
A Comparative Study on Level of Quality of Work Life Existing in Government and Private Institutions of Haryana

Dr. Jagjeet Singh Mor
Associate Professor in Commerce
Government College, Birohar
E-mail- jagjeetmor1967@gmail.com

Abstract

QWL is a construct that deals with the well-being of employees. One might argue at this point that QWL is the same as job satisfaction, however it has been stated that QWL differs from job satisfaction as job satisfaction is constructed as one of the many outcomes of QWL. It was also stated that QWL does not only affect job satisfaction but also satisfaction in other life domains such as family life, leisure life, social life, financial life and so on.

Therefore, there is evidence to say that the focus of QWL goes beyond job satisfaction by encompassing the effect in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life, personal happiness, and subjective well-being. This paper is an attempt to understand the level of quality of work life existing in select Government and Private institutions across Haryana.

Task Management, Drudgery, Career Advancement and General Well-Being have drawn varied responses between Government and Private employees with more weightage given by Government employees on all the above aspect.

Keywords: Quality of work life, job satisfaction, QWL factors

INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life is a process of joint decision-making, collaboration and building mutual respect between management and employees. It is concerned with increasing labour management cooperatives to solve the problems of improving organizational performance and employee satisfaction. According to the American Society of Training and Development, it is a process of work organization which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organisation's environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organisation and improved quality of work for employees. Quality of work life (QWL) has become a focus of growing concern in work and humanistic values which got neglected in the process of excessive concern for economic development and materialism during a major part of the twentieth century. Quality of work life means a set of objective organizational conditions and practices (e.g., promotion from within policies, democratic supervision, employee involvement, safe working conditions etc.). The other way equates QWL with employees' perceptions that they are safe, relatively well satisfied, and able to grow and develop as human beings. This way relates QWL to the degree to which the full range of human needs is met.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Suttle (1977) defines QWL as the degree to which employees are able to satisfy important personal basic needs through their experience in the organization is no longer relevant. Hackman and Oldham (1974) drew attention to what they described as psychological growth needs as relevant to the consideration of Quality of working life. Several such needs were identified; Skill variety, Task Identity, Task significance, Autonomy and Feedback. They suggested that such needs have to be addressed if employees are to experience high quality of working life. Mirvis and Lawler (1984) suggested that Quality of working life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life" as; safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement. Baba and Jamal (1991) listed what they described as typical

indicators of quality of working life, including: job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organisational commitment and turn-over intentions. For example, Ellis and Pompli (2002) identified a number of factors contributing to job dissatisfaction and quality of working life in nurses, including: Poor working environments, Resident aggression, Workload, Unable to deliver quality of care preferred, Balance of work and family, Shiftwork, Lack of involvement in decision making, Professional isolation, Lack of recognition, Poor relationships with supervisor/peers, Role conflict, Lack of opportunity to learn new skills.

Karrir and Khurana (1996) found significant correlations of Quality of work life of managers from three sectors of industry viz., Public, Private and Cooperative, with some of the background variables (education qualification, native/migrant status, income level) and with all of the motivational variables like job satisfaction and job involvement.

Singh (1983) conducted studies in chemical and textile factories in India that were designed to improve the Quality of work life by reorganizing the work and introducing participatory management. Bhatia and Valecha (1981) studied the absenteeism rates of textile factory and recommended that closer attention should be paid to improve the Quality of work life.

Kavoussi (1978) compared the unauthorized absenteeism rates in two large textile factories and recommended that closer attention be paid for improving the Quality of work life. Raghvan (1978), the Ex-Chairman of BHEL, a public sector organization, stressed the need for workers participation in management. According to him, “participation of workers in the management of undertakings, establishments, or other organizations engaged in any industry is underscored by Constitution of India”. Besides improved working conditions in the organization, there are ample evidence to highlight the implication of autonomy and participation at work to foster the meaning to work.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objectives of the Study

- *To assess and compare the level of quality of work life existing in Govt. and private institutions.*
- *To develop an objective and comprehensive assessing mechanism for evaluation of QWL in an organization, which, may also be used for comparison with other organizations.*

The study is based on primary data collected through well structured questionnaire based on six dimensions of QWL. The questionnaire was subject to a pilot study and alternations for better analysis and interpretation were incorporated. The slightly customized questionnaire included 76 items in Part I and 13 items in Part II. The first part was related to the responses from employees of technical institutions six dimensions of QWL and 13 items of part II were related to institutional & personal profile of respondents. All the responses on variable were obtained on a 5 point Likert scale (from for highly unsatisfactory to 5 for highly satisfactory). While conducting the survey due care was given to include respondents from various cadres of employees i.e. Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors from the teaching class and also the various departments of non-teaching class. A pilot study was undertaken and necessary changes incorporated in the questionnaire thereby.

Out of 500 questionnaire distributed in various parts of Haryana 486 were found fit for analysis. The 15 factor extracted after running factor analysis on the 76 questions pertaining to QWL were further subject to t test analysis.

The objective of the study was also to assess the perception among Government and private employee regarding QWL. The t-test results are shown in Table

| | Private | | Government | | T | Sig. |
|-----------------------------|---------|-------|------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | M | S.D. | M | S.D. | | |
| 1. Task Management | 3.483 | 0.605 | 3.703 | 0.611 | -2.027 | 0.043 |
| 2. Autonomy | 3.139 | 0.666 | 3.307 | 0.727 | -1.305 | 0.193 |
| 3. Drudgery | 3.000 | 0.671 | 3.363 | 0.688 | -2.976 | 0.003 |
| 4. Career Advancement | 3.142 | 0.877 | 3.450 | 0.788 | -2.179 | 0.030 |
| 5. Listening Management | 3.462 | 0.657 | 3.403 | 0.742 | -0.447 | 0.655 |
| 6. Effective Leadership | 3.343 | 0.553 | 3.512 | 0.731 | -1.322 | 0.187 |
| 7. Progressive Organization | 3.000 | 0.720 | 3.120 | 0.722 | -0.941 | 0.347 |
| 8. Conducive Environment | 3.500 | 0.604 | 3.390 | 0.683 | 0.911 | 0.363 |
| 9. Responsive Selves | 3.686 | 0.688 | 3.787 | 0.709 | -0.808 | 0.420 |
| 10. Motivating Self | 3.612 | 0.528 | 3.728 | 0.671 | -0.987 | 0.324 |
| 11. Efficient Leadership | 3.929 | 0.539 | 3.987 | 0.598 | -0.550 | 0.583 |
| 12. Self Competence | 3.647 | 0.788 | 3.611 | 0.688 | 0.286 | 0.775 |
| 13. Rewarding Organization | 3.386 | 0.533 | 3.535 | 0.674 | -1.260 | 0.208 |
| 14. Social Welfare | 2.970 | 0.997 | 3.044 | 0.891 | -0.461 | 0.645 |
| 15. General Well Being | 2.764 | 0.772 | 3.486 | 1.826 | -4.932 | 0.000 |

Out of the 15 significant factors of QWL the responses of Private and Government institution employees differed significantly at 0.01 level on aspect namely Drudgery and General Well Being with t-values of 2.976 & 4.932 respectively. Task Management and Career Advancement too show inconsistency in views of the Government & Private institution employees. The t-value of 2.027 and 2.179 were significant at 0.05 level. A perusal of mean scores of the dimensions reveal the fact that Task Management, Autonomy, Drudgery, Career Advancement, Effective Leadership, Progressive Organisation, Responsive Selves, Motivating Self, Efficient Leadership, Rewarding Organisation, Social Welfare and General Well Being have all been given higher weightage by employees of Government staff members.

Listening Management, Conducive Environment and Self Competence dimensions on an average are more highly regarded by employees of private institutions.

CONCLUSION

The analysis has resulted in identification of important dimensions of quality of work life namely Task Environment, Autonomy, Drudgery, Career Advancement, Listening Management, Effective Leadership, Progressive Organisation, Conducive Environment, Responsive Selves, Motivating Self, Efficient Leadership, Self Competence, Rewarding Organization, Social Welfare and General Well Being from the employees' viewpoint.

Task Management, Drudgery, Career Advancement and General Well-Being have drawn varied responses between Government and Private employees with more weightage given by Government employees on all the above aspect.

Quality of work life engulfs a lot of dimensions. The management or employees of technical education institutes need to focus their attention on those dimensions which directly has an impact of overall quality of work life perception of employees and strive to provision of the same to insure satisfaction of employees.

REFERENCES

- Baba, V.V. & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinisation of job context and job content as related to employees quality of working life: a study of psychiatric nurses. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 12. 379-386.
- Bhatia, S.K. & Valecha, G.K. (1981). A Review of Research Findings on Absenteeism, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17(2), 12-34.
- Ellis, N. & Pompli, A. (2002). *Quality of working life for nurses*. Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing, Canberra.
- Hackman, J. & Oldham, G. (1974). *The Job Diagnostic Survey*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Karrir, N. & Khurana, A. (1996). Quality of Work life of managers in Indian industry, *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 22(12), 1926.
- Kavoussi, N. (1978). The Effects of Unsatisfactory Working Condition on the Epidemiology of Unauthorised Absenteeism in an old textile factory, *Journal of Human Ecology*, 7(1), 8187.
- Mirvis, P. & Lawler, E. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work.. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 5, 197-212.
- Raghvan, S. P. (1978). Workers Participation in BHEL: 1, *Vikalpa*, 3(3).
- Singh, J.P. (1983). QWL Experiments in India: Trials and Triumphs, *Abhigyan*, Fall.
- Suttle, J.L. (1977). Improving Life at Work: Problem and Prospects. In H.R. Hackman & J.L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving Life at Work: Behavioural Science approaches to organizational change* (pp. 1-29). Santa Barbara, CA: Goodyear.
-