CHAPTER 2  
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Overview

A study of the available literature on the Quality of WorkLife was carried out to identify the research gap and to set direction for the proposed research. This chapter provides for an outline of the studies done so far. A few studies discuss the benefits of working in groups and the involvement of these workers in organizational design (Pasmore, Francis, Haldeman, & Shani, 1982). Similarly, a smattering of studies on the relationship between QWL and work related factors are also found. Nevertheless, there is not much study about the various factors which actually affect the QWL of workers in manufacturing, as well as service industries in Karnataka.

Therefore, this literature review chiefly focuses on quality of work life in general and in particular with respect to manufacturing and service sector. The literature survey attempts to analyse the determinants of QWL in these sectors and the QWL measures implemented and how the workers in these two sectors perceive QWL and job satisfaction. In this chapter an outline of the origin and development of the concept QWL, the definitions of QWL, the determinants of QWL, the measurement of QWL, the benefits of QWL to the organization and the current QWL measures available in manufacturing and service sectors and the role of an organization to improve the QWL are presented.
2.2. **Origin and Development of the Concept Quality of Work Life (QWL)**

A constant effort has been made to improve the work life ever since industrial revolution. A study conducted by the U.S. Congress, Robert F. Hozie reported the fight for scientific management techniques by unions, especially the mechanists. Thus, the Labor Union activities in 1930s and 1940s brought about improvement in work conditions through collective bargaining and legislation. In the 1950s, several theories were proposed by psychologists to create a positive link between morale and productivity that improved human relations. During the same period, job enrichment schemes and equal employment opportunity were introduced (Walton R. E., 1974). The term QWL was first used in the late 1960s, originating with General Motors and the United Auto Workers, to describe the workers’ level of job satisfaction. In 1960’s, Eric Trist and his colleagues developed work designs which were aimed for better integration of technology with people (Trist & Bamforth, 1951). Later in the mid-1970s, QWL was considered not only to enhance bottom-line productivity, but also to increase employee identification and a sense of belongingness and pride in their work (Davis & Cherns, 1975; Sashkin & Burke, 1987). Cherns (1978, p. 39) stated that “QWL owes its origins to the marriage of the structural, systems perspective of organizational behavior with the interpersonal, human relations, supervisory-style perspective.”

In Europe, North America and Japan, QWL has been accepted as an approach leading to humanization and democratization of the workplace which results in greater productivity of the work force. QWL is measured by assessing an individual’s reaction to work or personal consequences of the work experience (Nadler & Lawler, 1983). While discussing humanization, Delamotte and Walker (1974) emphasize the need for the
protection of the workers against hazards to health and safety, the wage-work bargain, threats of illness and unemployment and as well as from the impulsive behavior of the authority of management. Few researchers also believe QWL as a combination of methods, approaches or technologies which improve the work environment in order to make it more productive and satisfying (Kerce & Booth-Kewley, 1993; Nadler & Lawler, 1983).

In contrast to identifying QWL as a specific program, Nadler and Lawler (1983) and Kotze (2005), approached it as a movement. Similarly, Thompson (1983) indicated, “QWL programs propose a movement toward greater engagement with the cooperation, knowledge and tacit skills of the workforce.” It is a continuing process, not something with a beginning, middle and an end that could be turned on today and turned off tomorrow (Brooks & Gawel, 2001). The focus was on utilizing all of the organization’s resources, especially its human resources, better than what was done yesterday and even better tomorrow, developing awareness among all the members of an organization and understanding of the concerns and needs of others, and a willingness to respond to the concerns and needs.

At the same time, Nadler and Lawler (1983) frequently employed the terms “participative management” and “industrial democracy” to encompass the ideals of the QWL movement. Skrovan (1983)argues that the involvement and participation of employees in the creation of their work place is a central focus of every QWL process. Through this process, all members of the organization have some say about the design of their jobs and the work environment, in general (Bachner & Bentley, 1983). Similarly, according to Rubenstein (1983), QWL is defined “as the process used by an organization
to unlock the creative potential of its people by involving them in decisions affecting their work lives.” From this context, Ellinger and Nissen (1987, p.198) defined QWL as “an environment based on mutual respect, which supports and encourages individual participation and open communication in matters that affect our jobs, our business, our futures and our feelings of self-worth.” Further, in order to acquire meaningful basis for the organization’s mission, active participation of employee is necessary for the integration of organizational needs with worker growth needs (Rubenstein, 1983).

However, in the past, many workers have not been consulted to contribute their knowledge and skills to the solution or organizational problems as they did not possess the required skills (Kotze, The nature and development of the construct quality of work life, 2005). But Kantsperger and Kuhnz (2005) argues that systematic and regular training programs would give power to employees for their participation in decision-making process.

Maccoby (1984) concurred that QWL grew out of the collective bargaining process. It is, therefore, a commitment of management and union to support localized activities and experiments to increase employee participation in determining how to improve their work. This perspective is somewhat similar to the movement approach. The growth of QWL projects requires a developing relationship between management and union built on mutual respect for institutional interests and values (Maccoby, 1984; Kotze, 2005). On the contrary, Bluestone (1980) emphasizes that a QWL program cannot be successful unless the local parties develop a collective bargaining environment of mutual respect, where solving problems supersedes beating the other party down. In line with this view, Deutsch and Schurman (1993) have shown that unions in the US have
developed strategies to augment the employee participation in decision-making, especially in the areas of new technology, work environment and skill training and development.

Sirgy et al. (2001) highlighted out two dominant theoretical approaches from the QWL literature: need satisfaction and spill over. The need satisfaction approach to QWL is based on satisfaction of needs models developed by Maslow (1954), McClelland (1961), Herzberg (1966) and Alderfer (1972). The basic theory of this approach to QWL is that individuals want to fulfil their basic needs through their work and get satisfaction. Sirgy et al. (2001) goes on to explain about the spill-over approach to QWL as satisfaction in one area of life may influence satisfaction in another. For example, satisfaction with one’s job may influence other life domains, such as family, leisure, social, health, financial, etc. Spill-over can be either horizontal or vertical. Horizontal spill-over refers to the influence of one life domain on the neighbouring domains (e.g. job satisfaction, may influence feelings of satisfaction in the family life domain and vice versa). To understand the concept of vertical spill over, the concept of domain hierarchy must be understood. Life domains (job, family, leisure, community, etc.) are organized hierarchically in people’s minds. The most super-ordinate domain is “overall life” which is at the top in the domain hierarchy. Feelings in this top most domain reflect what quality of life researcher’s call as life satisfaction, subjective well-being and personal happiness. The sub-ordinate domain, such as family, job, leisure and community, follows the most super-ordinate life domain(Sirgy et al., 2001). Satisfaction/dissatisfaction with each of these major life domains “spills over” to the most super-ordinate domain, thus affecting life satisfaction. QWL does not only affect job satisfaction but also satisfaction in other life domains such as family life, social life,
leisure life, financial life etc. Therefore the focus of QWL is beyond job satisfaction. It involves the satisfaction at workplace with the job, satisfaction in personal life and satisfaction with overall life and subjective well-being.

Furthermore, Van Der Doef and Maes (1999) and Hade, et al. (2007) also regards job satisfaction as an outcome variable of QWL. Brooks and Gawel (2001) distinguish between job satisfaction and QWL by stating that conventional job satisfaction research focuses on the employee’s likes and dislikes, and sees the solution to problems as something for management to “fix”. QWL also focuses on the provision of opportunities for employees to make meaningful contributions to their organizations (Rauduan Che Rose, L.S, Uli, & Idris, 2006).

2.3. Conceptual Analysis of QWL

The concept of QWL is inexact and, therefore, highly debatable to be operationalised. The term “QWL” refers to the workplace conditions which are favourable or unfavourable for an employee. QWL programs were conducted in the industries to take care of employee needs and requirements. Higher the QWL, the better the performance of the employee is reflected in the growth of the organization.

A survey of the available literature on QWL leads to the conclusion that there is no universally accepted definition for QWL. Each author defines QWL in his/her own perspective. A series of definitions emerged during the initial development (1969-1975) of QWL. First was the “People’s reaction to work, particularly individual’s outcome related to job satisfaction and mental health (Davis L., 1977) ”. As per the second definition QWL was defined in terms of “an approach or method”. The third definition focused on methods. Few people defined QWL in terms of technology or approach used for improving the work
such as job enrichment, self-managed teams, labour management committees (Ford, 1973; Taylor, 1977). As a result QWL programs expanded beyond their initial focus on work design to include other features of the workplace that can affect an employee productivity and job satisfaction, such as reward and incentive system, workflows, management styles and work environment. Late 1970s and 1980s witnessed an alternative approach that included QWL as “a set of beneficial consequences of work life for the individual, the organization and the society” (Boisvert, 1977). Singh (1983) took the effort of deviating from theorizing QWL into approaching it as a concept that was concerned with overall climate of the workplace, where he refers to increased self-regulation, reduced supervision and self-management as the pillars of QWL.

Thereafter, Nadler and Lawler (1983) define QWL as a way of thinking about people, work, and organizations. Its distinctive elements are (1) a concern about the impact of work on employee, as well as on the effectiveness of organization and (2) the idea of participation in organizational problem solving and decision-making. Later, employee’s choice of interest in carrying out a task was considered while defining QWL. To strengthen this approach, Beukema (1987) indicated that QWL is the extent to which employees have complete freedom to reshape their job as per their opinion, interests and needs.

During the 1990s, the blending of motivational factors of work, socio-technical system, etc. was suggested by Jain (1991). All individuals spend most of their adult life at work, expending energy, time and mental and physical resources to achieve these factors. Therefore the last decade focussed on the participation of the individual in the workplace.

Sirgy, et al. (2001) defines QWL as employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the
workplace. As per this definition, concept of satisfaction comes back as an underlying theoretical model. In addition to Sirgy’s definition, Danna and Griffin (1999) view QWL as a hierarchy of concepts that includes life satisfaction (top of the hierarchy), job satisfaction (middle of the hierarchy) and work-specific satisfaction, such as satisfaction in terms of pay, relationship with co-workers, and supervisor among others.

Macoby (2001) defines QWL as a commitment from management and union side to support localized activities and experiments resulting in increased participation of employee in determining how to improve work. This process is guided by union-management committees and facilitators and requires education about the goals of work in training and group process. A few of the contexts have been addressed in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1: Definitions of QWL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Davis (1981)</td>
<td>Favourableness or unfavourableness of job environment for people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sashkin &amp; Burke (1987), Kongkiti Phusvant (2010)</td>
<td>Stressing the interaction of individual needs with the organizational and social dynamics of the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins (1989)</td>
<td>Organization response to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiernan &amp; Knutson (1990)</td>
<td>Incorporating the worker’s personal needs with company role expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangeetha Jain (1991)</td>
<td>Conscious efforts that are aimed at improving working conditions, work content and its attendant conditional like safety, security wages and benefits can legitimately qualify as QWL activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As per the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions (2002), QWL is associated with motivation, job satisfaction, job involvement, productivity, health, safety and well-being, job security, competence development and balance between work and non-work life.

Poor working environment, high work-loads and non-delivery within timelines, poor balance between work and family, odd shift-work, lack of involvement in decision making, lack of recognition and opportunity to learn new skills, poor relations with supervisors/peers are few of the reasons which contributes to job dissatisfaction, which were identified by Ellis and Pompli (2002).

Recently, Serey (2006) observed in his research on QWL that career growth opportunity is a crucial factor determining constructs of QWL. He defines QWL as (i) an opportunity to excel in the challenging situations which demands decision-making, self-directions and initiatives with their potential and talents; (ii) a meaningful activity thought to be worthwhile by the individuals involved; (iii) an activity, where an individual has clarity of roles necessary to achieve the overall goals; and (iv) a feeling of pride in what a person is doing and doing it well. These aspects of meaningful and satisfying work are generally linked with the job satisfaction and career growth, and are more favourable to QWL.

Rethinam & Ismail, (2008) define QWL as the effectiveness of the work 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, job satisfaction, professional development and balance between work and personal life.
Above-mentioned definitions of QWL indicate that QWL is a multi-dimensional construct, made up of a number of interrelated factors that need careful consideration to conceptualize and measure QWL. It is connected with job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety and well-being, job security, professional development and balance between work and personal life.

In the last three decades the changes in the theoretical concept of QWL have followed a fairly linear path. Initially it was rigid and objective however at the later phase the construct became progressively more subjective, dynamic and systemic. Despite all efforts of many researchers, some points are still open for debate, including the need to develop a clear operational definition of the construct, while taking the progress and consensus achieved to date into account (Martel & Dupuis, 2006).

In the beginning, QWL was synonymous with employability rate, job security, earnings and benefits (Elizur & Shye, 1990). These objective criteria later gave away to job satisfaction as the target assessment criterion. Despite this drift to a more subjective construct, some authors, such as Lawler (1975), remain stuck for the objective criteria to measure QWL. This contradiction between the theoretical way of thinking and the means to measure QWL is exacerbated by the different meanings given to QWL based on an individual (subjective criteria) or organisational (objective criteria) point of view (Walton, 1975).

Jaikumar and Kalaiselvi (2012) have defined quality of work life as ‘the impressions of the attributes of one’s work life in every possible angle which includes monetary rewards and benefits, growth in the workplace, guarantee of continuity in the job, relationship with the company and colleagues, and the effect of all these parameters
on one’s life’. Hence QWL can be called as an entity which affects a person’s life both at the work place and outside the workplace. It has been shown ‘as a way of improving a person’s life in total’. Talebi (2013) has quoted that quality is an important criteria that is essential to conserve a person’s personality as a whole and is attributed by ‘autonomy, self-respect and responsibility’ and described the QWL as ‘the resourcefulness, inclusion or rendition of physical and psychological goodness at the job environment’. The quality of work life is a multidimensional concept that affects a person’s satisfaction and gratitude and is most important for leading a happy life (Mejbel, Almsafir, Siron, & Alnaser, 2013).

2.4. Walton’s Eight Dimensions of QWL used in This Study

Several key variables have been identified by many authors to enhance QWL (Gadon, 1984; Taylor, 1987). Walton (1975) proposed eight conceptual categories that make up the quality of work life, and some of these are represented in Table 2.2. These variables suggest that QWL is not just about work space and earnings but deal with a number of factors that have direct or direct effect on work.

Rethinam and Ismail (2008) have depicted QWL with novel meaning and attributes show that QWL consists of equilibrium between professional and personal lives, satisfaction at work place, continuation and perks, competition and health benefits to the employees. According to Koonmee (2010), QWL is treated as a reformist movement that is concerned with the function and the working of a good organization. The organizations have begun to notice the importance of the QWL in the success of the companies and started providing better conditions for their employees.
Table 2.2: Variables of Quality of Work Life

| Adequate and fair compensation          |
| Safe and healthy working conditions    |
| Reasonable hours                       |
| Minimum risk of injury or sickness     |
| Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities |
| Autonomy or self-control in job        |
| Range of skills and abilities used or learned |
| Knowledge of results of actions on job |
| Knowledge of entire task and meaningfulness of task |
| The existence of opportunities to be involved in planning |
| Opportunity for continuous growth and security |
| Advancement opportunities              |
| Job security                           |
| Development of capabilities            |
| Social integration in the work organization |
| Equal opportunities                    |
| No prejudice                           |
| Support from primary work group        |
| Sense of community beyond work group   |
| Interpersonal openness                  |
| Constitutionalism in the work organization |
| Privacy                                |
| Freedom of speech                      |
| Equity                                 |
| Work and total life space              |
| Social relevance of work life          |

*Source: Derived from Walton (1975)*

Sinha (2012) has enlisted the twelve constructs of a quality of life as communication, growth and progress in job, fidelity to the company, support from higher ups, more relaxing work atmosphere, family responsive environment, encouragement from the management and colleagues, job hierarchy, support from the management,
satisfaction in job, monetary benefits, perks and increment. Singh and Srivastav (2012) stated that QWL is closely related to the skillfulness of the individual and the capacity of the company to excel in their latest job or project. They state that for an organization to achieve a good QWL it requires both the expertise of the company and that of the employee. The performance of the company increases with better life at the workplace, good working surroundings, decreased expenses, and enhanced outputs.

**Adequate and fair compensation**

Everyone works to earn a living which remains to be the key force which motivates to do well at work (Schreuder & Theron, 1997). Therefore, adequate and fair compensation are important determinants of QWL (Walton, 1973). Fairness can be determined through job evaluation measures such as job ranking, job classification and by factor comparison (Schuler, 1998). These measures assist in assessing the relationship between compensation and factors such as training that is required, job responsibility, intricacy of decision-making and harmfulness of working conditions (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Concomitantly, various techniques are available to determine the supply and demand for particular skills and competencies, and for establishing average levels of compensation for these various categories, thus enabling the implementation of fair compensation levels (Schuler, 1998). Furthermore, benchmarks can be used to determine what proportions of the profits should be distributed to employees in different occupations and across different categories within these occupations (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Stein (1983) and Reid (1992) have also recognized the importance of compensation in determining QWL. Stein (1983) identified pay as being one of five important components of QWL, although its categorical classification is somewhat
different to Orpen (1981) and Walton (1973). Stein includes pay under the category of external rewards, which in addition to pay includes promotion or position, and rank or status. According to Schreuder and Theron (1997) and Walton (1973) the fundamental driving force behind work is to earn a living. It is therefore plausible that QWL is affected by the extent to which this goal is achieved (Walton, 1973). Both the factors of adequate and fair compensation are therefore considered important determinants of QWL. Fairness can be determined through job evaluation measures such as job ranking, job classification and by factor comparison (Schuler, 1998). These measures assist in assessing the relationship between compensation and factors such as training that is required, job responsibility, intricacy of decision-making and harmfulness of working conditions (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Concomitantly, various techniques are available to determine the supply and demand for particular skills and competencies, and for establishing average levels of compensation for these various categories, thus enabling the implementation of fair compensation levels (Schuler, 1998). Furthermore, benchmarks can be used to determine what proportions of the profits should be distributed to employees in different occupations and across different categories within these occupations (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Stein (1983) and Reid (1992) have also recognized the importance of compensation in determining QWL. Stein (1983) identified pay as being one of five important components of QWL, although its categorical classification is somewhat different to Orpen (1981) and Walton (1973). Stein includes pay under the category of external rewards, which in addition to pay includes promotion or position, and rank or status. Walton’s approach to the concept of QWL has been commended and states the main dimensions of QWL as satisfaction in job, a good
working condition, growth prospects, inter-personal relationships, good working balance, and social relationship to the organization.

**Safe and healthy working conditions**

Safety and health related working conditions include the physical and psychological environment. QWL also involves improvements to the physical working conditions under which employees operate in order to make their work setting more favourable. Several studies carried out by OSHA, the European agency for Safety and Health at Work stressed that good health at work is directly related to the performance of the company; therefore, policies that are created to maintain good health benefit the company in multiple ways.

![Figure 2.1: Connection between a healthy workplace and performance](image)


Eurofound (2011) conducted case studies on Spanish savings bank Kutxa that has 2,701 employees. The outcome of the studies revealed that measures to improve safety, health and well-being included prevention of ergonomic reorganisation of the workplace, occupational hazards, and anti-stress programmes and flexible working time, reorganisation of work into self-managing teams and new technologies. The effects of reorganization manifested in lower sick absences, decreased insurance costs, increased
employee satisfaction and loyalty, and increased brand value. These aspects contribute to improved economic performance.

Safety in workplace has predominantly become the highest operational priorities facing organisations and human resource management (Nunez 2009). Exposure of employees to working conditions that can adversely affect their physical and mental health should be avoided (Orpen, 1981). Consequently, the results of employer concern, union action, and legislation have promoted favourable working conditions through focus on noise, illumination, work space, accident avoidance as well as the implementation of reasonable work hours and age limits for potential employees (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Like Walton (1973) and Orpen (1981), Stein, (1983); Kerce & Booth- Kewley, (1993); Bertrand, (1992) and Harrison (2000) agree that safe and health workplace have a significant impact on QWL.

Hazardous exposure refers to the extent that one is being exposed to dangerous tools, equipment and machinery (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999). For hazardous substances to have a toxic effect on the body they must first pass across a functional barrier separating the environment from the internal organs (Cherrie, Semple, Christopher, Saleem, Hughson, & Phillips, 2006). The common routes of entry into the body are inhalation, dermal absorption and ingestion (Dinman & Dinman, 2000). The basic approach to protect workers is either to eliminate the use of the material or to control exposure to a level where the risk is acceptably small, where the maximum exposure level that is considered acceptable is usually defined by an Occupational Exposure Limit (OEL) (Cherrie, 2009).
According to Vijay Anand (2013), the safety and health conditions among the textile mill employees working in Tamil Nadu were found to be very low. He recommends that investment should be made to raise employees’ health and safety to promote the general health of the organization, which would concurrently lead to higher efficiency of the organization. In the service industry, such as hospitals, job burnout is a great concern for HR management, because it affects the productivity and the well-being of the employees. Job burnout was commonly witness among the staff of the nursing profession as it is a stressful occupation (Lee & Akhtar 2011). Long working, especially the night shifts, often leads to depression among the healthcare professionals. While studying the nurses of Gauteng Province of South Africa, Mokoka et al. (2010) observed that the older nurses were stressed out due to long hours of work, on the contrary, the younger nurses were more concerned about shift work that had a negative impact on their family as well as social lives. McNall et al (2010) studied 220 employed working adults. The results showed that the relationship between the flexible work arrangements and job satisfaction and turnover intentions was mediated by work-to-family enrichment, even after controlling for age, gender, marital status, number of children, education, and hours worked. These results suggest that flexible work arrangements support the employees to experience a greater satisfaction from work to home, which resulted in higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions.

**Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities**

Walton (1973) asserts that experiencing a high QWL is dependent upon the extent to which jobs allow the employee to use and develop his/ her skills and competencies. In light of the above views, jobs should contain a number of features that would allow...
employees the opportunity to use and develop their human capacities and eventually experience QWL. These features include autonomy, skill variety, task significance and feedback, meaningfulness and wholeness. Orpen (1981) agrees with the importance of these features in determining QWL, yet locates their significance as contributing to personal growth, another of Walton (1973) determinants. A distinction in terms of the classification of the determinants of QWL is therefore witnessed.

The feature of skill variety allows employees the opportunity to use and develop their human capacities through exercise of their competencies, skills and abilities rather than the reception of limited, narrow skills (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). Oomens et al. (2007) found that people suffer more from mental illness when they have demanding jobs, experience higher job pressure and lower skill variety. The structural approach suggested by Herman and Hulin (1972) and Loscocco (1990) hints at the necessity of jobs to contain variety. Pinder (1984) and Ramlall (2004) pointed out that the inclusion of task variety as an element of job design is consistent with the concept of growth need satisfaction, as well as with more psychological approaches taken by activation theory. Stein (1983) refers to the component of progress and development which implies that the development of skills and competencies are an important contributing factor for QWL to be high.

Hackman and Oldham (1980) proposed that jobs which require the use of multiple talents are experienced as more meaningful and therefore more intrinsically motivating than jobs that require only the use of one or two types of skills.

Constructive feedback not only helps employees to do their work more effectively but also improves communication between supervisors and employees. Both employees
and supervisors can improve or change their performance if the specific and accurate information is provided in a constructive way. Appraising employees of good performance help to maintain their motivation and signals them to continue in this direction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

According to Orpen (1981), meaningfulness relates to the duties and tasks that delineate a particular job and which makes sense to the person who has to perform that job, in that he feels that doing the job well or poorly will make a difference to him and to others in the organization. Research on meaningful work has increased in recent years and the growing interest in the academic field parallels with the interest and concern in the world of work (Chalofsky, 2003; Dolet, 2003).

Meaningfulness according to Chalofsky (2003) is found to be more deeply intrinsic than values and suggests that it amounts to three levels of satisfaction, namely, extrinsic, intrinsic and something even deeper. Thomas (2000) highlighting the role of meaningfulness identifies the four critical intrinsic reward motivators: a sense of meaning and purpose, a sense of choice, a sense of competence and a sense of progress.

Meaningfulness is more related to emotions and motivation about work, the value an individual gives to a work goal or purpose, in relation to one’s own ideals and standards. The lack of meaningfulness can lead to alienation or disengagement from work (Antonovsky, 1987).

**Opportunity for continued growth and security**

According to this determinant of QWL, the emphasis is shifted from job to career advancement (Walton, 1973). Although Orpen’s (1981) research reflects a degree of
overlap between this determinant and the previous one, similarly what he categorized as ‘opportunity for personal growth’ includes focus upon the opportunities that are provided for employees to advance in their careers. This also relates to the idea of professional learning as a means for career development or succession possibilities (Bertrand, 1992). Tabassum et al. (2011) conducted a study among local 100 private and foreign bank employees and found that opportunity for continued growth and security is positively correlated with job satisfaction especially in foreign bank employees. The results indicated that attempt to improve the dimensions of QWL can significantly enhance job satisfaction of the employees. A similar correlation was found among the 1428 full-time faculty members from 12 private universities of Bangladesh in the research conducted by Tabassum (2012). Therefore, organizations should insist on developing human capacities by concentrating on skill development programs, training programs, and by providing power and authority to the employees. Empowerment of employees can significantly improve employee motivation (Mathis & Jackson 2005; Fisher, et al. 2004). In addition, skill development has direct relationship with the increase in performance-based incentives and job promotion as well as job security. Thus, the development of skill among the employees would increase the productivity and have greater impact on the job satisfaction of the employees.

Social integration in the work organization

According to Walton (1973) and Orpen (1981), the importance of social interaction is another determinant of QWL. Five factors, namely, equality, support, tolerance, mobility and identification are considered essential for these interactions to have beneficial outcomes for individuals.
Lyness and Thompson (1997) found that women were less satisfied with jobs than their male counterparts. A study conducted by Stroh et al. (1996) in Fortune 500 companies demonstrated that women left their managerial positions within two years than men. The reason for turnover was more often due to dissatisfaction in the role in the organisation than family issues (Rudman 2008).

Supportiveness relates to the nature of relationships between team members, which should be characterized by socio-emotional assistance, respect for individuality, reciprocity, trust, openness and honesty (Orpen, 1981; Walton, 1973). According to Bertrand (1992) the idea of supportiveness should also be demonstrated within supervisory relationships which should be both helpful and caring in nature. Some researchers have included supervisor support as an important determinant/dimension of QWL. Another form of social support that is referred to in the literature is social support colleague.

Social support colleagues refer to instrumental and emotional support provided by colleagues (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999). According to Jenkins and Elliot (2004) support can be emotional, such as the action of caring or listening sympathetically, or instrumental, involving tangible assistance such as help with a work task. High levels of support have been associated with low levels of burnout in a number of mental health nursing studies (Kilfedder, Poweer, & Wells, 2001).

According to Kheradmund and co-workers (2010), an in-depth understanding and a good inter-personal relationship between the organization and the employees takes the organization a long way in the path of success. The organizations that have implemented
QWL have shown greater performance, progress and profits than the others as a result of good communication between the workers and the management.

Two models have been proposed to explain the mechanism by which social support may have a beneficial effect on health outcomes such as burnout. As per the “main effects” model, social support from colleagues is helpful to one’s comfort and health, no matter the amount of stressors the individual is exposed to, by meeting necessary human desires for security, approval, social contact, belonging and affection. In contrast, the “buffering” hypothesis proposes that social support moderates the effects of stressors. To summarize, QWL is viewed as a wide ranging concept, of which the determinants/dimensions include adequate and fair compensation, safe and health working conditions, social integration in the work organization that enables an individual to develop and use all his capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, workers’ rights, recognition for achievement, meaningfulness and significance of work, workload/pressures and work, autonomy and control, enjoyment of work, creativity and innovation. These determinants/dimensions emphasize the good feeling perceived from the interaction between the individuals and the work environment. In the next section the focus will be on the measurement of QWL.

**Constitutionalism in the work organization**

The criteria to be proposed are essentially concerned with the extent to which work organizations, acting either in response to trade union pressure or on their own initiatives, have set up formal procedures to protect the individual worker from arbitrary and capricious actions by employers (Orpen, 1981).
The following are some of the workers’ rights that should be noted in the workplace. The first is privacy, which refers to the right of individuals to personal privacy. The fact that they are entitled to expect that things they consider part of their private lives are not divulged to others without their permission (Orpen, 1981). Furthermore, Orpen (1981) includes equity which is the right of the individual to equitable treatment in all matters of the importance on the job, such as compensation, status, security and advancement. Free speech is another right which includes the right of the individual to disagree openly with the ideas and opinions of their superiors in the organization without fear of reprisal or subsequent victimization (Orpen, 1981).

Another right includes due process which refers to the right of individuals to be governed by the rule of law rather than by the arbitrary and capricious actions of particular individuals, with established procedures to prevent them suffering unfairly at the hands of others. It entails that all people in the organization, whatever the hierarchy level is, should have the same access to appeals and to due process procedures.

The last right according to Orpen (1981) is equality which refers to the right of individuals not to be penalized as of their membership of any particular group or class. It implies that all individuals are entitled to expect to be treated in the same way as others, irrespective of the sex, race, religion or social class.

Work and total life space

The above-mentioned refers to the extent to which there is a balanced role of work in the employee’s other life spheres. This concept of a balanced role encompasses work, schedules, career demands, and travel requirements that do not continually take up
leisure and family time and advancement and promotion that do not require repeated geographical moves (Walton, 1973).

According to Orpen (1981) there is a wealth of evidence which points to the fact that an individual’s non-work experiences can have positive or negative effects on his or her non-working life, such as how he or she spends his or her leisure time and what sort of relations he or she has with family members. The importance of this point for the concept of quality of life is that work organizations, by virtue of this kind of ‘spillover effect’, influence an individual’s life of the job.

The social relevance of work life

According to Walton (1973), organizations which do not act in a socially responsible manner are suggested to cause increasing numbers of their employees to depreciate the value of their work and careers that, in turn, will affect their self-esteem. It is obvious therefore that QWL is affected by all facets of the employee’s functioning in the organization. Effective utilization of an employee and his or her satisfaction in the job are essential if a high QWL is to be maintained in an organization. As a consequence, work organizations whose actions are seen to have beneficial consequences receive more acclaim and are accorded more prestige than those whose actions are felt to have injurious or harmful consequences (Orpen, 1981).

The employees who feel their organization is acting in a socially responsible manner, in terms of such things as its products and services, will tend to value their work and careers more highly as a result, which in turn is likely to enhance the self-esteem and well-being (Orpen, 1981).
On the contrary, organizations which act in a socially irresponsible manner in the above-mentioned respects will cause increasing numbers of their members to depreciate the value of their work and careers, with negative consequences for their self-esteem and well-being.

On evaluating the QWL in teachers, Bharathi et al (2011) found that the QWL perception by the employees and its implementation has a positive role in changing the work scenario and has been shown to improve the life of the employee along with the organizations.

2.5. **QWL and Job satisfaction**

One of the most known theories of job satisfaction was developed by Frederick Herzberg (Brewer, 2005). Herzberg’s findings led to the conclusion that the nature of the job and work environment is the primary determinants of employee quality of work life.

The relationship of job satisfaction with work life quality is another aspect of working life that is often investigated. Job satisfaction is one among central variables in work and is seen as an important indicator of working life quality (Cohen et al., 2007; Aryee et al., 1999) determining the extent to which the employee is satisfied or is enthusiastic about his job (Aryee et al., 1999). Feelings of enthusiasm or having sense of enjoyment in one’s work are reflective of Herzberg’s Hygiene factors in his theory of motivation. (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1967; Herzberg, 1968).

According to Herzberg, satisfaction in the workplace is “intrinsic” to the job with which an employee is directly involved (Brewer, 2005). The stimulus for employee satisfaction is ultimately derived from both the job content and the context in which it occurs. Locke (1976) summarizes the existing researches on the causal factors in job
satisfaction and enumerates among the most important values or conditions conducive to achieve a high QWL. This includes the following: Mentally challenging work with which the individual can cope successfully; personal interest in the work itself; (work which is not too physically tiring); rewards for performance which are just, informative and in line with their individual’s personal aspirations; working conditions which are compatible with the individuals physical needs and which facilitates the accomplishment of his work goals; high self-esteem on the part of the employee; agents in the work place who help the employee to attain job values such as interesting work activities, pay and promotions, whose basic values are similar to his own and which minimize role conflict and ambiguity (Severinsson & Kamaker, 1999).

Locke (1976) has defined job satisfaction as a pleasing or positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of a person’s job (Haque & Taher, 2008). It is also defined as an individual’s general outlook regarding his or her job (Robbins, 1999). According to Mullins (1993) motivation is closely related to job satisfaction. Various factors like an employee’s needs and desires, job design, style and quality of management, social relationships with supervisors and colleagues, compensation, working conditions, future growth opportunities, and perceived opportunities elsewhere are considered to be the determinants of job satisfaction (Byars and Rue, 1997; Moorhead and Griffin, 1999). Job satisfaction has a considerable influence on employees’ commitment towards organization and in reducing absenteeism, accidents, and grievances (Byars & Rue, 1997; Moorhead & Griffin, 1999). According to Robbins (1999), a satisfied and happy workforce of employees can increase productivity of the organization by causing less
distraction by absenteeism or turnover, few incidences of their destructive behavior, and low medical expenses.

The relationship of job satisfaction with QWL is another aspect of working life that is often investigated by researchers. Job satisfaction is assumed to be one of the central variables in work and is seen as an important indicator of working life quality (Cohen, Kinnevya, & Dichtera, 2007; Aryee, Fields, & Luk, 1999). Along with the nature of job, workplace conditions and motivator factors, HR policies also play an important role in QWL of an employee and are closely associated with job satisfaction (Ting, 1997). Because many scholars and practitioners believe that sound HR practices result in better level of job satisfaction which ultimately improves organizational performance (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000).

2.6. QWL in India

QWL as a movement encompasses a set process to improve the working conditions of the employees, which works well within a particular cultural environment and is influenced by cultural values and philosophies imbibed by the population. Hence, QWL practices vary from one country to the other.

India has an employment to population ratio of 53.60 as of 2011 (IndexMundi, 2013). Every third person in an Indian city is youth with an average of 29 years. The findings of “State of the Urban Youth, India 2012: Employment, Livelihoods, Skills,” a report published by IRIS Knowledge Foundation in collaboration with UN-HABITAT (2012) suggests that greater political participation, engagement at a policy level and urgent attention to improving their quality of life can ensure that India enjoys the benefits of this dividend. Further, by 2020, India is expected to become the world’s youngest
country with 64% of its population in the working age group (The Hindu, 2013). Apart from the regular working are temporary workers in India, whose number has grown more than 18% in 2010. In addition, there is an increase in the number of informal workers in the organised sector (from 32% in 2000 to 68% in 2010) (Economy, 2012).

The quality of working life is no more than a frill that does not meet the growing needs of India. Technologies are fast growing and with the entry of several multinational companies with both men and women working in different kinds of shifts have become common. There are big challenges that need to be addressed while implementing measures to introduce and maintain QWL in India. Therefore, from the Indian context, a need to recognize employee’s economic, social and self-actualization needs are essential to develop their potential and to experience better QWL. For example, Thorsurd (1981) studied the QWL programs in the public sector industries and pointed out that reorganization of work and restructuring of monetary incentives can produce tangible changes in work atmosphere in developing countries.

In the global arena, the concept of QWL took root in the US in 1960’s though the origin goes back to 1930’s mainly to protect the rights of the workers through unionization movement. Specific emphasis was placed on job security and fair pay. From the European point of view, the QWL involved industrial democracy through legislative arrangements for employees and the involvement of employees in work-related decision making. In India, the concept of QWL emerged in mid-1970 at a time when the country was passing through intense labor unrest. The Indian approach of QWL involves social and economic framework that depends on organizational change resulting in task effectiveness of macro as well as micro-entities by using the potential of the human
capital as the cornerstone. The movement of QWL in India has been fuelled by some key factors that are summarized below (Jayakumar and Kalaiselvi 2012):

The profile of an Indian worker has changed from an illiterate, rural individual to educated, urban and suave individual having hopes and aspirations.

Workers are no longer considered as one among the machine but a human being with emotions and feelings by the organizations resulting in the treatment of workers with dignity. The realization has led to the formation of a separate Ministry of Human Resource Development by the Government of India.

Though there are only 10% of workers in unionized organization, the rest of the workers have also found to be more vocal regarding their demands. There is a need to study the organizational human behavior, which is highly unpredictable and complex.

The practices of QWL attempts to address issues pertaining to the adequate utilization of human potential along with job satisfaction and an overall well-being of the workforce.

De (1985) has described seven developmental stages to QWL projects in India. They are 1) Hostility, 2) Curiosity, 3) Spreading of interest, 4) Sense of feeling privileged by the experimental group, 5) Consciousness of groups descend on members involved in the project, followed by a power struggle within the sub-groups and ultimately, the group which is positively oriented prevails, 6) Perception of gain from the projects by the group members leading to further commitment to the projects and 7) Diffusion of the gains from the projects. Thus, QWL projects lead to job satisfaction among the employees.
Several companies in India follow the principles of QWL in India. Some of them are McKinsey & Company, Tata Motors Ltd, Google India Pvt. Ltd, Hewlett-Packard, American Express, Gillette, Dr. Reddy’s Laboratories, Reliance and Maruti Udyog Limited, MakeMyTrip (India) Pvt. Ltd, Smith Kline Beecham, Intel Technology India Pvt. Ltd, Marriott Hotels India Pvt. Ltd, NetApp India Pvt. Ltd, American Express, India, Colgate Palmolive, NTPC Ltd, PayPal India Pvt. Ltd, Godrej Consumer Products Ltd, Taj Hotels Resorts and Palaces and Whirlpool of India, etc.

In the companies that follow QWL, job enrichment, worker’s participation in work-related decision making, job enrichment, flexible working arrangements, leave for certain special occasions like exam preparation, marriage, adoption of a child, etc., are part of the policy of the companies.

Several scholars and HR practitioners have studied the QWL from different angles and have arrived at factors affecting QWL. Yet, an attempt to conduct a comprehensive study to objectively measure the various dimensions of QWL that affects the workers of India is not studied. Hence, an attempt has been made to provide the perception of QWL by the workers in the Indian context in general. Special attention has been paid to understand the QWL perception by the manufacturing and service sector employees.

Organizational culture refers to values, attitudes and beliefs that are shared among the members of the organisation. Therefore, it is a mixture of behaviours, assumptions, myths, stories and other ideas that are put together to understand the meaning of working in a particular organization. QWL is intertwined with the organization culture, which brings about the balance within an employee’s life. Though there are some published
research articles and books on workplace community (Nirenberg, 1995; Gozdz, 1995; Manning, et al, 1996), yet a lacunae is found in the amount of research required in this area. Wile (2001) has described the organizational community as “A philosophy of organizational culture that believes if you take care of the people in your organization, they will take care of your organization, your product, and your customers. A community environment is one that is described with terms like family; having a strong sense of belonging and sharing the same values”. Three elements are critical to maintain a balance between the workplace community and the workers and are found in organization which gives priority to the welfare of its employees. These can be summarized as leadership that is committed to employee centered values; sharing of power between the management and the employees; focus on strategy and results; an orientation of the values of trust, respect, and inclusion; values of accountability, transparency and belongingness; personal responsibility and a structure that maximizes communication, seeks collaboration, and promotes employee ownership. Chalofsky (2008) stated that employees do not work for the sake of benefits provided by the organizations, but for the cultural values of the organization, which results in complete commitment to their organizations.

Biswa and Mathew (2001) developed an operational framework to measure empowerment of the employees at work in the academic settings. The findings of this study suggested that the perceived empowerment does not affect perception of work-climate, learning environment, decision involvement and goal clarity emerged as salient empowerment par aments, that effects and leads to a favourable work-culture.

On the contrary, Mohanraj et al (2010), in their study conducted with permanent workers of NTC mill in Tamil Nadu, observed that QWL factors are essential for
promoting a strong work culture. They believe that a good HR climate, as well as work culture, can develop a positive feeling among the employee towards the organisation and would motivate them to do the job well.

The ethics of an organisation has a strong association with society in many ways, for example, purchasing raw materials from the suppliers, selling goods to customers, being responsible towards shareholders. Thus, the responsibility of an organisation extends towards offering quality goods, proper waste disposal, job security to the employees, etc. (Khanka, 2012). Any variation from this demonstration would lead to negative perception by the employees, who tend to feel that they work in an unethical organisation and therefore, would want to move out.

Men and women perceive QWL differently in the organizations depending on the type of job they work and the privileges that they enjoy in the workplace. Balachander et al (2013) surveyed 340 people working in insurance companies in Tamil Nadu to measure the impact of personal factors on quality of work life of the respondents. They found that there was no significant difference between male and female category officers working in insurance with respect to their quality of work life. On the contrary, Ayesha et al. (2011) demonstrated a significant difference between male and female employees working in bank in the way they perceive quality of work life.

India is undergoing a major shift in its work environment and the expectation from the job. Open economy policy, globalisation and growing economies has opened the floodgates of increase in the availability of jobs through foreign investment and outsourced jobs. In addition, these factors have presented new challenges as well as new opportunities for people. Hence, the perception of the people is also changing regarding
their jobs. However, the success of an organisation relies on acquiring and retaining talented workforce. In reality, there is a significant difference between income level and quality of work life. Those who receive more pay in relation to others of the same category seemed to have high level of quality of work life. Meenakshi Gupta et al. (2010) on studying the telecom sector employees found that adequate income and fair compensation have a positive relationship with quality of work life.

Linking pay with performance plays a crucial role in bringing job satisfaction among the employees. Performance related pay has an impact on the psychological state of being of a person, who is involved in a meaningful work for which he/she are rewarded pertinently (Heneman, Greenberger & Strasser, 1988; SHRM, 2008). In addition, performance-linked pay induces optimism in workers and helps to stay clear of the personal goals. Thus, it increases the overall job satisfaction and, in particular, satisfaction with pay and job security (Green & Heywood, 2008). In Indian scenario too, pay remains to be a predominant factor that determines the QWL. In a study conducted by Sandhu and Prabhakar (2012) among the 250 employees working in the public and private sector banks in Chandigarh, Punjab and Haryana, it was observed that remuneration for the employees to play as the most important determinant of QWL. The employees believe that pay and perks should commiserate with skill set and knowledge base, in addition, to be at par with the prevalent market index. Some of the suggestions by the employees include payment for overtime and during probation period, perks like free transport, free accommodation and provident fund.

Human resource management in corporate have been recognized to be associated to quality of work life, and hence cannot be isolated. Managing people with authority
with no room for discussion and with an intolerant attitude will not produce the desired result in an organization. The tools of QWL can be effectively used to manage people and enhance production and loyalty towards the organization. Priya (2012) stated that quality of work life can be used as an alternative to control approach of managing people. A high QWL index in job refers to an efficient work situation, where a management concerned about supporting employees to solve their problems (Kameshwara and Mohan 2008). Leadership attitude, thus, have a significant effect on the employees. Tabbodi (2009) conducted a study among 93 faculty members of humanities departments to correlate the leadership behaviour with the commitment of the humanities departments in the University of Mysore, India. He observed a significant relationship between the leadership behaviour of heads of humanities departments and faculty commitment in the university. This study suggests that the leadership behaviour has an impact on the workforce.

A healthy workplace enthuse staff to be dedicated to the organisation (Joanne Profetto-McGrath et al, 2003). However, many of the Indian organizations are yet to believe that safety and health concerns of the employees are a matter of prerogative. Long exposure to noise, chemical, smell pollution, etc., impairs the faculties of the employees. Unfortunately, the organizations have left the problems of pollutions to be solved on its own without realising its harmful effects. A worker in a factory is the bread-winner, the health of whom is essential for happiness of the family. A healthy worker marks higher productivity and spreads cheer among his colleagues and is an asset to the company. Jain (2004) has shown that employees at different levels will have different
perceptions due to differential exposure to various working conditions in terms of physical layout.

To make the working conditions comfortable Balachandar, e al. (2012) proposes providing basic amenities like fan, lights and accessories, good sanitation facility, hospital, tools, equipment and stationary in the workplace.

Working hours fall under the purview of Quality of work life as one of the factors that orients the employees towards the presence or absence of job satisfaction. It is just not about prescribed working hours in accordance with the labour laws, but also safer work timings to the employees, especially to the women. According to section 66 of The Factories Act, 1948 of India, women employees are permitted to work between 6 am to 7 pm only, emphasising the safety of women. This rule is adhered to by the management of the factories. Unfortunately, the emergence of BPO and ITes companies, who primarily focus on productivity and profitability do not abide by the rule. A study conducted by Gupta and Chaudhary (2013) among 60 BPO employees found that there is a significant dissatisfaction among those respondents in terms of Lack of Income & Fair Compensation, Safe & healthy working conditions, Opportunities to use & develop human capacity, Opportunity for career growth.

Apart from the shift system, in order to fulfil the certain family commitment, especially for women, the management can permit their employees to choose their own work schedule, flexible work option (Raju, 2004). Similarly, the IT sector in India is experiencing high level of attrition due to the long working hours. Therefore, a holistic approach is required to objectively view the humanization of work atmosphere and democratisation of work relations. Such approach would determine better relationship
management, stress management and other human factors in working place would ensure retaining of the talent pool.

Job restructuring and redesign, career development, promotional opportunities, etc. are gaining importance rapidly as the workers expect the management to take steps to improve these facilities which in turn enhances QWL.

Uma Rani (2010) observed from her study that career development as an important factor that decides the QWL. Therefore, the management should focus on career growth of employees. Talents available internally in an organization should be used to fill the vacancies instead of hiring from outside. Thereby, the morale of the employees gets boosted and makes them committed to the organization.

Tabassum et al. (2012) investigated the QWL in private universities in Bangladesh and have observed that acceptance of the job in the society, safety and security in the job place was imperative for those who work in the universities.

Lakhawat et al. (2013) investigated the QWL in insurance sector in Allahabad and found that QWL is most affected by economic policies of the companies as this has largely found to influence job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The other constructs that affect QWL are flexibility in leave, timings, relationship amongst the co-workers , and higher level managers, supervisors, etc.

Battu and Chakravarti (2014) studied the QWL aspect among nurses and found that QWL was affected by several factors, notable of which were high levels of stress, night duties, extreme physical strain, sleep loss, and other factors affected the QWL drastically. The low QWL had an adverse effect on the nature of behaviour, responses to
others, handling critical situations and on the personal life. The authors have quoted Brooks inference after studying the nature of the job in nursing sector that it could be noted that the job satisfaction was not just the monetary benefits and security, it was more on acceptance by others, being needed and valued.

2.7. QWL in Manufacturing Sector

Adhikari (1992) states that most of the jobs in manufacturing sectors are simple to perform, routine, repetitive in nature, involve conventional technology, lack of innovation and do not require a high level of mental efforts. He further observed that jobs are less creative and innovative in their respective field and therefore workers have less challenges in the work.

Manufacturing industries face a number of problems, such as high cost for raw materials, absence of corporate cultures, weak enforcement of rules and regulations, a little access to international markets, insecurity among investors, poor financial management, overstaffing, operational inefficiencies, dissatisfied employees, increasing quality complaints, government interference, and lack of control mechanism and efforts (Adhikari, 1992; 2000; 2005; IIDS, 1996; Pant and Pradhan, 2002). Some of these problems are created by increasing employees’ dissatisfaction which leads to low capacity utilization in the manufacturing industries.

The QWL in the manufacturing sector have been studied by the researchers trying to understand the satisfaction level of the employees with respect to their workplace. Hawthorne (1963) studied out how employers and government can help the worker to improve productivity and how can worker themselves contribute to improve the QWL. According to him, the productivity improvement occurs best with respect to economic
growth. He demonstrated that many workers face the problems of change and insecurity. Training can play an important part to help ease the situation and help the workers to move within the industry. In addition, teamwork can help achieve increased productivity; however, the benefits reaped from it should be shared fairly among employers, workers and the public generally.

**Private Sector**

Kavoussi et al. (1978) studied the absenteeism in two textile factories in Iran. Poor working conditions in the factories led to the high absenteeism rate, which the authors say could be improved by improving the quality of working life as absenteeism have widespread consequences across the factory. A similar study conducted on absenteeism by Haque (1992) revealed that QWL is positively related to performance and negatively correlated to absenteeism. At the same time, there was no correlation between perceived QWL and workers’ age, education and job experience.

Sinha and Sayeed (1980) investigated the relationship between QWL, job stress and performance. Through their results they have demonstrated that that higher QWL leads to greater job satisfaction. A contrasting view between low and high educational industrial workers in India was studied by Rahman (1984). He found that subjects having low educational background and lower income had a better perception of QWL than those having higher education and higher income.

Suri, et al. (1991) conducted a study on the quality of work life practices among the manufacturing and service sector workers. Several trends that have implication on the QWL practices and their outcomes were shown through their study. They showed that public as well as private sector organisations did not have a preference for the job and
workplace redesign programmes. On the contrary, organisations prefer system-wide practices rather than isolated experiments that are limited to certain sections or departments.

QWL among women working in public and private sectors was studied by Wadud (1996). The results of the study indicated a significantly higher QWL among the private sector women employees than their counterparts in the public sector. Further, in comparison with the older and the lower experienced groups, younger group and the higher experienced group had significantly higher perception of QWL.

Hoque and Rahman (1999) conducted a comparative study on the public and private industrial sector workers in Bangladesh (Dhaka) to assess the QWL. They studied the relationship among QWL, job behaviour and demographic variables of the workers. The results of the study established that the private sector workers have significantly higher perception of QWL than their public sector counterparts. Similarly, QWL had significant positive correlation with performance and negative correlation with absenteeism and accident. The study conducted by Adhikari (1992) shows that most of the union leaders are seeking new opportunities in the work in order to get higher satisfaction and thus improve their QWL. Some companies have formal system of performance check and few of the union leaders indicated that their promotion is done on the basis of work performed. In the manufacturing sector, physical conditions at workplace plays an important role in worker’s QWL. The study indicates that enterprises need to increase safety measures like fire-exits, fire alarms, and safe drinking water to improve the QWL. Additionally, skill development of workers can be addressed through on-the-job training.
The union leaders believe that QWL in Nepal is primarily related to adequate pay and benefits. The extrinsic character of jobs like wages and salaries, incentives and benefits, physical conditions of work place and facilities are still more essential to maintain QWL than the intrinsic features of jobs like meaningful jobs and work autonomy in the work sites. Other important factors are job security and good working environments which were felt necessary and prioritized by leaders to enhance the quality of work life. As the extrinsic rewards are important for the better QWL, the intrinsic factors like, challenges at work, autonomy are necessary for better productivity and efficiency.

Mankidy (2000) posted that “the more positive the industrial relations processes, the greater the possibility of improved QWL.” He proposed that positive industrial relations should make sure those flexible hours of work, better wages, employment benefits, conducive work environment, job satisfaction, career prospects, and meaningful employee involvement in decision making etc. are available to workers in order to construct better QWL. The study concluded that the progressive QWL will help to improve the family life of the employees, which in turn will result in improved performance of the organisation. Organization culture has to be built around work culture. A study was conducted among 282 executives from automobile companies by Singh (2001). The results indicated that most of the dimensions of the organization culture were positively correlated with the work culture.

The correlation of group cohesiveness in sugar industry in Bangladesh by Sengupta and Sadique (2001). They showed that there was a positive correlation between
QWL and group cohesiveness and the dimensions of the QWL contributed towards group cohesiveness.

Kanagalakshmi and Nirmala Devei (2003) attempted to assess if the QWL had any relationship with work related factors and with demographic factors. Their results showed that workers perceive significantly higher QWL according to the demographic factors of age, income, and education.

Beh and Rose (2007) tested the relationship between QWL and job performance by conducting a survey among 475 managers in a manufacturing industry. They observed a significant positive relationship between QWL and Job performance.

Layer, et al. (2009, p. 413) set out to find the relationship between human performance in manufacturing sector and the cognitive demands of the worker and the perceived quality of work life attributes. The results of the study showed that human performance was the result of the combined and uncorrelated effect of cognitive demands and quality of work attributes experienced by workers. The main implication of this research was that a worker’s perceived QWL attributes can be paired with the cognitive demand related to a particular manufacturing task to optimize the worker’s performance.

On studying the textile and engineering workers in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, Subramaniam and Anjani (2010) found that the major factors affecting the QWL in the textile and engineering industries workers was the nature of the job, economic package, better opportunities in the job circle, relationships with co-workers and higher ups, role in decision making process, good job environment, pressures from home and job, work time management, presence of counselling facilities or grievance cell and opportunities for growth. This was no different from any of the other industries.
Another survey conducted by Indumathy and Kamalraj (2012) among the textile industry worker to understand the level of QWL. They found that the workers are most satisfied with work environment and safety measures in the company. Workers are not much satisfied with the relation and cooperation with co-workers and job security and they are least satisfied with salary.

Jagatheesh (2013) assessed the quality of work life of employees in the industrial estates of Kerala by interviewing 322 respondents. He reported that the socio-economic background of the employees in the industrial estate is not satisfactory for economic development. Moreover, he observed that the employees are not satisfied with their compensation, opportunity to use and develop their capacities, opportunities for continued growth and security, constitutionalism in the work organisation, and their work and total life space.

Rubel and Kee (2014) studied the relationship between QWL, job satisfaction and performance in the readymade garment companies in Bangladesh. They found that compensation and benefits, behaviour of supervisor, and work life balance had a significant influence on job satisfaction, while job satisfaction was significantly correlated to an employee’s job performance.

Public Sector

In 2012, Aggarwal investigated the ‘work life balance’ amongst the workers in the Gujarat refinery, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Vadodara, Gujarat. The major constructs used in the study were perception of life by the employees, effect of stressors in work place and at home, effect of constructs which are related to professional and personal life, mind-set of the employees toward the regulations of the organization. The
employees wanted the organization to be more worker-friendly and understanding to the problems of the employees’ needs and support them with good work-life balance (WLB) and relaxing atmosphere. A good WLB can bring a positive attitude in the minds of the employees towards the company. From this result, it is understood that organizations can benefit by adopting WLB, wherein the employees become more responsive to the support provided which adds to their performance.

Adhikari and Gautam (2010) conducted a study of Nepalese firms to investigate the extent to which these firms comply with labour laws on QWL and to evaluate the expectations of union leaders on different dimensions of QWL. Unfortunately, the results revealed that the QWL conditions in the workplaces are deteriorating in Nepal. In order to create an effective and harmonious industrial relations environment, the government, employers, and union leaders should be committed to work on QWL initiatives.

Sankar and Mohanraj (2013) conducted the studies on QWL of workers in the industries of sago and starch manufacturing from tapioca in Tamil Nadu, India. Tamil Nadu is the highest producer of sago in India and thus sago production is a major industry in this region. The existing work life conditions and the relationship between QWL and the wellness and work environment of the workers in this industry have been evaluated in the study. It was noted that the workers exhibited a high work culture and had a good QWL in these industries.

2.8. **QWL in Service Sector**

*Private Sector*

Service industries play a crucial role in our economy wherein it creates employment and contributes towards national economy. Without a doubt, the post-
wareconomy triggered a phenomenal growth in the service sector, which represented nearly 60% of all jobs in the United States by the end of the 1960s (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). As early as in the 1950s and 1960s, researchers began to realize the importance of workplace environments and its influence on the psychological health of its employees, which translates to health of the organisation itself (Argyris, 1957; McGregor, 1960). The work environment of the organization dictates the ingenuity of the employees; hence, utmost attention should be given to provide a satisfying and a high quality work environment for the employees which commensurate with other related work factors (Mumford, 2006).

Schneider and Bowen (1985) indicated that the attention to employee wellbeing serves as a foundation for a climate for service. Hence, the ability of the organization to deliver higher quality service is enhanced if employees are satisfied resulting in higher performance (Berry, The employee as customer, 1981). In the case of service sector employees, quality in the work life of an employee reflects instinctively in mental and physical wellbeing and is appropriately conveyed as ‘quality’ in the service towards customers. Some studies have been conducted in the context of viewing customers as not just external entity but the employees of the organization are also considered internal customers (Berry, Hensel, & Burke, 1976). A British study conducted by Holman (2002) in call centres ascertains the correlation of higher levels of employee wellbeing with employees having greater control over work methods and procedures.

Greene, et al. (1994) have demonstrated in a study that when employees are treated as internal customers and are involved in contingent organisational practices then these internal marketing resourcefulness leads to outstanding service and successful
external marketing. Consequently, satisfied employees naturally provide a higher level of external service quality, furthering increased customer satisfaction (Johnson J. W., 1996; Griffith, 2001). On the contrary, low QWL may affect the quality of services and commitment to the organization (Von de Looi & Bender, 1995).

In the service sector, the quality of work life depends on the satisfaction in a job, autonomy to prioritize the work, challenging task, motivation by the organization and organizational commitment. Service industries are becoming increasingly important to the economies of developed nations (Dabholkar, Thorpe, & Rentz, 1996). Managers of service organization know that their employees are the most valuable asset (Tzafrir & Gur, 2007). This is particularly relevant for those service sectors, which are largely dependent on the direct interaction of employees and customers (Testa & Ehrhart, 2005). Inducing quality into the work lives of employees is an incredible task as well as inevitable for any organisation, which is especially true in the case of service sector employees. Hodson and Roscigno (2004) describes that organisational success and employee well-being are complementary to each other. Any initiative taken towards improving the QWL of the employees will extend to their greater self-esteem and improved job satisfaction (Suttle, 1977), because satisfied employees are motivated to work harder and offer better services (Yoon & Suh, 2003). Similarly, according to Gröpel and Kuhl (2009), there is a direct relationship between satisfaction at work and social domains and work life balance and subjective well-being.

Edvardsson and Gustavsson (2003) believe that despite understanding the relationship between wellbeing of the employees and success of the organization, not
much has been paid towards working conditions of the employees at the workplace, which is the foundation for service inclined employees.

Mowday et al. (1979) referred organizational commitment to the extent to which the employee demonstrate a strong desire to remain the member of the organization, the degree of willingness to exert high level of efforts for organization and belief and acceptance of the major goals and values of the organization.

Hossain and Islam (1999) investigated the correlation between QWL and job satisfaction, QWL and performance, and job satisfaction and performance. On the basis of stratified random sampling, three nurses were selected from three government hospital and data was obtained from them. The findings revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between QWL and job satisfaction, between QWL and performance, and job satisfaction and performance. QWL has the highest contribution to performance.

Organizational commitment of the employees is essential to deliver consistent quality service to the customers. Mowday et al. (1979), in his study on two different occupational groups (hospital and retail employees), found a correlation between organizational commitment and job performance. Modern management of employees attempt to foster employee’s commitment to the organisation by reinforcing employee loyalty as those committed are reported to perform better (MueIIuer, Boyer, Price, & Iverson, Employee Attachment and Noncoercive Conditions of work: The Case of Dental Hygienists., 1994; Jauch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978).

In line with those thoughts, Mowday et al., (1979) felt that committed employees are more aligned to the goals of the organization and less likely to seek employment outside. Similarly, Baugh and Roberts (1974) showed that strong levels of positive work
were found in committed individuals. In contrast, those who were not committed recorded a weak level of positive outcome.

Moreover, studies have shown that women are more effectively committed to the organization than are men (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982); (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In contrast, Aranya et al (1986) and Marsden et al. (1993) reported that men displayed a higher level of commitment than women. Several studies have reported a positive correlation between human resource practices and organizational commitment (Scandura & Lankau, 1997); Gaertner and Nollen (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989); (Lau & Ngo, 1996).

Many of the call centres in order to compete with the service quality design tasks such that it involves the discretion of employees thereby facilitate individual autonomy (Hutchinson, Purcell, & Kinnie, 2000; Deery & Kinnie, 2002). In contrast to this view, some companies, who aim to minimise costs and maximise volume, accentuate on service standardisation. These companies automate the tasks in such vigour that the tasks almost become “repetitive, routine and highly scripted” (Deery and Kinnie, 2002, p. 4). Acute automation of tasks strips of creative involvement of the employees' effort and offers limited job diversity and little decision-making prudence (Paul & Huws, 2002; Houlihan, 2002). Hannif (2007) demonstrated that call center employees, who were given work that had job variety and had some autonomy that helped them to control their work functions as well as working hours, were found to be a satisfied with their work, which in turn produced low turnover.

Saklani (2004) stressed that with the advancing technology and easily accessible information, the study of organizations with respect to productivity, efficiency and quality of services is very crucial in order to improve the performance of work in India.
The need to improve organizational productivity in the health care industry encouraged Brook and Anderson (2005) to develop the construct of quality of nursing work life. They identified four dimensions of the conceptual framework namely; work life/home life dimension, work design dimension, work context dimension and work world dimension.

The relationship between job involvement, role stress and personality types were studied by Dhadda (1990) in aviation and railway officials. He found a negative correlation between role overload and stress among the railway officials. On the contrary, role ambiguity had negative correlation with stress.

Job involvement was also shown to be positively related to role stress. Venkatachalam et al. (1998) studied the impact of job level and the organization’s identity on job involvement and job satisfaction among the workers of banks, schools and government organization. In all the three organizations, job level had a significant effect on job involvement and job satisfaction and organization’s identity demonstrated an effect on job satisfaction.

Manickavasagam (2000) studied the relation between morale and some factors of job performance such as productivity, labour cost, turnover, absenteeism and accidents. The study established that there are positive though insignificant relationships between morale and job performance.

In a critical study by Ramesh (2004) on call centre employees exposed the vulnerabilities and insecurities of labour engaged in non-standard work. A host of insecurities to the workforce includes increased stress at work, growing attrition rates and eroding collectivity of workers. This study explained how the emergence of a new genre of worker, with distinct features and differently conceived identity, enables the firm to
draw and maintain a “productively docile” workforce within a changed framework of human resource management.

Vathsala Wickramasinghe (2010) studied the relationship between work-related attitudes of Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) employees. Around 117 employees were selected for this study from 25 BPO firms. The two main criteria tenure and marital status were studied. Of these, tenure had an impact on task autonomy and marital status had a significant effect on working hours. The work-related attitudes of BPO employees towards their work and work environment were found to have positive correlated, which brings to the fore that these organizations provided employees with key information that could enable them to make informed managerial decisions.

In an interesting study conducted by Juliet Mary (2012) among the IT and ITES employees shows that QWL dimensions positively influenced, affected and correlated with People Capability Maturity Model (PCMM). But there was no difference in QWL among PCMM implemented and non-implemented organizations. The authors believe that the observed results can instigate the companies which have not implemented PCMM to prepare the employees psychologically to meet the demands and challenges which else may risk a poor QWL program implementation.

Bindu and Yashika (2014) have stated that the QWL in academic sector is deficient and needs to be improved greatly. An organised strategy is essential as a method of modification of QWL in the teaching sector which must involve training workshops, design and remodelling of the teaching methods for upgrading the informational quality of the faculty, role of faculty in managerial issues, introduction of better policies for promotion and thus improvement in the life style of the teaching faculty.
Mosadeghrad (2013) investigated the QWL of nurses in Iranian hospital as the nurses are subjected to high levels of stress due to the nature of their jobs. The main stressors are high physical strain, low degree of staffing, lower pay packages, lack of promotional opportunities, greater work load, which takes a heavy toll on them. He suggests that concepts like good and decent participation, treatment by the management, proper environment, increased income, and monetary benefits be given to the nurses to increase the QWL. Coburn and Hall (2014) studied the perception of QWL between four generations in the nursing workforce. Due to a different set of values held by each generation, the perception of QWL, psychological empowerment, and job satisfaction were better among the baby boomers suggesting a need to create a work environment by manager that is supportive of multiple generations of nurses. On the contrary, Han et al (2014) observed that high quality initial training provided to the nurse produced better job satisfaction. Therefore, they have recommended that training be given priority to arrest high turnover rate among the nurses.

Further, Skinner et al (2014) extended the work life challenges across the life course in healthcare professionals. She found a significant difference in the perception of work life balance at different stages of life. Such a pattern was also observed with respect to work demand and flexibility. However, the existing policies of the companies do not meet these demands which in turn lead to reduced work hours and increased turn-over rates.

Public Sector

Uma Sekaran (1985) investigated the QWL in the Indian (Nationalized) banking industry as perceived by organisational members at different levels and job positions.
According to the study, QWL was not great in the banking profession. Some of the reasons for such poor QWL were due to inequitable reward system, which demotivate the better performing employees, the recruitment of overqualified personnel for rather routine job, frustration experienced due to lack of alternative job avenues, scarce chance of promotion, alienation from work etc. The author recommends more autonomy, power and control and greater decentralization in order to recruit the right people for the right job, design the job description, and reward employees according to performance and thereby enhance the QWL in banks.

Baldev and Sharma (1987) conducted a study on banking industry to study the impact of managerial beliefs and work technology on organisational climate and management. Pareek (1991) explains the improvement of HRD climate, strategy and spirit of implementation of HRD techniques in banks.

The findings of Ganguly and Joseph (1976), while studying QWL among Air India staff, revealed an interesting aspect of job satisfaction which is related to physical and psychological conditions of work, such as family ties, job earned community respect, pride in organisation, reasonable working hours, rural background, etc., rather than to physical strain, friendship with colleagues, skills, risks of injury and good work location.

The study of QWL in the life of bus drivers of Pune Municipal Corporation was studied by Dhar (2008) and it was found that several constructs affect the QWL of a bus driver in a metropolitan city. These factors play a crucial role in their life as the condition is a complex type with a vast number of factors influencing the QWL. It was found that the constructs that affected the QWL in this case were the working conditions, the quality
of the buses driven, external conditions like pollution, and heavy work demands like the unruly and noisy commuters who are not cooperative. Thus, the QWL in this case was low due to bad working conditions and also domestic pressures which further increased the stress of the drivers.

Kamel(2013) has studied the relationship between QWL and the intention to leave the job in Saudi Arabian Business Administration College and stated that the level of QWL among the faculty members was just above average and their intention of continuing with college jobs were affected by the commitment to the job. The results of the study helped in gaining knowledge about the level of QWL in the academic sectors in Saudi Arabia.

2.9. Research Gap

Lots of studies on the relationship between QWL and work related factors are available. Few studies discuss only the benefits of working in groups and the involvement of the workers in organizational design. Nevertheless, a comprehensive study of manufacturing and service sector is still not available. This gap in the research has elicited the conduct of this particular study.

The literature review gives an evidence that even though there are number of researches being conducted on QWL, there is not much research of comparing the overall satisfaction of employees working in manufacturing and service sector industries in Karnataka and the various factors which actually affect the QWL of workers in manufacturing and service sector industries.