CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Globalization has significantly affected the economies of the world by opening new opportunities and challenges due to fierce competition among the companies. The companies have caught up the moments of change by revisiting their business goals and reworking on strategies to achieve these goals. The dynamism of the businesses in the highly competitive market have driven the organisations to achieve organizational efficiency by increasing the productivity of the employees, decreasing the cost of production that has a cascading effect on the employee cost, i.e., downsizing headcount and reducing employee benefits. A feeling of insecurity, decreased job satisfaction, enormous stress, and commitment to the workplace is rampant among the employees. Quality of work life is the sum of these factors that are mentioned above, and it is put to critical purview by the employees.

Organizations that critically assess their capabilities on attracting, retaining, developing and motivating its employees become successful. These factors act as catalysts to achieve the Quality of work life as well as organizational efficiency and reduce job stress and insecurity; on the other hand, increase job satisfaction and commitment of the employees to the work place resulting in organizational efficiency and productivity.

This thesis has compared the quality of work life between the employees of the manufacturing and service sectors.
Based on the literature survey conducted by the researcher, this research was found to be unique, as this study of comparison of the QWL of manufacturing sector with that of the service sector employees were not done before to determine their perception and level of satisfaction among the employees. From the study it is evident that such a comparison has not been done in the past among the manufacturing and service sectors in Mysore, Bangalore, Maddur and Nanjanagud cities of Karnataka State.

The present chapter concludes the thesis by summarizing the key findings of the study and identifying certain issues that emerged from the empirical research, and provides suggestions for balancing the QWL among the employees, with special reference to how the organizations can come forward to address the issues and challenges relating to the employees and maintain a balance between family and work life.

The main objectives of the study were

- To analyse the quality of work life and its determinants in the selected manufacturing and service sector industries.
- To measure the level of employee satisfaction and its determinants in the selected industrial units.
- To evaluate the employees opinion on the organizational policies with respect to compensation, career prospect, occupational stress and participation in management.
- To identify the areas that need improvement and to make suggestions to improve the QWL in the organizations under study.
Major Findings of the Study

- As expected, significant gender parity among those working in the manufacturing companies is seen. They employ more men than women with 81% men working in this sector. On the other hand, an almost equal distribution of men and women were found to be working in the service sector.

- Manufacturing sector had more employees working in the age group of 31 to 45 years age. Service sector was most preferred by those in the age group of 20-30 years.

- Both sectors had almost equal number of married people, although the service sector had more number (78%) of married employees than manufacturing sector (71%).

- Employees of service sector had more graduates (that includes even post graduates) (89%) than manufacturing sector (77%). Others who were not involved in this group had completed their diploma. The difference in educational qualification was significant (T = 2.54; p = 0.012).

- Service sector had more number of graduates (90%), while manufacturing sector lesser number of graduates (70%).

- A significant number (51%) of those working in Manufacturing sector were at a junior position in comparison with service sector.

- Manufacturing sector had more number of employees with >10 years of experience (47%), while the service sector had more employees in 2-5 years experience group.
• The maximum number of employees in both the sectors was in the group of Rs.11,000 to Rs.20,000 monthly incomes (32% and 29%, respectively). While a significant parity was found in the Rs.21,000 to 30,000 group, where there were large number of employees from service sector (28%) compared to manufacturing sector (17%).

• In manufacturing as well as service sector half of the employees had 5 or more number of years of experience.

• The overall consistencies of the measures were tested using reliability analysis. For the manufacturing industry, the Cronbach’s alpha value for different constructs ranged from 0.620 to 0.928 indicating a high internal consistency among the items.

• In Service Sector Cronbach’s alpha value ranged from 0.67 to 0.81, which suggests the existence of internal consistency among the items of the constructs.

• Sampling adequacy was tested through the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure. For the manufacturing sector, a value of 0.888 was obtained, while 0.872 for service sector. The KMO value indicated an adequate sample size. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, thus affirming the factorability of the correlation matrix with a high significance level (0.000) for both the sectors.

• The objective to analyze the quality of work life and their determinants in the selected manufacturing and service sectors was achieved through the Factor Analysis that revealed the factors perceived to play a role in QWL.

• Factor Analysis extracted seven factors with Eigen value more than 1 that explained 70% of the variability of the data for the manufacturing sector.
Varimax (variance maximising method) rotation of the extracted factors produced the 41.760% variance for Job satisfaction, 8.009% for Adequate and fair compensation, 5.978% for Opportunity for growth, 4.633% for Training and development, 3.861% for Work load, 3.074% for Safe and healthy working conditions, and 2.705% for Social integration in the work organization.

- In the service sector, eight factors were extracted with Eigen value more than 1 that explained 61% of the variability of the data. The factors in the order of importance perceived by the employees are Commitment to workplace (32.25%), Adequate and fair compensation (6.59%), Job satisfaction (5.53%), Training and development (4.12%), Safe and healthy working conditions (3.78%), Skill utilization and opportunity for growth (3.44%), Social integration in the work organisation (3.094%), and Work environment (2.7%).

- The second objective to measure employee satisfaction and their opinion on the organizational policies with respect to compensation, career prospect, occupational stress and participation in management was achieved by conducting the regression model that arrived at identifying the influencing factors on overall satisfaction of the employees.

- In the manufacturing sector, the linear regression model established that the independent variables, Job satisfaction, Work load, Opportunity for growth, Training and development, Adequate and fair compensation, Safe and healthy working conditions, and Social Integration could predict the QWL of the employees working in manufacturing organizations. Job satisfaction accounted for 32.5%; Work Load, 17.3%; Opportunity for growth, 35.8%; Training and
development, 9.7%; Adequate and fair compensation, 42.8%; Safe and health working conditions, 33.7%; and Social Integration, 47.4% of the explained variability in overall satisfaction of the employee with the company. The research models proposed were highly statistically significant at a confidence level of 95% with p values less than 0.000.

- In the service sector, Commitment to the work place could explain 46.1% of the variation in the overall satisfaction, Adequate and fair compensation, 31.2% Job satisfaction, 23.8%; Training and development, 20.7%; Safety and healthy working conditions, 21.4%; Skill utilization and opportunity for growth, 35.8%; Social integration in the work organisation, 25%; and Work environment, 31.4%.

- Correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate the pair-wise relationship between the constructs studied. All the factors in the manufacturing sector were found to be correlated with the overall job satisfaction, with Opportunity for growth, \( r = .602 \); Work load, \( r = .422 \); Training and development, \( r = .321 \); Adequate and fair compensation, \( r = .657 \); Safe and healthy working conditions, \( r = .584 \); and Social Integration, \( r = .691 \).

- In the case of service sector too, the QWL factors were highly correlated with the Overall satisfaction of the employees. The correlation values were found to be .679 for Commitment to workplace, 0.559 for Adequate and fair compensation, 0.488 for Job satisfaction, 0.455 for Training and development, 0.463 for Safe and healthy working conditions, 0.598 for Opportunity for growth, 0.499 for Social Integration, and 0.560 for Work environment.
• Comparison of the QWL factors of the manufacturing and service sectors indicated that job satisfaction among the manufacturing sector (mean = 5.174±0.899) was slightly more than the service sector (mean = 5.124±0.803).

• Factors such as Opportunity for growth and ability to use the skills, Safe and healthy working conditions, Social integration, Adequate and fair compensation, and Training and development contributed to the organization’s effort to achieve a balanced QWL for the employees. These factors were perceived as important factors that could bring about a balanced QWL.

• Opportunity for growth and ability to use the skills were equally important for both sectors. A slight increase in the need was felt in the service sector (mean = 5.247±0.921), in contrast to manufacturing sector (mean = 5.04±1.05). This difference was also statistically significant as noted by the T value = -1.84 and p value = 0.033.

• In this study, manufacturing sector (mean = 5.229±0.942) placed greater importance for social integration than the service sector (mean = 5.132±0.832). However, the p value of 0.325 suggests that this factor does not significantly influence the employees of manufacturing sector over the service sector.

• Safe and healthy working conditions are important parameters for employees of both manufacturing and service sectors. The manufacturing sector was found to show affinity towards Safe and healthy working conditions as the mean show 5.26±1.27, while the service sector mean was 5.11±1.13, though not statically different (T = 1.14; p = 0.254).
- Adequate and fair compensation are an important factor of QWL dimension considered by both manufacturing (mean = 5.05±1.1) and service sectors (5.08±0.88). The difference was not statistically significant (T = -0.34, p = 0.734).

- Training and development was also perceived to be important component of QWL factor equally by the manufacturing and service sectors, without any statistical difference (T = -0.18; p = 0.856).

- Overall satisfaction among employees of manufacturing and service sector was found to be similar and no statistically significant difference was found between them (T = -0.27; p = 0.392).

Overall, it can be said that manufacturing sector perceive Job satisfaction to be most important criteria for QWL, while commitment to the workplace is considered as an important criteria for service sector. Both the sectors give equal weightage for Adequate and Fair Compensation and Training and Development factors.

From the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that the instrument/model that was developed by the researcher is capable of assessing the levels of each indicator and balancing of the quality of work life. These models can further be used to predict the changes that occur due to the change in the factors, which may arise out of positive intervention by the organization. Periodical assessment using the model provides sufficient opportunity for the organization to identify the areas of weaknesses.

In addition, based on the evaluation of the QWL of employees, the organizations can formulate strategies to improve the indicators of quality of worklife for the
employees. Extant studies conducted in various organizations can further increase the scope of improving the instrument.

**Recommendations**

Employees are the strength of an organisation and need to be treated with dignity and respect for their sincere and hard work. The employees have the burden of handling the responsibilities in their personal life as well as achieving the higher work expectations in their professional life. Managements should adopt welfare measures and programs to satisfy the employees through various resources, activities and the participatory outcomes in a work place. Organizations can conduct repeated surveys using the instrument and obtain the feedback of the employees to design programs that would be directed towards improving the quality of work life. A high quality of work life results in employee satisfaction and thus in high productivity.

This study has shown that in order to keep the employees satisfied, the organisation must provide a conducive climate to enhance commitment, fair compensation, job satisfaction, safety and health, training and development, opportunity to develop skill and growth, social integration. It is suggested that organisations make performance appraisal transparent, conduct training programs that would enhance skills and capabilities of the employees. The employees who perform challenging jobs remain motivated and perform better. As the employees spend most of their time in the workplace, it is important that an effort be made to address the grievances and minor skirmishes among the employees. An organisation, which considers strategies and policies to create balance in work life, will possibly have a workforce that has increased productivity and increased penchant to work towards achieving organisation goals.
This study has identified the positive and negative factors that influence the way employees perceive the quality of work life. As a practical implication, these factors can aid organizations to conceptualize strategies that strive to positively assimilate quality of work life and career development of the employees, thus guaranteeing long-term competitive gain.

**Manufacturing Sector**

In the manufacturing sector, the employees give more importance to job satisfaction. Therefore, the company will have to ensure that they provide new opportunities to work to increase the level of satisfaction. Increasing job satisfaction can reduce turnover rate, absenteeism, coming late for work and negative feelings. Past studies have highlighted the repetitive nature of the job in the manufacturing sector resulting in dissatisfaction with the job. Firms should provide employees with an opportunity to think creatively and innovatively with respect to their work, in order to overcome the routine working procedures and making the work challenging. This study clearly shows the lack of continuous training being given to the employees. Training is an important aspect that could provide a sense of confidence and a clear view and knowledge about the procedures and the expected standards of the organization. Therefore, manufacturing companies should focus on training its employees, not only to develop the skill set, but also instil confidence in them to make decisions pertaining to their role. Safe and healthy working condition is one of the factors that scored the least loadings. This is an area of concern in most of the manufacturing companies, as working in these companies often involves physical risk factors, such as procedure causing injuries and exposure to harmful radiations and chemicals, which is a threat to the very
sustenance of life. Therefore, manufacturing companies should make efforts not only to install safety measures inclusive of fire extinguishers, fire alarms, first aid, but also to train the employees on how to use them.

Manufacturing firms should revamp the HR strategy for the employees introducing unbiased performance appraisal systems that would have built in performance linked incentives and rewards and recognition system to motivate the employees to perform better. Organizations should provide equal employment opportunities without discrimination against gender, age, ethnic, or minority. Working environment should be conducive to the employees with adequate appropriate equipment, work breaks, and division of labour. Ombudsman should be available to address the grievances of the employees and disciplinary procedures.

**Service Sector**

From this study it is evidenced that organisational commitment of the employees in the service sector was found to have a great impact on the overall satisfaction of the employee with the organization. Any deficiency in QWL reduces the commitment of the employee to the organization. This can cause the employees to look for opportunities outside the organization, unwillingness to take responsibility, and not paying attention to the voice of customers. Therefore, the service sector companies should develop human resource practices that improve QWL in the organization which in turn can increase the organisational commitment of the employees.

In this present study, the employees working in the service sector showed lower levels of job satisfaction, less safe and healthy conditions and social integration. Varying work shift, loss of opportunities in the working environment, loss of leisure time and
unsafe working procedure can lead to job stress, which in turn can affect the job satisfaction. Since the service sector normally involves stress due to job, organizations will have to ensure that employees are consulted appropriately with regard to the work, by creating achievable targets, deadlines, etc. Another aspect of QWL that has emerged out of this study is the social integration factor. Companies should provide support to the employees through the supervisors by understanding the areas of need, for example, imparting product and process knowledge, cordial interaction, to instil confidence in the management system.

**Directions for Future Work**

Substantial research is needed before well-founded generalization of the implications for public and public sector organizations can be drawn. Although the overall findings of this research are very encouraging, the present results are in no way conclusive. Despite the limitations of the study, the findings contributed to the extant literature by providing empirical evidence on the different components of QWL for manufacturing and service sectors. It is suggested that a similar study be conducted in other sectors across the country to increase the generalizability of the study and to compare the results. Future studies can also investigate the employee’s behaviour, in terms of turnover, absenteeism, job involvement and engagement among these sectors.

Stress is an important criteria that substantially contributes to the quality of work life. Future studies can examine QWL from the impact of stress angle on QWL. Stress also plays a role in performance on the job and motivation to remain in a company. The three pronged approach to study the impact of stress on QWL and job performance can be taken up.