more conducive and limited to a particular group of employees’ working in MSEDCL in Pune city.
4) The researcher faces inherent limitation in the study of QWL as the concept is not researched to that extent in public sector organizations.

FINDINGS
I) Gender wise QWL of employees in MSEDCL in Pune city
1) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about adequate & fair compensation.
2) On an average, male participants felt working conditions were Safe & healthy than female participants. This difference was significant.
3) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Opportunities to use and develop capacities.
4) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Opportunity for continued growth and security.
5) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Social Integration in the work organization.
6) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Social relevance of work life.
7) Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Work and the total life space.
Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Superior subordinate relationship.

Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Welfare facilities.

Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Constitutionalisation in the work organization.

Male and Female participants did not differ significantly in their opinion about Quality of Work Life Score.

II) Education wise QWL of employees in MSEDCL in Pune city

1) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about adequacy and fairness of compensation. Graduate differs significantly from postgraduates and undergraduates.

2) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Safe & healthy working conditions. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

3) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Opportunities to use and develop capacities. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

4) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Opportunity for continued growth and security. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

5) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Social Integration in the work organization. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates and undergraduates differ significantly from postgraduate.

6) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Social relevance of work life. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

7) There is no significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Work and the total life space.

8) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Superior subordinate relationship. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.
9) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Welfare facilities. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

10) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about constitutionalisation in the work organization.

11) There is significant difference among different levels of education of participants about Quality of Work Life Score. Graduate differs significantly from undergraduates.

III) Experience wise QWL of employees in MSEDCL in Pune city

1) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about adequacy and fairness of compensation. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differ significantly from the participants with 5-10 Yrs Experience. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs Experience and participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 20-30 Yrs Experience and participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 30 Yrs and above Experience.

2) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Safe & healthy working conditions. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differ significantly from the participants with 5-10 Yrs Experience. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs Experience and participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 20-30 Yrs Experience and participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 30 Yrs and above Experience.

3) There is no significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Opportunities to use and develop capacities.

4) There is no significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Opportunity for continued growth and security.

5) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Social Integration in the work organization. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs Experience and participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly
from the participants with 30 Yrs and above Experience. Participants with 5-10 Yrs Experience differ significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs Experience and participants with 20-30 Yrs Experience differ significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs experience.

6) There is no significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Social relevance of work life.

7) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Work and the total life space. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differ significantly from the participants with 5-10 Yrs Experience.

8) There is no significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Superior subordinate relationship.

9) There is no significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Welfare facilities;

10) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Constitutionalisation in the work organization.

11) There is significant difference among different levels of Experience of participants about Quality of Work Life Score, participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 5-10 Yrs Experience. Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 10-20 Yrs Experience Participants with 1-5 Yrs Experience differs significantly from the participants with 30 Yrs and above Experience.

IV) Marital Status wise QWL of employees in MSEDCL in Pune city

1) On an average, married participants feel adequate & fair compensation than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

2) On an average, married participants feel Safe & healthy working than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

3) On an average, married participants feel that they get opportunities to use and develop capacities than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

4) On an average, married participants feel that they get opportunity for continued growth and security than to single participants. This difference was not significant.
5) On an average, married participants feel social integration in the work organization than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

6) On an average, married participants feel social relevance of work life than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

7) On an average, married participants feel balance of work and the total life space than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

8) On an average, married participants feel better superior subordinate relationship than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

9) On an average, married participants feel better welfare facilities than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

10) Single and Married participants differ significantly in their opinion about constitutionalisation in the work organization.

11) On an average, married participants have better quality of Work Life Score than to single participants. This difference was not significant.

V) Monthly Income wise QWL of employees in MSEDC in Pune city

1) There is no significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about adequacy and fairness of compensation.

2) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Safe & healthy working conditions, participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 25000-50000 monthly income and participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income and participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income and participants with 25000-50000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income.

3) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Opportunities to use and develop capacities. Participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income and participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income.

4) There is no significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Opportunity for continued growth and security.
5) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Social Integration in the work organization, Post hoc test results confirms that participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income.

6) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Social relevance of work life. Participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income.

7) There is no significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Work and the total life space.

8) There is no significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Superior subordinate relationship

9) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Welfare facilities, participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income and participants with 25000-50000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income and participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh monthly income.

10) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Constitutionalisation in the work organization.

11) There is significant difference among different levels of monthly income of participants about Quality of Work Life Score. Participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 25000-50000 monthly income and participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with 50000-1 Lakh monthly income and participants with <25000 monthly income differs significantly from the participants with >1 Lakh

II) **QWL across Organizational Hierarchy**

1) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about adequacy and fairness of compensation, participants with Pay Grade III differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade IV.
2) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Safe & healthy working conditions, participants with Pay Grade I differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade II, III and IV and participants with Pay Grade II differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade IV.

3) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Opportunities to use and develop capacities. Participants with Pay Grade IV differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade I and III.

4) There is no significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Opportunity for continued growth and security.

5) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Social Integration in the work organization, participants with Pay Grade I differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade III and IV. Similarly, participants with Pay Grade II differ significantly from the participants with Pay Grade III and IV.

6) There is no significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Social relevance of work life.

7) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Work and the total life space. Participants with Pay Grade IV differ significantly from the participants with Pay Grade I and III.

8) There is no significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Superior subordinate relationship.

9) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Welfare facilities, participants with Pay Grade I differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade II, III and IV.

10) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Constitutionalisation in the work organization.

11) There is significant difference among different levels of Pay Grade of participants about Quality of Work Life Score. Participants with Pay Grade I differs significantly from the participants with Pay Grade III and IV.
Findings related to overall QWL:
MSEDCL employees perceive that their compensation is average. (Mean=3.29)

MSEDCL employees perceive that their working conditions are not safe and healthy (Mean=3.66)

MSEDCL employees perceive that they have average opportunity to use and develop capacities. (Mean=3.06)

MSEDCL employees perceive that they have average opportunity for continued growth and security. (Mean=3.34)

Employees perceive that social integration in MSEDCL is average. (Mean=3.04)

MSEDCL employees perceive that they have average social relevance of work life. (Mean=2.56)

MSEDCL employees perceive that there is no work and total life space. (Mean=3.66)

MSEDCL employees perceive that they have average constitutionalism. (Mean=2.57)

MSEDCL employees perceive that they have average superior subordinate relationship. (Mean=3.11)

MSEDCL employees perceive that there are no welfare facilities. (Mean=3.66)

Mean (3.20) of total QWL score indicates that QWL of MSEDCL is perceived as average QWL.
**Suggestions & Recommendations**

Based on the various findings of this research, and thoughts supported by literature review, few recommendations were proposed by the researcher aiming at QWL identification, QWL assessment and in addition to that to make better utilization of human resources research has proposed some interventions for making QWL of employees better. The objective of researcher is to identify the existing level of QWL of employees and make necessary suggestions.

The recommended strategies for QWL enhancement and management are designed for organization. Although while designing and recommending strategies, the primary focus was on betterment of QWL of employees in the organization. The QWL has various constituents which need to be worked upon to make overall QWL better. This largely will have an impact on QWL management at workplace and which will in turn have impact on QWL of employees.

The recommendations made by the researcher for the organization can be considered by the organization while designing “employee engagement initiatives” and the given recommendations can be implemented for building better “QWL at workplace.

Organization must ensure safe & healthy working conditions for females working in the organization by creating awareness and giving training about health and safety measures at workplace. Organization can also start special women cell which will address their grievances.

Organization must emphasize on safe and healthy working conditions, work life balance and welfare facilities.

**Scope for Further Research**

The subject of QWL is an ocean and deeper the research reaches, better will be the outcome. As the QWL movement will march ahead all over the world there will be sharp rise in accurate measurement of QWL assessment. There will be greater than before use of QWL concept for diversified workforce and to recognize how employees can be engaged better at workplace.
The present study is focused on QWL of employees’ in MSEDCL. Even though during the study the QWL was evaluated by the parameters developed by Richard Walton (adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capacity, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, social relevance of work life, work and the total life space, constitutionalisation in the work organization, superior subordinate relationship and welfare facilities), there is scope for further research in the area of Quality of Work Life with respect to work performance, employee behavior and productivity.