CHAPTER – 9
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

CHAPTER – 9
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this chapter, data have been analysed using the following statistical techniques, with the help of SPSS software - Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), t-test, and Correlations. ANOVA, also called F-test is calculated, if there are more than two samples, to examine, if there is a difference in their means. If there are two means, and the purpose is to examine if there is a difference in the means, t-test is used.

Correlation analysis helps to determine the degree of relationship between two or more variables, and it does not indicate cause and effect relationship. The relative strength of the relationship between two variables is typically measured by co-efficient of correlation, the value of which ranges from -1.00 for a perfect negative correlation up to +1.00 for a perfect positive correlation. Partial correlation technique is used in this study through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The main attempt of the study is to examine the relationship between employees' 'quality of work life' and their socio-economic variables and organizational variables, viz., job category, occupation, length of service, age, religion, community, residence, education, family size, housing type, health conditions, income, and earning members in the family. Nine quality of work life parameters were identified by the researcher and the employees' rating is collected on a constant sum scale. The results of mean score, standard deviation, and significance of the factors are presented in this chapter in various tables. If the calculated p-value (asymp. sig.) is higher than 0.05, null hypothesis is accepted; if it is lower than 0.05, null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis of association between the two factors is accepted.

9.1 Nature of the Job and Quality of Work Life

Table 9-1 explains the nature of the job and Quality of Work Life; the respondents are classified into Workmen and Supervisors. The table shows the distribution of Mean Score of QWL parameters and their significance level among the employees. Regarding the health and safety, the mean score of workmen of GLTTL is 1.28 and of ML&Co 1.73. The mean score for supervisors in GLTTL and ML&Co is

1.36 and 1.10, respectively. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -0.116 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.908. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is 1.065 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.288. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in case of both the factories, the t-test reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. The result shows no significance of relationship between health and safety on workmen and supervisors of women workers in both the factories.

Regarding the welfare facilities, the mean score of workmen in GLTTL is 1.63 and in ML&Co 1.59. The mean score of supervisors is 0.64 in GLTTL and 2.07 in ML& Co. The calculated t- value in GLTTL is 1.789 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.076, whereas in ML& Co, it is   -1.050 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.296. As the calculated p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and shows no significance of welfare facilities of workmen and supervisors on welfare facilities on women workers and supervisors in both the factories.

Regarding working conditions, the mean score of workmen is 1.83 in GLTTL and 2.14 in ML&Co, whereas the mean score of supervisors in GLTTL is 2.29 and in ML&Co 2.70. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -0.739 and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.461, whereas in ML&Co, the t-value is -0.872 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.384. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals the acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. This indicates that the relationship between working conditions of workmen and supervisors and category of employees is insignificant in both the factories.

Relating to the parameter of job security, the mean score of workers is 0.50 in GLTTL and 0.69 in ML & Co; mean score of supervisors in GLTTL is 0.00 and -0.20 in ML & Co. The obtained t-value is 1.037 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.301 for GLTTL, whereas in ML&Co the t-value is 1.692 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.093. In both the factories, as p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This reveals that the influence of workmen and supervisors on job security, a parameter of QWL is insignificant in both the factories.

The mean score of the respondents regarding compensation for the workers in GLTTL is 0.21 and 0.40 in ML&Co, and for supervisors is -0.64 in GLTTL and 0.00

in ML&Co. The calculated t-value is 1.719 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.088. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is 0.880 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.380. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This reveals that the influence of workmen and supervisors on compensation is insignificant in both the factories.

Regarding the career growth and development parameter, the mean score of workmen in GLTTL is -0.20 and in ML& Co -0.19. For supervisors category, the mean score of the above parameter in GLTTL is -1.89 and in ML&Co -0.67. The calculated t-value is 3.232 and p-value is 0.002 for GLTTL. As p-value is less than 0.05, it reveals significance at 0.05 level in GLTTL. The test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association between the variables. In ML&Co, the calculated t-value is 0.836 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.405. Here as the p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating the insignificance of association between the variables. Association between workmen and supervisors on one side on *career growth and development parameter is significant for GLTTL and insignificant for ML&Co.* The first indicates influence, and the second lack of influence.

The mean score of grievance redressal mechanism parameter for workmen in GLTTL is 0.37 and in ML&Co 0.37; for supervisors in GLTTL -0.75 and in ML& Co 0.30; the generated t-value is 3.167 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.002 in GLTTL. As p-value is less than 0.05, t-value shows significance in GLTTL. The test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and *acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of significance of relationship between grievance redressal mechanism and workmen and supervisors in GLTTL.* In ML&Co the calculated t-value is 0.185 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.853. The p-value is greater than 0.05, showing insignificance of t-value. The test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that workmen and supervisors in ML&Co have different opinions on grievances handling system.

The mean score regarding the social integration in the organization among workmen in GLTTL is 0.14 and 0.17 in ML&Co. For supervisors it is -0.75 in GLTTL and 0.10 in ML & Co. The estimated t-value in GLTTL is 1.980 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.500. The calculated t-value in ML & Co is 0.181 and p-value is 0.857.

As p-value in both the factories is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, showing insignificance as the result. This conveys that there is difference of opinion between social integration at workplace among workmen and supervisors in GLTTL as well as in ML&Co.

About the parameter of social relevance, the mean score of workmen in GLTTL is 0.37 and in ML&Co 0.46. The mean score of the above parameter for supervisors is 0.32 in GLTTL and 0.50 in ML&Co. The generated t-value in GLTTL is 0.101 and p-value 0.920. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is -0.067 and p-value 0.946. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys insignificance of association. This reveals that there is difference opinion on social relevance of work life among workmen and supervisors in both the factories.

9.1.1 Summing up

The analysis of the above table shows that only the t-value of the QWL parameters of career development and grievance redressal mechanisms in GLTTL are significant, whereas in ML&Co, the result shows insignificance for these parameters. The QWL parameters in respect of the remaining factors discussed in the table of health and safety, welfare facilities, working conditions, job security, compensation, social integration at work, and social relevance are not significant in both the factories.

As for QWL parameters, GLTTL takes personal interest on career development and grievance redressal mechanism of women workers, compared to ML&Co. Hence on these aspects; GLTTL secured significance as the result of association. In all other parameters, there are differences in the approaches adopted by the two companies, and the association is insignificant for both the factories. GLTTL and ML&Co have to provide sufficient working facilities to improve the QWL of employees. For all the employees put together, as well as for employees of workmen and supervisors categories, ML&Co shows higher mean score on almost all QWL parameters. However, these have not resulted in significance in the result. Among all parameters, career development is one where the mean score is negative in all categories, which means greater stress is needed on this aspect in future. In respect of

supervisors, negative mean score is notified for job security (for ML&Co), compensation (for GLTTL and ML&Co), grievance redressal mechanism (for GLTTL) and social integration at work (for GLTTL). It is important to encourage the experienced persons in the organisation by providing necessary incentives and facilities. The organisation has to plan on these lines.

Table 9-1
Mean Score Value of the Category of employees on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Designation / QWL Parameter	Organization	Workmen		Supervisors		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.28	2.23	1.36	2.79	1.290	2.275	-0.116	0.908
	ML&Co	1.73	2.17	1.10	2.27	1.670	2.185	1.065	0.288
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.63	1.93	0.64	2.18	1.533	1.970	1.789	0.076
	ML&Co	1.59	1.63	2.07	2.03	1.636	1.672	-1.050	0.296
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.83	2.08	2.29	3.02	1.876	2.172	-0.739	0.461
	ML&Co	2.14	2.32	2.70	2.85	2.193	2.369	-0.872	0.384
Job Security	GLTTL	0.50	1.71	0.00	1.84	0.453	1.717	1.037	0.301
	ML&Co	0.69	1.95	-0.20	1.69	0.600	1.942	1.692	0.093
Compensation	GLTTL	0.21	1.76	-0.64	1.70	0.126	1.770	1.719	0.088
	ML&Co	0.40	1.68	0.00	1.58	0.360	1.669	0.880	0.380
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.20	1.90	-1.89	1.55	-0.356	1.925	3.232*	0.002
	ML&Co	-0.19	2.09	-0.67	1.98	-0.240	2.081	0.836	0.405
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.37	1.26	-0.75	1.25	0.263	1.294	3.167*	0.002
	ML &Co	0.37	1.46	0.30	1.53	0.366	1.466	0.185	0.853
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.14	1.59	-0.75	1.73	0.056	1.616	1.980	0.500
	ML&Co	0.17	1.49	0.10	1.69	0.166	1.502	0.181	0.857
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.37	1.61	0.32	1.88	0.363	1.629	0.101	0.920
	ML&Co	0.46	2.01	0.50	2.07	0.466	2.010	-0.067	0.946

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level.

9.2 Type of Employment and Quality of Work Life

The manpower of the organization is broadly divided into permanent, and temporary based on the experience and service put in by the employees. Table 9-2 presents the distribution of mean score of QWL parameters and their significance level among permanent and temporary category of employees. As regards health and safety, the mean score for permanent employees in GLTTL is 1.32 and in ML&Co 1.81; and for temporary employees in GLTTL is 1.23 and 1.40 in ML&Co. In GLTTL, the calculated t-value is 0.252 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.801. In ML&Co, the calculated t-value is 1.071 and p-value (asymp.sig) 0.286. As p-value is greater than 0.05, for both factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, showing the result as insignificant. This reveals that there is no association between categories of employment and health and safety parameter of QWL.

Regarding welfare facilities, the mean score of permanent employees in GLTTL is 1.20 and in ML&Co 1.63; and for temporary employees the mean score in GLTTL is 2.15 and in ML&Co 1.65. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -2.908 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.004. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis, and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *This reveals that association between welfare facilities and category of employment is significant in GLTTL.* In ML&Co, the calculated t-value is -0.069 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.945. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This shows that in ML&Co, there is insignificant relation between category of employment and welfare facilities.

Regarding the working conditions parameter, the mean score of permanent employees in GLTTL is 2.11 and in ML&Co 2.75; for temporary employees the mean score in GLTTL is 1.45, and in ML&Co 1.08. The generated t-value 1.779 in GLTTL and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.077. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This shows that there is insignificant association between category of employees and working conditions in GLTTL. In ML&Co, t-value is 4.302 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.000. This shows high level of significance as p-value is lower than 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected and the

alternative hypothesis is accepted. *The influence of working conditions on category of employees is significant in ML&Co.*

As regards Job security parameter, the mean score for permanent employees in GLTTL is 0.51 and in ML&Co 0.94, and the mean score for temporary employees in GLTTL is 0.36 and in ML & Co -0.07. In GLTTL the calculated t-value is 0.499 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.619. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, revealing that there is insignificant association between Job security and category of employment in GLTTL. In ML&Co, the calculated t-value is 3.071 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.003. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *This shows significance of relationship between job security and category of employment in ML&Co.*

Regarding compensation, the mean score for permanent employees in GLTTL is -0.04 and in ML&Co 0.48, and the mean score for temporary employees in GLTTL is 0.43 and in ML&Co 0.12. The estimated t-value in GLTTL is -1.579 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.166. In ML&Co, the t-value is 1.248 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.214. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This shows that there is insignificant association between compensation and category of employees in both the factories.

Relating to the parameter of career development, for permanent employees the mean score in GLTTL for -0.59 and in ML&Co 0.04; and the mean score for temporary employees in GLTTL is 0.08 and in ML&Co -0.79. The estimated "t-value" in GLTTL is -2.053 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.042. The t-value in ML&Co is 2.321 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.022. As p-value is lower than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of significance in association between the variables. *In career development, the category of employees has recorded significance of association in both the companies.*

In respect of grievance redressal mechanism parameter, mean score among permanent employees in GLTTL is 0.07 and in ML&Co 0.51; and among temporary employees, the mean score in GLTTL is 0.61 and in ML&Co 0.08. The t-value in

GLTTL is -2.488 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.14. The t-value in ML&Co is 1.704 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.90. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of null hypothesis. There is insignificant association between category of employment and grievance redressal mechanism in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter of social integration at work, mean score of permanent employees, in GLTTL is 0.00 and in ML&Co 0.40; and mean score among temporary employees in GLTTL is 0.16 and in ML&Co -0.30. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -0.580 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.563. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This shows no association between category of employees and social integration at work in GLTTL. In ML&Co t-value is 2.748 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.007. As p-value is less than 0.05, the result shows significance of association between the variables. *The category of employees influences the social integration at work in ML&Co.*

About the parameter of social relevance, the mean score of permanent employees in GLTTL is 0.46 and in ML&Co 0.63; and the mean score among temporary employees in GLTTL is 0.18 and in ML&Co 0.14. The generated t-value in GLTTL is 1.023 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.308. In ML&Co, t-value is 1.412 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.160. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This shows that there is no association between category of employees and social relevance in both the factories.

9.2.1 Summing up

Among the nine parameters of QWL presented in Table 9-2, the results reveal the following as significant in terms of association between QWL parameters and categories of employees, as permanent and temporary. In career development, GLTTL and ML&Co, both the factories, have recorded significance. Apart from this, in GLTTL, significance is recorded for welfare facilities; and in ML&Co, significance is recorded for working conditions, job security, and social integration at work. In all other aspects, insignificance or no association has been recorded. In terms of mean score for total employees, ML&Co has scored better than GLTTL in all aspects, except social integration at work. Negative total score is recorded for career development. For temporary workers, in ML&Co, negative score is recorded for three

parameters: - job security, career development, and social integration at work, all in ML&Co. For permanent employees, negative score is recorded in GLTTL for compensation, and career development.

Table 9-2
Mean Score Value of the employees by Type of Employment on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Type of Job / QWL Parameter	Organiasation	Permanent		Temporary		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.32	2.42	1.23	2.01	1.290	2.275	0.252	0.801
	ML&Co	1.81	2.23	1.40	2.08	1.670	2.185	1.071	0.286
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.20	1.98	2.15	1.82	1.533	1.970	-2.908*	0.004
	ML&Co	1.63	1.69	1.65	1.65	1.636	1.672	-0.069	0.945
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.11	2.30	1.45	1.87	1.876	2.172	1.779	0.077
	ML&Co	2.75	2.15	1.08	2.42	2.193	2.369	4.302**	0.000
Job Security	GLTTL	0.51	1.64	0.36	1.87	0.453	1.717	0.499	0.619
	ML &Co	0.94	1.76	-0.07	2.13	0.600	1.942	3.071*	0.003
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.04	1.88	0.43	1.52	0.126	1.770	-1.579	0.166
	ML&Co	0.48	1.53	0.12	1.91	0.360	1.669	1.248	0.214
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.59	2.00	0.08	1.71	-0.356	1.925	-2.053*	0.042
	ML&Co	0.04	1.88	-0.79	2.36	-0.240	2.081	2.321*	0.022
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.07	1.30	0.61	1.23	0.263	1.294	-2.488	0.14
	ML&Co	0.51	1.36	0.08	1.63	0.366	1.466	1.704	0.90
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.00	1.69	0.16	1.48	0.567	1.616	-0.580	0.563
	ML&Co	0.40	1.45	-0.30	1.52	0.166	1.502	2.748**	0.007
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.46	1.69	0.18	1.51	0.363	1.629	1.023	0.308
	ML&Co	0.63	1.91	0.14	2.19	0.466	2.010	1.412	0.160

*Significant 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level.

9.3 Experience in years and Quality of Work Life

The work experience of the respondents is divided into five groups. Table 9-3 presents distribution of mean score of QWL parameters and their significance levels by experience of service of the respondents. Categorisation of experience of respondents is in five categories as follows: 0-2 years, 2 – 4 years, 4 – 6 years, 6-8 years, and 8 years and above.

About health and safety, the mean score of respondents of different categories: 0 to 2 years is 0.66 in GLTTL and 1.04 in ML&Co, 2 to 4 years 1.85 in GLTTL and 2.10 in ML&Co, 4 to 6 years 1.40 in GLTTL and 2.16 in ML&Co, 6 to 8 years 1.21 in GLTTL and 1.08 in ML&Co, and 8 years and above 0.90 in GLTTL and 1.17 in ML&Co. The calculated F-value is 1.169 in GLTTL with p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.327. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 2.219 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.070. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore there is insignificant association noticed between health and safety and job experience in years in both the factories.

As regards welfare facilities, the mean score of respondents of different categories: 0 to 2 years 2.10 in GLTTL and 1.52 in ML&Co, 2 to 4 years 2.10 in GLTTL and 1.95 in ML&Co, 4 to 6 years 1.35 in GLTTL and 1.48 in ML&Co, 6 to 8 years 1.01 in GLTTL and 1.50 in ML&Co, 8 years and above 0.90 in GLTTL and 1.89 in ML&Co. The calculated F- value in GLTTL is 2.405 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.052. *As p-value is close to 0.05, the result shows significance of association in GLTTL between welfare facilities and length of experience*. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 0.554 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.697. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in ML&Co, the result shows acceptance of the null hypothesis. This reveals absence of association between welfare facilities and experience of respondents in ML&Co.

Regarding the working conditions parameter, the mean score of respondents for different categories 0 to 2 years experience is 1.26 in GLTTL and 0.78 in ML&Co, 2 to 4 years 2.06 in GLTTL and 2.34 in ML&Co, of 4 to 6 years 2.46 in GLTTL and 2.62 in ML&Co, 6 to 8 years 1.41 in GLTTL and 2.37 in ML&Co, and above 8 years experience 1.97 in GLTTL and 2.28 in ML&Co. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 1.719 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.149. In ML&Co the generated F-value

is 2.631 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.370. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This reveals that there is no association between working conditions and different categories of experience in both the factories.

Regarding the job security parameter, the mean score of respondents of different categories: in GLTTL for 0 to 2 years, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years, and above 8 years 0.28, 0.26, 0.74, 0.22, and 0.97, respectively, and the generated F-value is 0.936 which is not found to be significant, as p-value (0.445) is found to be higher than 0.05. In ML&Co 0 to 2 years of experience, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years, and above 8 years is -0.57, 1.16, 1.01, 0.83, and -0.39, respectively. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 5.045 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.001. As p-value is less than 0.05, it shows the result as significant. The test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *Significance of association between job security and years of experience is established in ML&Co.*

Regarding compensation in the organisation, the mean score of respondents of different categories in GLTTL 0 to 2 years of experience, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years, and above 8 years -0.04, 0.47,-0.41, 0.54 and 0.07, respectively.   The estimated F-value in GLTTL is 1.843 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.124. In ML&Co, the mean score of different categories of respondents: 0 to 2 years of experience, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years, and above 8 years, 0.02, 0.40, 0.72, 0.27, and -0.19, respectively.   The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.380 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.224. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both factories, the result shows absence of significance. The test statistic reveals that the null hypothesis is accepted. This reveals absence of association between compensation and different categories of years of experience of respondents in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter career development, the mean score of different categories of the respondents in 0 to 2 years of experience in GLTTL is 0.40 and in ML&Co -1.74, 2 to 4 years in GLTTL is 0.11 and in ML & Co 0.27, 4 to 6 years in GLTTL is -0.66 and in ML&Co 0.43, 6 to 8 years in GLTTL is -0.99 and in ML & Co -0.56, and above 8 years in GLTTL is -0.50 and in ML&Co -0.69. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 2.804 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.280. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals the acceptance of the null hypothesis In GLTTL, and

conveys that there is no association between career development and different categories of years of experience of employees. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 5.851 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.000. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *Therefore, there is a highly significant association between career development and different periods of work experience in ML&Co.*

Regarding the grievance redressal mechanism the mean score of different category of respondents, in GLTTL 0 to 2 years of experience, 0.12 and in ML&Co - 0.26, 2 to 4 years in GLTTL 0.76, and in ML&Co 0.89, 4 to 6 years in GLTTL is 0.14, and in ML&Co 0. 59, 6 to 8 years in GLTTL 0.04, and in ML&Co 0.46, and 8 years and above in GLTTL is 0.13, and in ML&Co –0.50. The estimated F-value in GLTTL is 1.838 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.125. As p-value is greater than 0.05, it indicates absence of significance. The test statistic indicates acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association in GLTTL between grievance redressal mechanism and different years of experience. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 4.265 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.003. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis, and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *There is significant relationship between grievance redressal mechanism and years of experience in ML&Co.*

Regarding social integration at work life in the organisation, the mean score of different categories of respondents: In GLTTL 0 to 2 years, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years and more than 8 years is -0.18, 0.17, 0.25, -0.07, -0.03, respectively, and the generated F-value is 0.379 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.823. In ML&Co, the mean score of different categories of respondents: -0.43, 0.15, 0.47, 0.23 and 0.00 respectively. And the generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.547 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.192. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the result shows acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between social integration at work and different years of work experience in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter social relevance of work life, the mean score different categories of respondents: In GLTTL 0 to 2 years 0.18, and in ML&Co - 0.39, 2 to 4 years in GLTTL 0.47 and in ML&Co 1.26, 4 to 6 years in GLTTL 0.24

and ML&Co 0.76, 6 to 8 years in GLTTL 0.41 and in ML&Co -0.48, and above 8 years in GLTTL 0.63 and in ML&Co 0.72, and the calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.284 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.888. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in GLTTL, the test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted, indicating no association between the two variables in GLTTL. In ML&Co, the F-value is 4.410 and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.002. As p-value is less than 0.05, the result is found to be highly significant. The test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. *Therefore significant relationship is noticed between social relevance of work life and years of experience of respondents in ML&Co.*

9.3.1 Summing up

Analysis of Table 9-3 reveals as follows: In four parameters, ML&Co has recorded significant result. These parameters are: job security, career development, grievance redressal mechanism, and social relevance at work. In all other features, the results are observed as insignificant. In welfare facilities, GLTTL has recorded significant result showing association between this parameter and years of experience. Out of nine parameters, in respect of four, ML&Co, and in respect of one parameter GLTTL have recorded significance indicating association between the respective parameters of QWL and the categorisation of years of experience. In respect of all the parameters, ML&Co has scored better mean score. In career development, both the factories recorded negative score.

Table 9-3
Mean Score Value of the employees' Experience in years on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Experience / QWL Parameter	Organization	0 to 2 Years		2 to 4 Years		4 to 6 Years		6 to 8 years		8 years and above		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	0.66	2.16	1.85	1.74	1.40	2.16	1.21	2.68	0.90	2.81	1.290	2.275	1.169	0.327
	ML&Co	1.04	2.04	2.10	1.96	2.16	2.10	1.08	2.15	1.17	2.70	1.670	2.185	2.219	0.070
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	2.10	1.51	2.10	2.32	1.35	1.84	1.01	1.85	0.90	1.96	1.533	1.970	2.405*	0.052
	ML&Co	1.52	1.75	1.95	1.62	1.48	1.55	1.50	1.73	1.89	1.99	1.636	1.672	0.554	0.697
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.26	2.03	2.06	2.06	2.46	1.94	1.41	2.24	1.97	2.81	1.876	2.172	1.719	0.149
	ML&Co	0.78	2.93	2.34	1.93	2.62	2.14	2.37	2.50	2.28	2.28	2.193	2.369	2.631	0.370
Job Security	GLTTL	0.28	1.92	0.26	1.75	0.74	1.51	0.22	1.75	0.97	1.78	0.453	1.717	0.936	0.445
	ML&Co	-0.57	2.12	1.16	1.99	1.01	1.68	0.83	1.78	-0.39	1.74	0.600	1.942	5.045*	0.001
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.04	1.30	0.47	1.76	-0.41	1.69	0.54	2.01	0.07	1.91	0.126	1.770	1.843	0.124
	ML&Co	0.02	2.22	0.40	1.53	0.72	1.38	0.27	1.56	-0.19	1.92	0.360	1.669	1.380	0.224
Career Development	GLTTL	0.40	1.82	0.11	1.77	-0.66	2.05	-0.99	1.91	-0.50	1.67	-0.356	1.925	2.804	0.280
	ML&Co	-1.74	2.54	0.27	1.76	0.43	1.62	-0.56	2.35	-0.69	1.68	-0.240	2.081	5.851*	0.000
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.12	1.44	0.76	1.17	0.14	1.41	0.04	1.12	0.13	1.23	0.263	1.294	1.838	0.125
	ML&Co	-0.26	1.64	0.89	1.42	0.59	1.28	0.46	1.35	-0.50	1.50	0.366	1.466	4.265*	0.003
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.18	1.51	0.17	1.71	0.25	1.41	-0.07	1.81	-0.03	1.77	0.056	1.616	0.379	0.823
	ML&Co	-0.43	1.32	0.15	1.89	0.47	1.41	0.23	1.42	0.00	1.21	0.166	1.502	1.547	0.192
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.18	1.35	0.47	1.72	0.24	1.59	0.41	1.89	0.63	1.41	0.363	1.629	0.284	0.888
	ML&Co	-0.39	2.58	1.26	1.61	0.76	1.88	-0.48	1.85	0.72	1.67	0.466	2.010	4.410*	0.002

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.4 Employees' Age and Quality of Work Life

The respondents have been classified into five groups on the basis of their age: less than 25 years, 25 – 35 years, 35 – 45 years, 45 – 55 years, and above 55 years. Table 9-4 shows distribution of mean score of QWL parameters across different age groups of employees. As regards Health and safety, the mean score of less than 25 years of age group in GLTTL is 1.24 and in ML&Co is 1.40, of 25 to 35 years in GLTTL 1.34 and in ML&Co 2.11, of 35 to 45 years in GLTTL 1.62 and in ML&Co 1.69, of 45 to 55 years in GLTTL 1.34 and in ML&Co 1.92, and above 55 years in GLTTL 0.38 and in ML&Co 0.47. The calculated F-value of GLTTL is found to be 0.885 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.475. In ML&Co the calculated F-value is 1.735 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.146. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore for both the factories, it is revealed that there is no association between health and safety aspects and different age groups of the respondents.

Regarding welfare facilities, for of different categories of respondents, groups of less than 25 years, 25 to 35 years, 35 to 45 years, 45 to 55 years, and more than 55 years, the mean score is as follows in GLTTL: 2.24, 1.91, 1.68, 1.11 and 0.65, respectively, and the estimated F-value in GLTTL is 2.436 and p-value 0.050; as p-value is equal to 0.05, it indicates significance. The test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. *Significance of relationship between welfare facilities and different age groups of respondents is established in GLTTL.* Regarding the ML&Co, the mean score of different age groups is as follows: 2.25, 1.63, 1.58, 1.63 and 0.87, respectively, and the generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.642 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.167. As p-value is greater than 0.05, it indicates insignificance. The test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no association between welfare facilities and different age groups of women workers in ML&Co.

Regarding working conditions, the mean score of different age groups of respondents is as follows: less than 25 years age group in GLTTL is 2.19 and in ML&Co is 1.71, 25 to 35 age group in GLTTL 1.64 and in ML&Co 1.77, 35 to 45 age group in GLTTL 1.87 and in ML&Co 2.58, 45 to 55 age group in GLTTL 2.04 and in ML&Co 2.48, and more than 55 years in GLTTL 1.56 and in ML&Co 2.20.

The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.344 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.848. In ML&Co, calculated F-value is 0.940 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.442. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the result is not found to be significant. Therefore, the test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted. This reveals that there is no influence of different age groups on working conditions in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter job security, the mean score of different age groups of respondents is as follows: up to 25 years age group in GLTTL is 0.17, in ML&Co 0.33, 25 to 35 years of age group in GLTTL 0.59 and in ML&Co 0.70, 35 to 45 years age group in GLTTL 0.64 and in ML&Co 0.98, 45 to 55 years age group in GLTTL 0.41 and in ML&Co 0.36, and more than 55 years age group in GLTTL 0.21 and in ML&Co 0.20. The obtained F-value in GLTTL is 0.403 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.806. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.829 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.508. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the result is not found to be significant. The test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no association between job security parameter and different age groups in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter compensation, the mean score of different age groups in the sequence mentioned above is as follows: in GLTTL is 0.76, -0.28, 0.37, 0.35, and -1.00, respectively, and the generated F-value in GLTTL is 3.380 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.011. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. *Hence significance is established between compensation and different age groups of women workers in GLTTL.* The mean score in ML&Co for different age groups in the same sequence is 0.19, 0.31, 0.58, 0.30 and 0.23, respectively, and the calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.288 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.885. As p-value is greater than 0.05, it indicates the result is not found to be significant. Therefore the test statistic reveals null hypothesis is accepted. There is no association between compensation and different age groups of workers in ML&Co.

Regarding the parameter career development, the mean score of different age groups in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.90, 0.42, -0.47, -1.15 and -1.21, respectively, and the obtained F-value in GLTTL is 7.162 and p-value

0.000. As p-value is less than 0.05, the result is highly significant. The test statistic reveals the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. *Significant relationship is established between career development and different age groups of workers in GLTTL*. The mean score in different age groups in ML&Co in the same sequence is -0.60, -0.14, -0.02, 0.05 and -1.13, respectively and the calculated F-value is 1.170 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.327. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the result is not found to be significant. The test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between compensation and various age groups in ML&Co. Here the calculated F-value is highly significant in GLTTL. The result shows highly significant association regarding career development and different age groups in GLTTL; whereas in ML&Co the association is not found to be significant. More effort needs to be made to improve efforts in this direction in ML&Co.

The mean score in different age groups regarding grievance redressal mechanism parameter is as follows: less than 25 years in GLTTL 0.95 and in ML&Co 0.21, 25 to 35 years in GLTTL 0.14 and in ML&Co 0.56, and 35 to 45 years in GLTTL 0.74 and in ML&Co 0.57, 45 to 55 years in GLTTL -0.05 and in ML&Co 0.25, above 55 years in GLTTL -0.71 and in ML&Co -0.17, and the obtained F-value in GLTTL is 6.789 and p-value 0.000. As p-value is less than 0.05, the result is found to be highly significant. The test statistic reveals that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. *There is significant association between grievance redressal mechanism and different age groups in GLTTL*. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.971 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.425. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the result is not found to be significant. The test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between grievance redressal mechanism and various age groups in ML&Co. Here the F-value is highly significant in GLTTL, where the grievance redressal mechanism is good; it reflects on work and working environment, whereas in ML&Co, the handling grievance is stated to be very slow. Further the company has focused on grievance procedure, and has been trying to reduce the unhealthy mechanism.

In respect of the parameter of social integration at work, the mean score of different age groups in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is -0.24,

0.30, 0.23, 0.20 and -0.76, respectively, and the generated F-value is 1.666 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.161. The mean score of different age groups in the same sequence in ML&Co is -0.13, 0.39, 0.34, -0.03 and 0.03, respectively. The calculated F-value is 0.723 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.578. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no association between social integration at work and different age groups in GLTTL and ML&Co organisations.

Regarding the parameter, social relevance of work life, the mean score of different age groups in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.02, 0.48, 0.40, 0.55 and 0.03, respectively, and the generated F-value is 0.581 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.677. In ML&Co, the mean score of different age groups in the same sequence is 0.67, 0.60, 0.60, 0.33 and -0.27, respectively, and the generated F-value is 0.679 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.608. As p-value in both the factories is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no association between social relevance of work life and different age groups in GLTTL and ML&Co.

9.4.1 Summing up

The foregoing analysis reveals that in GLTTL four parameters are found to be significant in their association with different age groups of respondents. These are welfare facilities, compensation, career development, and grievance redressal mechanism. In all other parameters, in GLTTL, the result has shown insignificance. In ML&Co for all parameters, the result has been found to be insignificant. In the mean score for all respondents totaling 150, ML&Co has consistently shown better performance in all parameters. Minus mean score is recorded for both the factories in career development. The result speaks of the need to plan for specific focus in the coming years to improve the QWL of women employees of different age groups.

Table 9-4
Mean Score value of the employees' Age on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

QWL Parameter	Organization	Less than 25 years		25 to 35 Years		35 to 45 years		45 to 55 Years		More than 55 Years		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.24	2.50	1.34	1.88	1.62	1.97	1.34	2.48	0.38	2.79	1.290	2.275	0.885	0.475
	ML&Co	1.40	2.00	2.11	2.19	1.69	1.83	1.92	2.62	0.47	2.18	1.670	2.185	1.735	0.146
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	2.24	1.69	1.91	1.77	1.68	2.18	1.11	1.87	0.65	2.04	1.533	1.970	2.436*	0.050
	ML&Co	2.25	1.33	1.63	1.62	1.58	1.80	1.63	1.37	0.87	2.25	1.636	1.672	1.642	0.167
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.19	2.23	1.64	1.91	1.87	1.77	2.04	2.61	1.56	2.41	1.876	2.172	0.344	0.848
	ML&Co	1.71	2.62	1.77	2.47	2.58	2.53	2.48	1.70	2.20	2.46	2.193	2.369	0.940	0.442
Job Security	GLTTL	0.17	2.04	0.59	1.82	0.64	1.23	0.41	1.90	0.21	1.71	0.453	1.717	0.403	0.806
	ML&Co	0.33	2.51	0.70	1.78	0.98	1.83	0.36	1.68	0.20	2.14	0.600	1.942	0.829	0.508
Compensation	GLTTL	0.76	1.68	-0.28	1.52	0.37	1.71	0.35	2.01	-1.00	1.27	0.126	1.770	3.380*	0.011
	ML&Co	0.19	1.84	0.31	1.84	0.58	1.47	0.30	1.68	0.23	1.66	0.360	1.669	0.288	0.885
Career Development	GLTTL	0.90	2.00	0.42	1.64	-0.47	1.53	-1.15	2.02	-1.21	1.71	-0.356	1.925	7.162*	0.000
	ML&Co	-0.60	2.27	-0.14	2.50	-0.02	1.65	0.05	1.78	-1.13	2.38	-0.240	2.081	1.170	0.327
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.95	0.84	0.14	1.30	0.74	1.15	-0.05	1.28	-0.71	1.34	0.263	1.294	6.789*	0.000
	ML&Co	0.21	1.70	0.56	1.70	0.57	1.23	0.25	1.25	-0.17	1.57	0.366	1.466	0.971	0.425
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.24	1.49	0.30	1.36	0.23	1.65	0.20	1.71	-0.76	1.77	0.056	1.616	1.666	0.161
	ML &Co	-0.13	1.88	0.39	1.57	0.34	1.48	-0.03	1.22	0.03	1.30	0.166	1.502	0.723	0.578
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.02	1.42	0.48	1.75	0.40	1.51	0.55	1.35	0.03	2.44	0.363	1.629	0.581	0.677
	ML&Co	0.67	2.39	0.60	2.30	0.60	1.57	0.33	1.83	-0.27	2.24	0.466	2.010	0.679	0.608

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.5 Religion and Quality of Work Life

Based on religion, the respondents are classified into Hindus, Muslims and Christians, Table 9-5 presents the distribution of mean score of parameters and their significance levels by religion of the respondents.

As regards health and safety, the mean score of various religious groups is as follows: for Hindu respondents in GLTTL is 1.37 and in ML&Co 1.68, Muslims in GLTTL is 1.95 and in ML&Co 1.30, and Christians in GLTTL is 0.85 and in ML&Co 1.88. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.672 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.191. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.479 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.620. As the p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the F-test reveals the acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no significant association of health and safety with Hindus, Muslims and Christians in both the factories.

As regards the welfare facilities, the mean score religious group-wise is as follows: Hindus in GLTTL 1.25 and in ML&Co 1.53, Muslims in GLTTL 2.03 and in ML&Co 1.86, and Christians in GLTTL 1.89 and in ML&Co 1.76. The calculated F-value is 2.257 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.108 in GLTTL. The estimated F-value in ML&Co is 0.481 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.619. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between welfare facilities and religious groups in both the factories. It is important for the company to state clearly the needs of employees taking their religious interests into account.

Regarding working conditions parameter, the mean score religious group-wise is as follows: Hindus in GLTTL is 2.00 and in ML&Co 2.29, Muslims in GLTTL 1.29 and in ML&Co 2.52, and Christians in GLTTL 1.89 and in ML&Co 1.75. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.833 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.437. In ML&Co, the generated F-value is 0.915 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.403. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. In working conditions at work place, there is no association with religion in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter job security, the mean score religious group-wise is as follows: Hindus in GLTTL is 0.34 and in ML&Co is 0.65, Muslims in GLTTL

0.24 and in ML&Co 0.86, and Christians in GLTTL 0.76 and in ML&Co 0.31. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.032 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.359. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 0.647 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.525. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between job security and religious groups. The management must try to give job security to persons of all religions.

As regards compensation in the organisation, mean score religious group-wise is as follows: in GLTTL for Hindus, Muslims and Christians 0.00, 0.21, and 0.34, respectively, and generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.563 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.571. The mean score religious group-wise in ML&Co for Hindus, Muslims and Christians is 0.31, 0.55 and 0.38, respectively. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 0.177, and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.838. In case of both the factories, as p-value is higher than 0.05, the result reveals insignificance through the acceptance of null hypothesis. Religion does not influence compensation paid by the two companies.

The mean score of career development parameter among the Hindus, Muslims and Christians in GLTTL is -0.70, -0.11 and 0.20, respectively, and the generated F-value is 3.488 and p-value 0.33. In ML&Co, the mean score religious group-wise is: -0.30, 0.43 and -0.50, respectively, and the generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.472 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.233. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in case of both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no association between career development and religious groups.

Relating to the grievance redressal mechanism parameter religious group-wise mean score: of Hindus in GLTTL 0.08 and in ML&Co 0.31, Muslims in GLTTL 1.16 and in ML&Co 0.43, and Christians in GLTTL 0.24 and in ML&Co 0.47, and the obtained F-value in GLTTL is 5.754 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.004. As p-value is less than 0.05 in GLTTL, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis, and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *The result shows significance of association between the grievance redressal mechanism and religion in GLTTL.* The women workers feel happy in GLTTL about the grievance redressal mechanism, as the redressal procedure is good; In ML&Co, the estimated F -value is 0.182 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.834. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance

of the null hypothesis. There is no association between grievance redressal mechanism and religious groups in ML&Co.

Regarding the parameter of social integration at work, the mean score of Hindus, Muslims, and Christians in GLTTL is -0.16, 1.00 and 0.08, respectively, and the generated F-value is 4.202 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.017. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *Social integration at work and religious groups are associated in a significant way in GLTTL.* The mean score in ML&Co religious group-wise is -0.01, 0.48 and 0.42, respectively, and the generated F-value is 1.584 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.209. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. Therefore there is no significant association between social integration at work life and religious groups in ML&Co. Regarding the association of religious groups with social integration at work, GLTTL has shown significance, and ML&Co, has shown insignificance. This is related to the management policies or approaches, which the respondents have reflected upon.

Regarding the social relevance of work life in the organisation, the mean score religious group-wise in GLTTL for the Hindus, Muslims and Christians is 0.15, 0.55, and 0.70, respectively. In ML&Co the mean score religious group-wise is 0.45, 0.91 and 0.24, respectively, and the generated F-value is 0.770 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.465. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. This reveals lack of association between social relevance of work life and religious groups in both the factories.

9.5.1 Summing up

The analysis reveals the significant results as follows: Two parameters of QWL, grievance redressal mechanism and social integration at work in GLTTL have shown significance. In all other parameters, GLTTL has not shown significance. In respect of ML&Co, none of the parameters has been able to show significance. In total responses, mean score of ML&Co for various parameters has been higher than that of GLTTL. In career development, mean score recorded for both the factories is negative for total respondents, and also for Hindus; negative sign is shown for Muslims in GLTTL, and for Christians in ML&Co.

Table 9-5
Mean Score of the employees by Religion on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Religion / QWL Parameter	organization	Hindus		Muslims		Christians		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.37	2.39	1.95	2.34	0.85	1.96	1.290	2.275	1.672	0.191
	ML&Co	1.68	2.15	1.30	2.53	1.88	2.07	1.670	2.185	0.479	0.620
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.25	1.98	2.03	1.73	1.89	1.99	1.533	1.970	2.257	0.108
	ML&Co	1.53	1.72	1.86	1.72	1.76	1.54	1.636	1.672	0.481	0.619
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.00	2.27	1.29	1.90	1.89	2.08	1.876	2.172	0.833	0.437
	ML&Co	2.29	2.55	2.52	2.29	1.75	1.89	2.193	2.369	0.915	0.403
Job Security	GLTTL	0.34	1.69	0.24	1.94	0.76	1.68	0.453	1.717	1.032	0.359
	ML&Co	0.65	1.96	0.86	1.51	0.31	2.14	0.600	1.942	0.647	0.525
Compensation	GLTTL	0.00	1.73	0.21	1.86	0.34	1.82	0.126	1.770	0.563	0.571
	ML&Co	0.31	1.76	0.55	1.60	0.38	1.51	0.360	1.669	0.177	0.838
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.70	1.91	-0.11	1.85	0.20	1.88	-0.356	1.925	3.488	0.33
	ML&Co	-0.30	2.15	0.43	1.67	-0.50	2.10	-0.240	2.081	1.472	0.233
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.08	1.33	1.16	1.30	0.24	1.08	0.263	1.294	5.754*	0.004
	ML&Co	0.31	1.42	0.43	1.38	0.47	1.65	0.366	1.466	0.182	0.834
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.16	1.69	1.00	1.31	0.08	1.47	0.056	1.616	4.202*	0.017
	ML&Co	-0.01	1.58	0.48	1.61	0.42	1.17	0.166	1.502	1.584	0.209
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.15	1.76	0.55	1.28	0.70	1.44	0.363	1.629	1.865	0.159
	ML&Co	0.45	2.06	0.91	1.87	0.24	1.97	0.466	2.010	0.770	0.465

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.6 Community and Quality of Work Life

The Indian society is traditionally divided on the basis of caste. This influences the way the society functions in a number of ways. Even today the caste plays a dominant role in all functional activities. The respondents are classified according to community as Forward Caste (OC); Backward Caste (BC), Scheduled Caste (SC), and Scheduled Tribe (ST). Table 9-6 explains the distribution of the mean score of QWL parameters and their significance levels among the employees.

About the health and safety , the mean score of (OC) community in GLTTL is 1.44 and in ML&Co 1.75, (BC) community in GLTTL is 1.57 and in ML&Co 1.33, (SC) community in GLTTL is 0.85 and in ML&Co 1.95, and (ST) community in GLTTL is 0.50 and in ML&Co 1.00. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.022 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.385. In ML&Co calculated F-value is 0.687 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.568. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. Association between health and safety and community groups is not significant in both the factories.

As regards welfare facilities, the mean score of (OC) community in GLTTL is 1.35 and in ML&Co 1.80, of (BC) community in GLTTL is 1.45 and in ML&Co 1.23, of (SC) community in GLTTL is 1.79 and in ML&Co 1.67, of (ST) community in GLTTL is 2.50 and in ML&Co 1.11. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.744 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.528. In ML&Co, the calculated F-value is 1.094 and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.345. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. There is no association between welfare facilities and community groupings in both the factories.

Regarding the working conditions parameter, the mean score of (OC) in GLTTL is 1.59 and in ML&Co 2.51, of (BC) in GLTTL is 2.20 and in ML&Co 2.27, of (SC) in GLTTL is 1.90 and in ML&Co 1.50, and that of (ST) in GLTTL is 1.50 and in ML&Co 1.17. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.726 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.538. In ML&Co, the generated F-value is 1.954 and p-value 0.123. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance

of the null hypothesis. Association between working conditions and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

Regarding the job security parameter, the mean score of (OC) community, (BC) community, (SC) community and (ST) community are in GLTTL 0.38, 0.32, 0.75 and 0.00, respectively. And the generated F-value is 0.641 and p-value is 0.590. The mean score of ML&Co is 0.76, 0.75, 0.29 and -0.33, respectively, the calculated F-value is 1.175 and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.322. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The association between job security and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

The mean score of compensation parameter of (OC) community, (BC) community, (SC) community, and (ST) community are in GLTTL -0.21, 0.34, 0.19 and 1.50, respectively. The estimated F-value is 1.735 and p-value 0.162. Mean score of (OC) community, (BC) community, (SC) community, and (ST) community in ML&Co is 0.43, 0.08, 0.36 and 0.50, respectively. The generated F-value is 0.317 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.813. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The association between compensation and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

The mean score of career development parameter among the (OC) community, (BC) community, (SC) community and (ST) community are in GLTTL -0.79, -0.30, 0.17 and -0.63, respectively. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 2.050 and p-value 0.109. The mean score in the same sequence in ML&Co is -0.09, -0.31, -0.07 and -2.00, respectively. The calculated F-value is 2.429 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.680. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The association between career development and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

Relating to the parameter of grievance redressal mechanism , the mean score of (OC) community in GLTTL is 0.37 and in ML&Co 0.37, of (BC) community in GLTTL 0.13 and in ML&Co 0.38, of (SC) community in GLTTL 0.24 and in ML&Co 0.34, and of (ST) community in GLTTL 0.63 and in ML&Co 0.39. The

generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.402 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.752. In ML&Co the generated F-value is 0.004 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 1.000. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. Association between grievance redressal mechanism and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

About the parameter of social integration at work, the mean score of (OC) community, (BC) community, (SC) community and (ST) community in GLTTL is -0.80, 0.22, -0.01 and 0.63, respectively. And the generated F-value is 0.496 and p-value 0.686. The mean score in the same sequence in ML&Co is 0.12, 0.10, 0.48 and -0.17, respectively. The calculated F-value is 0.622 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.602. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. Association between social integration at work and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

The mean score of social relevance of work life in the organization among (OC) community in GLTTL is 0.10 and in ML&Co 0.55, (BC) community in GLTTL 0.38 and in ML&Co 0.62, (SC) community in GLTTL 0.64 and in ML&Co 0.31, and (ST) community in GLTTL 0.88 and in ML&Co -0.22. The estimated F-value in GLTTL is 1.024 and p-value (asymp.sig.) is 0.384. In ML&Co the generated F-value is 0.498 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.684. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. Association between social relevance of work life and community grouping is insignificant in both the factories.

9.6.1 Summing up

The analysis of the above table shows that the F-value of the GLTTL and ML&Co in all QWL parameters is not found to be significant. Mean score of total responses in ML&Co has been higher than that of GLTTL in all parameters. In career development, negative sign is noticed for mean score in total respondents, open community and ST for both the factories. In respect of SC, it is noticed only in ML&Co.

Table 9-6
Mean Score Value of the employees' Community on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

QWL Parameter	Organization	Open Category		Backward Class		Schedule Caste		Schedule Tribe		Total (150)		Significance	
Community		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.44	2.39	1.57	2.40	0.85	2.01	0.50	1.15	1.290	2.275	1.022	0.385
	ML&Co	1.75	2.26	1.33	1.93	1.95	2.18	1.00	2.26	1.670	2.185	0.687	0.562
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.35	1.99	1.45	1.96	1.79	2.01	2.50	1.29	1.533	1.970	0.744	0.528
	ML&Co	1.80	1.72	1.23	1.48	1.67	1.71	1.11	1.54	1.636	1.672	1.094	0.354
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.59	2.31	2.20	2.11	1.90	2.08	1.50	2.12	1.876	2.172	0.726	0.538
	ML&Co	2.51	2.55	2.27	1.83	1.50	1.94	1.17	2.80	2.193	2.369	1.954	0.123
Job Security	GLTTL	0.38	1.96	0.32	1.46	0.75	1.73	0.00	1.08	0.453	1.717	0.641	0.590
	ML&Co	0.76	1.89	0.75	1.78	0.29	2.26	-0.33	1.62	0.600	1.942	1.175	0.322
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.21	1.73	0.34	1.76	0.19	1.78	1.50	1.83	0.126	1.770	1.735	0.162
	ML&Co	0.43	1.76	0.08	1.51	0.36	1.74	0.50	**0.97**	0.360	1.669	0.317	0.813
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.79	1.94	-0.30	1.85	0.17	1.94	-0.63	1.49	-0.356	1.925	2.050	0.109
	ML&Co	-0.09	2.07	-0.31	1.68	-0.07	2.41	-2.00	1.54	-0.240	2.081	2.429	0.68
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.37	1.52	0.13	1.23	0.24	1.03	0.63	1.55	0.263	1.294	0.402	0.752
	ML&Co	0.37	1.38	0.38	1.31	0.34	1.86	0.39	1.56	0.366	1.466	0.004	1.000
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.08	1.67	0.22	1.70	-0.01	1.52	0.63	0.48	0.056	1.616	0.496	0.686
	ML&Co	0.12	1.62	0.10	1.24	0.48	1.24	-0.17	1.80	0.166	1.502	0.622	0.602
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.10	1.92	0.38	1.43	0.64	1.44	0.88	1.44	0.363	1.629	1.024	0.384
	ML&Co	0.55	2.05	0.62	2.11	0.31	1.78	-0.22	2.15	0.466	2.010	0.498	0.684

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.7 Demographic Background and Quality of Work Life

The demographic background of employees plays a vital role in the performance of employees. The performance of an employee is influenced by the place where he hails from/ resides and in what position he is performing his duties. Based on the dwelling background of the respondents, they can be divided into Urban, Semi-Urban and Rural. The dwelling background is likely to have its influence on various qualities of work life parameters under study. Table 9-7 presents the distribution of mean score of Quality of Work Life (QWL) parameters and their significance levels among different dwelling backgrounds of the employees viz., Urban, Semi-urban and Rural.

The mean score regarding health and safety in the organization of GLTTL for urban, semi-urban and rural respondents is 1.55, 0.86 and 1.03, respectively, and the estimated F-value is 1.214, and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.300. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis. The result shown insignificance of association between health and safety and residence classification in GLTTL. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is 2.10, 0.78 and 1.88, respectively. The calculated F-value is 3.203 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.043. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and *acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of significance of association between the two variables namely, health and safety and place of residence in ML&Co.*

As regards the welfare facilities, the mean score of urban background respondents in GLTTL is 1.51 and in ML&Co 0.80; of semi-urban background respondents in GLTTL is 1.89 and in ML&Co 1.95; and of rural background respondents in GLTTL is 1.41 and in ML&Co 1.59. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.443 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.643. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.197 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.305. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between welfare facilities and residence classification in both the factories.

About the working conditions, the mean score of urban background respondents in GLTTL is 2.27 and in ML&Co 1.90, of semi-urban background respondents in GLTTL is 0.86 and in ML&Co 2.18; and of rural background respondents in GLTTL is 1.66 and in ML&Co 2.21. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 4.110 and p-value 0.18. Calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.040 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.960. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between working conditions and residence classification in both the factories.

The mean score regarding the job security in GLTTL organization among urban background respondents is 0.49, semi-urban background 0.41 and rural background 0.40, and the calculated F-value is 0.50 and p-value 0.951. In ML&Co organization among urban background respondents, the mean score is 0.20, of semi-urban background 0.85, and of rural background 0.55. The estimated F-value in GLTTL is 0.386 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.680. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.386 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.680. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between job security and residence classification in both the factories.

Regarding the compensation parameter, the mean score of urban background respondents in GLTTL is 0.17 and in ML&Co 0.40, of semi-urban background respondents in GLTTL is 0.07 and in ML&Co 0.38, and of rural background respondents in GLTTL is 0.08 and in ML&Co 0.35, respectively. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.055 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.946. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.006 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.994. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between compensation and residence classification in both the factories.

Relating to the parameter career development, the mean score of urban background respondents in GLTTL is -0.37 and in ML&Co -0.80, of semi-urban

background respondents in GLTTL is -0.50 and in ML&Co -0.52; and of rural background respondents in GLTTL is -0.27 and in ML&Co -0.14, and the generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.105 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.900. The estimated F-value in ML&Co is 0.566 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.569. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between career development and residence classification in both the factories.

The mean score regarding grievance redressal mechanism parameter in GLTTL among urban, semi-urban and rural background respondents is 0.35, 0.16, and 0.16, respectively. The estimated F-value is 0.380 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.685. The mean score in ML&Co among urban back- ground, semi-urban background and rural background respondents is 0.50, 0.00 and 0.46, respectively, and the calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.177 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.311. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between grievance redressal mechanism and residence classification in both the factories.

The mean score of social integration at work parameter for urban background in GLTTL is 0.25 and in ML&Co -1.10, semi-urban background in GLTTL is -0.43 and in ML&Co 0.30, and rural background in GLTTL is -0.05 and in ML&Co 0.19. The estimated F-value which is worked out in GLTTL is 1.716 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.183. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.929 and p-value (asump.sig.) 0.149. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between social integration at work and residence classification in both the factories.

Regarding the social relevance of work life parameter, mean score of the respondents for urban background in GLTTL is 0.37 and in ML&Co -0.70, semi-urban background in GLTTL is 0.20 and in ML&Co 0.20, rural background in GLTTL is 0.42 and in ML&Co 0.59. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.136 and p-value (asymp.sig.)

0.873. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.317 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.271. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables. The result shows insignificance of association between social relevance of work life and residence classification in both the factories.

9.7.1 Summing up

Significance of association is noticed between health and safety and place of residence in ML&Co. With the exception of this parameter noticed in ML&Co, both in ML&Co and GLTTL, no association has been noticed in the context of place of residence. In total mean score, ML&Co has recorded better performance. Mean score for career development, is recorded as negative in total as well as in all the three places of residence. Negative mean score is also recorded in a few other cases.

Table 9-7

Mean Score of the employees' Residence - Urban/Semi-Urban/Rural background on QWL parameters and their significance levels

Residence / QWL Parameter	Organization	Urban		Semi-Urban		Rural		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.55	2.24	0.86	1.70	1.03	2.54	1.290	2.275	1.214	0.300
	ML&Co	2.10	1.56	0.78	2.48	1.88	2.08	1.670	2.185	3.203*	0.043
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.51	1.94	1.89	2.60	1.41	1.68	1.533	1.970	0.443	0.643
	ML&Co	0.80	1.35	1.95	1.73	1.59	1.67	1.636	1.672	1.197	0.305
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.27	2.14	0.86	1.77	1.66	2.25	1.876	2.172	4.110	0.180
	ML&Co	1.90	1.64	2.18	2.55	2.21	2.36	2.193	2.369	0.040	0.960
Job Security	GLTTL	0.49	1.58	0.41	1.70	0.40	1.98	0.453	1.717	0.50	0.951
	ML&Co	0.20	1.92	0.85	2.20	0.55	1.88	0.600	1.942	0.386	0.680
Compensation	GLTTL	0.17	1.88	0.07	1.71	0.08	1.63	0.126	1.770	0.055	0.946
	ML&Co	0.40	1.47	0.38	1.88	0.35	1.63	0.360	1.669	0.006	0.994
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.37	1.96	-0.50	1.88	-0.27	1.92	-0.356	1.925	0.105	0.900
	ML&Co	-0.80	1.75	-0.52	2.08	-0.14	2.10	-0.240	2.081	0.566	0.569
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.35	1.29	0.16	1.24	0.16	1.35	0.263	1.294	0.380	0.685
	ML&Co	0.50	0.61	0.00	1.59	0.46	1.45	0.366	1.466	1.177	0.311
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.25	1.75	-0.43	1.13	-0.05	1.54	0.056	1.616	1.716	0.183
	ML&Co	-1.10	1.56	0.30	1.08	0.19	1.58	0.166	1.502	1.929	0.149
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.37	1.65	0.20	1.62	0.42	1.63	0.363	1.629	0.136	0.873
	ML&Co	-0.70	1.20	0.20	2.08	0.59	2.01	0.466	2.010	1.317	0.271

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level.

9.8 Employees' Education Level and Quality of Work Life

In respect of the level of education categories, the respondents have been classified into four types, viz., Below SSC, Secondary School Certificate (SSC), Intermediate, and Graduate. Table 9-8 presents distribution of mean score of QWL parameters across different levels of education of respondents and their significance levels.

About the health and safety, the mean score of respondents with below SSC qualification in GLTTL is 1.30 and in ML & Co 1.32, of respondents with SSC qualification in GLTTL is 2.21 and in ML&Co 2.31, of respondents with Intermediate qualification in GLTTL is 0.75 and in ML&Co 2.25, and of the respondents with graduate qualification in GLTTL is 2.50 and in ML&Co 1.83. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.034 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.384.

Calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.254 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.296. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys that association is insignificant between health and safety and education level in both the factories.

As regards welfare facilities, the mean score of respondents for below SSC qualification in GLTTL is 1.88 and in ML&Co 1.47, of SSC qualification in GLTTL is 1.93 and in ML&Co 1.81; of Intermediate qualification in GLTTL is 1.50 and in ML&Co 1.50; and of graduate qualification in GLTTL is 0.75 and in ML&Co 4.00. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.280 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.840. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 2.292 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.834. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys that association is insignificant between welfare facilities and educational level in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter of working conditions, the mean score of respondents with below SSC qualification in GLTTL is 1.86 and in ML&Co 2.03; of respondents with SSC qualification in GLTTL is 1.55 and in ML&Co 1.75; of respondents with Intermediate qualification in GLTTL is 2.75 and in ML&Co 2.25; and of graduate qualification in GLTTL is 3.75 and in ML&Co 3.17. The generated F-value in

GLTTL is 1.034 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.384. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 0.288 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.834. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys that there is no association between working conditions and educational level in both the factories.

Regarding the Job security parameter, the mean score of respondents with different education levels in the sequence mentioned above, in GLTTL is 0.62, 0.67, -1.25 and 0.75, respectively. And their F-value is 1.448, and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.237. The mean score of ML&Co in the above mentioned sequence is 0.35, 0.63, 0.38 and 1.67, respectively, and the F-value in GLTTL is 1.448 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.237. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.557 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.632. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys the absence of association between job security and educational level in both the factories.

The mean score regarding compensation parameter in the organisation of different education levels in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.12, 0.36, 0.13 and -0.75, respectively, and the calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.300 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.825. The mean score in the same sequence of ML&Co is 0.19, 0.63, -0.88 and 1.33, respectively. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.195 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.317. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between compensation and educational level in both the factories.

The mean score of career development parameter among the respondents with different education levels the below SSC, SSC, Intermediate, and Graduate qualification in GLTTL is 0.07, 0.19, 1.25 and 0.75, respectively and the F-value is 0.526 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.666. The mean score of ML&Co in the same sequence as mentioned above is -0.38, 0.00, -0.75 and -0.17, respectively, and the generated F-value in ML&Co is 0.175 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.913. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null

hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between career development and educational level in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter grievance redressal mechanism, the mean score of respondents with below SSC qualification in GLTTL is 0.32 and in ML&Co 0.27, of SSC qualification in GLTTL is 0.55 and in ML&Co 0.84, of Intermediate qualification in GLTTL is 1.13 and in ML&Co 1.38, and of Graduate qualification in GLTTL is 0.75 and in ML&Co 0.83, and the obtained F-value in GLTTL is 0.547 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.652. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.329 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.271. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and educational level in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter of social integration at work life, the mean score of respondents with different education levels in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.11, 0.45, 0.25 and -0.25, respectively, and the estimated F-value in GLTTL is 0.233 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.873. The mean score of ML&Co in the same sequence as mentioned earlier is 0.36, 0.03, 0.25 and 0.17, respectively. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 0.179 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.910. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between social integration at work and educational levels in both the factories.

The mean score regarding social relevance of work life organization among the respondents with different education levels in the same sequence as mentioned earlier in GLTTL is 0.23, 0.52, -0.13 and 1.75, respectively, and the estimated F-value in GLTTL is 0.802 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.497. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and indicates absence of association between social relevance of work life and educational level in GLTTL. For different education levels in the same sequence as mentioned earlier, mean score in ML&Co is 0.19, 1.22, -0.50 and 3.17, respectively, and the calculated F-value in ML&Co is 3.508 and p-value (asymp.sig.) 0.019. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association between

variables. *Association between social relevance of work life and educational qualification in ML&Co is significant.*

9.8.1 Summing up

The above analysis shows that the F-value of all parameters in GLTTL is not found to be significant, and in ML&Co, social relevance is a significant factor, and all the remaining parameters are not found to be significant. In total mean score, ML&Co performance has been better than that of GLTTL in all parameters. Mean score recorded is negative for career development in total score. Negative mean score is recorded in a few other cases in both the factories.

Table 9-8
Mean Score of QWL parameters across Educational Qualifications
of employees and their significance levels

Educational Qualification / QWL Parameter	Organization	Bellow SSC		SSC		Inter		Graduate		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.30	2.18	2.21	2.39	0.75	2.18	2.50	4.24	1.290	2.275	1.034	0.384
	ML&Co	1.32	1.92	2.31	1.84	2.25	3.30	1.83	1.04	1.670	2.185	1.254	0.296
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.88	1.91	1.93	1.62	1.50	3.29	0.75	1.77	1.533	1.970	0.280	0.840
	ML&Co	1.47	1.67	1.81	1.73	1.50	1.47	4.00	.87	1.636	1.672	2.292	0.834
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.86	2.02	1.55	1.91	2.75	1.76	3.75	3.18	1.876	2.172	1.034	0.384
	ML&Co	2.03	2.23	1.75	3.13	2.25	3.80	3.17	1.44	2.193	2.369	0.288	0.834
Job Security	GLTTL	0.62	1.62	0.67	2.08	-1.25	1.26	0.75	1.77	0.453	1.717	1.448	0.237
	ML&Co	0.35	1.82	0.63	1.60	0.38	2.59	1.67	0.29	0.600	1.942	0.557	0.632
Compensation	GLTTL	0.12	1.73	0.36	1.60	0.13	1.44	-0.75	1.77	0.126	1.770	0.300	0.825
	ML&Co	0.19	1.66	0.63	1.90	-0.88	2.75	1.33	1.26	0.360	1.669	1.195	0.317
Career Development	GLTTL	0.07	2.00	0.19	1.59	1.25	2.60	0.75	1.06	-0.356	1.925	0.526	0.666
	ML&Co	-0.38	2.27	0.00	1.52	-0.75	4.52	-0.17	0.58	-0.240	2.081	0.175	0.913
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.32	1.31	0.55	1.46	1.13	0.85	0.75	.35	0.263	1.294	0.547	0.652
	ML&Co	0.27	1.40	0.84	1.54	1.38	0.75	0.83	2.25	0.366	1.466	1.329	0.271
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.11	1.63	0.45	1.71	0.25	2.90	-0.25	1.77	0.056	1.616	0.233	0.873
	ML&Co	0.36	1.46	0.03	1.78	0.25	2.53	0.17	3.18	0.166	1.502	0.179	0.910
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.23	1.75	0.52	1.35	-0.13	0.95	1.75	.35	0.363	1.629	0.802	0.497
	ML&Co	0.19	1.81	1.22	1.89	-0.50	3.83	3.17	1.04	0.466	2.010	3.508*	0.019

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level.

9.9 Family Size and Quality of Work Life

Based on the number of members in the family, the respondents have been divided into four groups. Table 9-9 explains the distribution of mean score of QWL parameters and their significant levels by size of the family of the respondents.

About the health and safety, the mean score of respondents for single member in GLTTL is -0.50 and in ML& Co 0.96, of respondents having up to 2 to 3 members in GLTTL is 1.07 and in ML&Co 1.79, of respondents having up to 4 to 5 members in GLTTL is 1.18 and in ML&Co 1.66, of the respondents having more than 5 members in GLTTL is 1.99 and in ML&Co 1.78. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 2.974 and p-value 0.340. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 0.528 and p-value 0.664. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys that there is no association between health and safety and family size in both the factories.

As regards welfare facilities, the mean score of respondents having single member in GLTTL is 0.43 and in ML&Co 0.81, of 2 to 3 members in GLTTL is 1.81 and in ML&Co 1.73, of 4 to 5 members in GLTTL is 1.47 and in ML&Co 1.81, of more than 5 members in GLTTL is 1.59 and in ML&Co 1.62. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.004 and p-value 0.356. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.285 and p-value 0.282. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys that there is no association between welfare facilities and family size in both the factories.

Regarding the working conditions parameter, the mean score of respondents having a single member in GLTTL is 0.86 and in ML&Co 1.19, of respondents between 2 to 4 members, in GLTTL is 1.63 and in ML&Co 2.01, between 4 to 5 members in GLTTL is 1.88 and in ML&Co 2.33, of above 5 members in GLTTL is 2.26 and in ML&Co 2.43. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 1.088 and p-value 0.356. In ML&Co the F-value is 1.071 and p-value 0.363. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between working conditions and family size in both the factories.

The mean score of job security parameter among single member respondents in GLTTL is -0.07 and in ML&Co -0.12, between 2 to 3 family members in GLTTL is 0.74 and in ML&Co 0.37, within 4 to 5 family members in GLTTL is 0.34 and in ML&Co 0.68, and in above 5 members in GLTTL is 0.49 and in ML&Co 0.85. And the generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.652 and p-value 0.583. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.079 and p-value 0.360. As p-value is greater than 0.05, in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between job security and family size in both the factories.

The mean score with regard to compensation in the organization of respondents in single member in GLTTL is -0.21 and in ML&Co 0.12, respondents having up to 2 to 3 members in GLTTL is 0.56 and in ML&Co 0.29, respondents with 4 to 5 members in GLTTL is -0.23 and in ML&Co 0.14, respondents with above 5 family members in GLTTL is 0.41 and in ML&Co is 0.67. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 2.077 and p-value 0.106. The generated F-value in ML&Co is 1.014 and p-value 0.388. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys the absence of association between compensation and family size in both the factories.

Regarding the parameter of career growth and development, the mean score of single member respondents in GLTTL is -0.64 and in ML&Co -0.88, 2 to 3 family members in GLTTL is -0.56 and in ML&Co -0.71, of 4 to 5 family members in GLTTL is -0.40 and in ML&Co -0.30, and in above 5 members in GLTTL is -0.06 and in ML&Co 0.28. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.494 and p-value 0.687. The estimated F-value in ML&Co is 2.200 and p-value 0.091. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys the absence of association between career development and family size in both the factories.

Relating to the grievance redressal mechanism parameter, the mean score of single member respondents, of 2 to 3 family members, of 4 to 5 family members, and above 5 family members in GLTTL is 0.64, 0.21, 0.12 and 0.49, respectively, and that

the estimated F-value in GLTTL is 0.902 and p-value 0.442. The mean score regarding ML&Co in the same sequence as mentioned above is -0.12, 0.34, 0.25 and 0.60, respectively. The calculated F-value in ML&Co is 1.037 and p-value 0.378. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys the absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and family size in both the factories.

Regarding social integration at work parameter, the mean score of single member family in GLTTL is -0.50 and in ML&Co -0.15, of 2 to 3 family members in GLTTL is 0.03 and in ML&Co 0.19, of 4 to 5 members in GLTTL is 0.08 and ML&Co 0.10 and of more than 5 members in GLTTL is 0.14 and in ML&Co 0.29. The generated F-value in GLTTL is 0.314 and p-value 0.815. In ML&Co, the F-value is 0.338, and p-value 0.798. As p-value greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between social integration at work and family size in both the factories.

The mean score of social relevance of work life parameter among the respondents in the sequence mentioned above, in GLTTL is 0.50, 0.13, 0.44 and 0.41, respectively. The calculated F-value in GLTTL is 0.318 and p-value 0.812. Among the respondents in the sequence mentioned above, mean score in ML&Co is -0.54, 0.29, 0.64 and 0.68, respectively, and the estimated F-value is 1.500 and p-value 0.217. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between social relevance of work life and family size in both the factories.

9.9.1 Summing up

The analysis reveals that on all parameters, in GLTTL and ML&Co, family size does not reveal association, as the results show insignificance of association. In total mean score, ML&Co has shown better performance in respect of all parameters. For career development, negative mean score is noticed in a few family sizes for both factories. Negative score is also noticed for a few other parameters in either of the factories.

Table 9-9
Mean Score of employees' Family size on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Family Size / QWL Parameter	Organization	Single member		2 to 3 Members		4 to 5 Members		More than 5 Members		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	-0.50	2.74	1.07	2.32	1.18	2.25	1.99	2.03	1.290	2.275	2.974	0.340
	ML&Co	0.96	2.85	1.79	2.28	1.66	2.00	1.78	2.14	1.670	2.185	0.528	0.664
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	0.43	1.97	1.81	2.33	1.47	1.83	1.59	1.85	1.533	1.970	1.004	0.356
	ML&Co	0.81	1.89	1.73	1.62	1.81	1.68	1.62	1.63	1.636	1.672	1.285	0.282
Working Conditions	GLTTL	0.86	2.38	1.63	2.41	1.88	2.15	2.26	1.94	1.876	2.172	1.088	0.356
	ML&Co	1.19	2.52	2.01	2.34	2.33	2.09	2.43	2.57	2.193	2.369	1.071	0.363
Job Security	GLTTL	-0.07	2.42	0.74	1.74	0.34	1.74	0.49	1.53	0.453	1.717	0.652	0.583
	ML&Co	-0.12	3.10	0.37	1.64	0.68	1.88	0.85	1.83	0.600	1.942	1.079	0.360
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.21	1.70	0.56	1.89	-0.23	1.73	0.41	1.67	0.126	1.770	2.077	0.106
	ML&Co	0.12	1.91	0.29	1.60	0.14	1.80	0.67	1.53	0.360	1.669	1.014	0.388
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.64	2.90	-0.56	1.69	-0.40	2.12	-0.06	1.59	-0.356	1.925	0.494	0.687
	ML&Co	-0.88	2.45	-0.71	1.87	-0.30	1.86	0.28	2.23	-0.240	2.081	2.200	0.091
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.64	1.03	0.21	1.16	0.12	1.37	0.49	1.31	0.263	1.294	0.902	0.442
	ML&Co	-0.12	1.26	0.34	1.44	0.25	1.28	0.60	1.66	0.366	1.466	1.037	0.378
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.50	2.45	0.03	1.54	0.08	1.47	0.14	1.80	0.056	1.616	0.314	0.815
	ML&Co	-0.15	1.52	0.19	1.18	0.10	1.65	0.29	1.57	0.166	1.502	0.338	0.798
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.50	1.19	0.13	1.18	0.44	1.83	0.41	1.70	0.363	1.629	0.318	0.812
	ML&Co	-0.54	2.67	0.29	1.91	0.64	1.98	0.68	1.90	0.466	2.010	1.500	0.217

 *Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.10 Living Status and Quality of Work Life

The employees' living status is a very important aspect for consideration regarding the quality of life. This is judged by stating whether the residential house is owned or rented. This influences the quality of work life parameters. Table 9-10 presents distribution of mean score of quality of work life parameters and their significant levels by the employees' living status as revealed through the type of house - owned or rented.

Regarding health and safety, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 0.93 and in ML&Co 1.56, and for respondents staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 1.76 and in ML&Co 1.78. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -2.249 and p-value 0.026. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association between two variables. *The result shows significance of association between health and safety and nature of the residence in GLTTL.* The generated t-value in ML&Co is 0.604 and p-value is 0.547. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between health and safety and nature of the residence in ML&Co.

Regarding welfare facilities, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 1.29 and in ML&Co 1.55, and of respondents staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 1.85 and in ML&Co 1.73. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -1.754 and p-value 0.081. The estimated t-value in ML&Co is -0.636 and p-value 0.526. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between welfare facilities and nature of the residence in both the factories.

Regarding the working conditions parameter, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 1.81 and in ML&Co 2.01, and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 1.96 and in ML&Co 2.39. The generated t-value in GLTTL is -0.417 and p-value 0.677. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is -0.992 and p-value 0.323. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables and

conveys absence of association between working conditions and nature of the respondents in both the factories.

Regarding the job security parameter, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 0.29 and in ML&Co 0.58, and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 0.67 and in ML&Co 0.62, and the generated t-value in GLTTL is -1.350 and p-value 0.179. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is 1.204 and p-value 0.887. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between job security and nature of residence in both the factories.

The mean score regarding compensation in the organisation, for respondents having own house in GLTTL is -0.07 and in ML&Co 0.52, and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 0.38 and in ML&Co 0.19. The calculated t-value in GLTTL is -1.568 and p-value 0.119. The generated t-value in ML&Co is 0.877 and p-value 0.231. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between compensation and nature of the residence in both the factories.

Regarding the career development parameter, the mean score of the respondents having own house and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is -0.70 and 0.09, respectively, and the generated t-value in GLTTL is -2.542 and p-value 0.012. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association between two variables. *It conveys significance of association between career development and nature of the residence in GLTTL.* The mean score of ML&Co in the same sequence is -0.36 and -0.12, and the generated t-value is -0.143 and p-value 0.481. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in ML&Co, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys the absence of association between career development and nature of the residence in ML&Co.

Relating to the parameter of grievance redressal mechanism, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 0.04 and in ML&Co 0.31, and of

respondents staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 0.55 and in ML&Co 0.42, and generated t-value in GLTTL is -2.442 and p-value 0.016. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association between two variables. *The result conveys significance of association between grievance redressal mechanism and nature of the residence in GLTTL.* The calculated t-value in ML&Co is -0.707 and p-value 0.639. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and nature of the residence in ML&Co.

About the parameter of social integration at work, the mean score of respondents having own house in GLTTL is 0.01 and in ML&Co -0.01, and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 0.12 and in ML&Co 0.36. The generated t-value in GLTTL is -0.388 and p-value 0.699. The estimated t-value in ML&Co is -1.511 and p-value 0.133. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between social integration at work, and nature of the residence in both the factories.

The mean score regarding social relevance of work life in the organization among respondents having own house in GLTTL is 0.26 and in ML&Co 0.21, and for those staying in a rented house in GLTTL is 0.49 and in ML&Co 0.74, and the generated t-value in GLTTL is -0.847 and p-value 0.398. The calculated t-value in ML&Co is -1.629 and p-value 0.106. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between social relevance of work life and nature of the residence in both the factories.

9.10.1 Summing up

The analysis reveals that in GLTTL, the t-value of three parameters, namely, health and safety, career development, and grievance redressal mechanism is significant at 0.05 level, and for all the remaining parameters, t-value is not significant. In that way in ML&Co, the t-value for all parameters is not significant.

Table 9-10 Mean Score of the employees' Housing Type on QWL parameters and their significance levels

QWL Parameter	Organization	Own		Rent		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	0.93	2.29	1.76	2.18	1.290	2.275	-2.249*	0.026
	ML&Co	1.56	2.40	1.78	1.94	1.670	2.185	0.604	0.547
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.29	2.02	1.85	1.87	1.533	1.970	-1.754	0.081
	ML&Co	1.55	1.85	1.73	1.48	1.636	1.672	-0.636	0.526
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.81	2.22	1.96	2.13	1.876	2.172	-0.417	0.677
	ML&Co	2.01	2.34	2.39	2.40	2.193	2.369	-0.992	0.323
Job Security	GLTTL	0.29	1.65	0.67	1.80	0.453	1.717	-1.350	0.179
	ML&Co	0.58	1.75	0.62	2.14	0.600	1.942	1.204	0.887
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.07	1.75	0.38	1.78	0.126	1.770	-1.568	0.119
	ML&Co	0.52	1.55	0.19	1.78	0.360	1.669	0.877	0.231
Career Development	GLTTL	-0.70	1.96	0.09	1.80	-0.356	1.925	-2.542*	0.012
	ML&Co	-0.36	1.96	-0.12	2.21	-0.240	2.081	-0.143	0.481
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.04	1.28	0.55	1.27	0.263	1.294	-2.442*	0.016
	ML&Co	0.31	1.56	0.42	1.37	0.366	1.466	-0.707	0.639
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.01	1.54	0.12	1.72	0.056	1.616	-0.388	0.699
	ML&Co	-0.01	1.58	0.36	1.41	0.166	1.502	-1.511	0.133
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.26	1.75	0.49	1.46	0.363	1.629	-0.847	0.398
	ML&Co	0.21	1.94	0.74	2.06	0.466	2.010	-1.629	0.106

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level.

9.11 Health Conditions and Quality of Work Life

According to the health conditions, the parameter has been classified into four categories, as excellent health, good health, average health, and poor health. Table 9-11 explains the distribution of mean score of QWL parameters and their significant levels.

About health and safety, mean score of responses on health condition categorised as excellent, good, average, and poor in GLTTL is 2.23, 1.44, 0.57 and 0.00, respectively, and the estimated F-value in GLTTL is 3.781 and p-value 0.120. The mean score in ML&Co in the same sequence as mentioned above is 1.12, 1.80, 1.95 and 0.17, respectively; the generated F-value is 1.276 and p-value 0.285. As p-value is greater than 0.05 in both the factories, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between health and safety and categorization of health in both the factories.

About welfare facilities, the mean score of responses on health conditions categorised as excellent, good, average and poor in GLTTL is 2.21, 2.03, 0.47 and 0.00, respectively; the generated F-value is 9.084, and p-value 0.000. As p-value is less than 0.05, the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *This conveys that association between welfare facilities and health categories is significant in GLTTL.* The mean score of responses on health condition categorised in the same sequence as mentioned above, in ML&Co is 1.40, 1.83, 1.34, and 0.04, respectively; the generated F-value is 1.766, and p-value 0.156. As p-value is greater than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of null hypothesis of association between variables, and conveys absence of association between welfare facilities and health categorization in ML&Co.

About the working conditions, the mean score of respondents in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 2.46, 2.17, 1.15, and 0.83, respectively; the generated F-value is 3.238, and p-value 0.240. The mean score of responses in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.98, 2.35, 1.93 and 1.50, respectively; the generated F-value is 0.430 and p-value 0.732. As p-value in both the factories is higher than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null

hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between working conditions and categorisation of health in both the factories.

The mean score of job security parameter in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.52, 0.69, 0.04, and 0.50, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.374 and p-value 0.247. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.08, 0.74, 0.57, and 0.70, respectively; the calculated F- value is 0.805 and p-value 0.493. As p-value in both the factories is greater than 0.05, the F- test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis; and conveys absence of association between job security and health categorization in both factories.

As regards compensation parameter, the mean score in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.18, 0.38. -0.20, and -1.17, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.572 and p-value 0.199. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.27, 0.31, 0.64, and 0.50, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.259 and p-value 0.855. As p-value in both the factories is greater than 0.05, the F-value statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis; and conveys absence of association between compensation and health categorisation in the both the factories.

As regards career development parameters, the mean score in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.50, 0.14, -1.62, and -0.50, respectively; the generated F-value is 12.501, and p-value 0.000. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is -1.12, -0.08, 0.30, and -1.20, respectively; the generated F-value is 2.655 and p-value 0.051. As p-value in both the factories is less than or close to 0.05 the test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis, and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis of association. *The result conveys that association between career development parameter and categorization of health in both the factories is highly significant.*

About the parameter, grievance redressal mechanism, the mean score in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned earlier in GLTTL is 0.48, 0.37, -0.01, and 0.00, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.70 and p-value 0.323. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned earlier in ML&Co

is 0.42; 0.37, 0.18 and 0.80, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.271 and p-value 0.846. As p-value in both the factories is higher than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis; and conveys the absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and categorization of health in both the factories.

About the parameter social integration at work, the mean score in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned earlier, in GLTTL is 0.55, 0.28,-0.57, and -0.17, respectively; the calculated F-value is 3.995 and p-value 0.009. As p-value is less than 0.05, the F-test statistics reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis; and *conveys that association between social integration at work and categorization of health is highly significant in GLTTL.* The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above, in ML&Co is 0.38, 0.10. 0.16, and 0.30, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.250 and p-value 0.861. As p-value is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between social integration at work and health categorization in ML&Co.

About the parameter, social relevance of work life, the mean score in relation to the categorization of health in the same sequence as mentioned earlier, in GLTTL is 0.64, 0.53, -0.07 and 0.67, respectively; and calculated F-value is 1.709 and p-value 0.168. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above, in ML&Co is 0.25, 0.59, 0.48 and -0.90, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.998 and p value 0.396. As p value in both the factories is more than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between social relevance of work life and health categorization in both the factories.

9.11.1 Summing up

The above analysis reveals that for health categorization in GLTTL, association has been found to be significant in respect of three parameters, namely, welfare facilities, career development and social integration at work. In case of ML&Co for health categorization, association has been found to be significant only in respect of career development. For all other parameters in both GLTTL and ML&Co, association has been proved to be absent.

Table 9-11
Mean Score of the employees' Health Conditions on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Health Conditions / QWL Parameter	Organization	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	2.23	2.06	1.44	1.97	0.57	2.66	0.00	0.50	1.290	2.275	3.781	0.120
	ML&Co	1.12	2.32	1.80	2.07	1.95	2.47	0.17	2.47	1.670	2.185	1.276	0.285
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	2.21	1.62	2.03	1.55	0.47	2.27	0.00	2.18	1.533	1.970	9.084*	0.000
	ML&Co	1.40	1.82	1.83	1.65	1.34	1.37	0.40	2.04	1.636	1.672	1.766	0.156
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.46	1.90	2.17	1.90	1.15	2.54	0.83	2.08	1.876	2.172	3.238	0.240
	ML&Co	1.98	2.39	2.35	2.49	1.93	1.81	1.50	2.42	2.193	2.369	0.430	0.732
Job Security	GLTTL	0.52	2.12	0.69	1.48	0.04	1.76	0.50	2.00	0.453	1.717	1.394	0.247
	ML&Co	0.08	2.23	0.74	1.95	0.57	1.66	0.70	1.25	0.600	1.942	0.805	0.493
Compensation	GLTTL	0.18	1.70	0.38	1.69	-0.20	1.92	-1.17	1.04	0.126	1.770	1.572	0.199
	ML&Co	0.27	1.91	0.31	1.66	0.64	1.51	0.50	1.50	0.360	1.669	0.259	0.855
Career Development	GLTTL	0.50	1.56	0.14	1.73	-1.62	1.77	-0.50	3.04	-0.356	1.925	12.501*	0.000
	ML&Co	-1.12	1.83	-0.08	2.11	0.30	1.91	-1.20	2.39	-0.240	2.081	2.655*	0.051
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.48	1.49	0.37	1.14	-0.01	1.34	0.00	2.18	0.263	1.294	1.170	0.323
	ML&Co	0.42	1.48	0.37	1.49	0.18	1.44	0.80	1.30	0.366	1.466	0.271	0.846
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	0.55	1.44	0.28	1.41	-0.57	1.82	-0.17	2.31	0.056	1.616	3.995*	0.009
	ML&Co	0.38	1.68	0.10	1.58	0.16	.96	0.30	1.20	0.166	1.502	0.250	0.861
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.64	1.96	0.53	1.33	-0.07	1.82	0.67	0.58	0.363	1.629	1.709	0.168
	ML&Co	0.25	1.91	0.59	2.09	0.48	1.40	-0.90	3.11	0.466	2.010	0.998	0.396

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.12 Monthly Income levels and Quality of Work Life

Salary is one of the important factors which influences the employees' quality of work life. Table 9-12 presents the distribution of mean score of QWL parameters and their significance levels by the monthly salary of respondents. Monthly salary categorization into five parts is as follows: up to Rs 3,000, Rs 3,000 - 4,000, Rs 4,000 – 5,000, Rs 5,000 – 6,000, and more than Rs 6,000.

About health and safety parameter, mean score of responses in five categories in the same sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 1.33, 0.95, 1.48, 1.41, and 1.12, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.378 and p-value 0.824. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.88, 1.91, 1.76, and 0.82, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.773 and p-value 0.545. As p-value in both the factories is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between health and safety and income categorization in both the factories.

About the welfare facilities parameter, the mean score of respondents in five categories in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 2.00, 1.57, 1.71, 1.50 and 0.50, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.075 and p-value 0.371. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.88, 1.59, 1.65, 2.19, and 0.79, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.890 and p-value 0.115. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in case of both the factories, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between welfare facilities and income categorization in both the factories.

About the working conditions parameter, the mean score of responses in five categories in the same sequence as mentioned above in GLTTL is 2.50, 1.67, 1.72, 2.19, and 2.46, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.618 and p-value 0.651. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.50, 1.24, 2.54, 2.39, and 1.93, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.712 and p-value 0.150. As p-value in case of both the factories is above 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between working conditions and income categorisation in both the factories.

As regards job security parameters, the mean score in relation to income categorisation in five categories in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 2.33, 0.44, 0.48, 0.59, and -0.38, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.756, and p-value 0.141. The mean score in the same sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is -1.25, 0.28, 0.83, 0.69, and 0.29, respectively; the generated F-value is 1.499 and p-value 0.206. As p-value in both cases is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between job security and income categorisation in both the factories.

As regards compensation parameter, the mean score in relation to the income categorization in five categories in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.50, 0.37, 0.13, -0.14, and -0.15, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.457 and p-value 0.767. The mean score in the same sequence as mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.25, -0.02, 0.33, 0.80, and 0.14, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.162 and p-value 0.330. As p-value in both cases is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between compensation and income categorization in both the factories.

As regards career development parameter, the mean score in relation to the income categorisation in five categories in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.33, -0.38, -0.07, -0.66, and -1.19, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.245 and p-value 0.294. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is -1.75, -0.46, 0.09, -0.39, and -0.93, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.531, and p-value 0.196. As p-value in both cases is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between career development and income categorisation in both the factories.

As regards grievance redressal mechanism, the mean score in relation to income categorization in five categories in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.67, 0.39, 0.33, 0.22, and -0.46, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.244, and p-value 0.295. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in GLTTL, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and income categorization in GLTTL. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is -0.38, 0.19, 0.70, -0.07, and -0.07, respectively; the calculated F-value is 2.365 and p-value 0.056. As p-value is close to

0.05, the F-test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis, and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *The result conveys that association between grievance redressal mechanism and income categorisation is significant in ML&Co.*

About social integration at work parameter, the mean score in respect of income categorization in five parts in the sequence mentioned above, in GLTTL is -0.83, -0.06, 0.18, 0.34, and -0.62, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.172 and p-value 0.326. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is -1.25, 0.24, 0.19, 0.00, and 0.61, respectively; the calculated F-value is 1.306 and p-value 0.271. As p-value in both the cases is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between social integration at work and income categorization in both the factories.

About social relevance of work parameter, the mean score in respect of income categorization in five parts in the same sequence as mentioned above, in GLTTL is 0.83, 0.17, 0.43, 0.31 and 0.65, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.337 and p-value 0.853. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is -0.25, 0.37, 0.66, 0.50, and -0.29, respectively; the calculated F-value is 0.811 and p-value 0.520. As p-value in both the cases is higher than 0.05, the F-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between social relevance at work and income categorization in both the factories.

9.12.1 Summing up

The above analysis reveals that for grievance redressal mechanism in ML&Co, association has been found to be significant in respect of income categorization. Except this, for all other parameters in GLTTL and ML&Co, absence of association between variables has been recorded.

Table 9-12
Mean Score of employees' Monthly Income on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Wage / QWL Parameter	Organization	Less than Rs 3000		Rs 3000 to 4000		Rs 4000 to 5000		Rs 5000 to 6000		More than Rs 6000		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	1.33	3.69	0.95	2.10	1.48	2.09	1.41	2.66	1.12	2.70	1.290	2.275	0.378	0.824
	ML&Co	0.88	3.20	1.91	1.86	1.76	2.06	1.74	2.75	0.82	2.03	1.670	2.185	0.773	0.545
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	2.00	0.50	1.57	2.20	1.71	1.89	1.50	1.88	0.50	1.90	1.533	1.970	1.075	0.371
	ML&Co	0.88	0.95	1.59	1.93	1.65	1.55	2.19	1.55	0.79	1.97	1.636	1.672	1.890	0.115
Working Conditions	GLTTL	2.50	3.04	1.67	2.27	1.72	1.89	2.19	2.32	2.46	2.75	1.876	2.172	0.618	0.651
	ML&Co	1.50	1.78	1.24	2.44	2.54	2.41	2.39	2.25	1.93	2.06	2.193	2.369	1.712	0.150
Job Security	GLTTL	2.33	0.58	0.44	1.63	0.48	1.67	0.59	1.97	-0.38	1.56	0.453	1.717	1.756	0.141
	ML&Co	-1.25	3.12	0.28	2.39	0.83	1.74	0.69	1.84	0.29	1.78	0.600	1.942	1.499	0.206
Compensation	GLTTL	0.50	0.00	0.37	1.83	0.13	1.63	-0.14	1.88	-0.15	2.26	0.126	1.770	0.457	0.767
	ML&Co	1.25	0.65	-0.02	2.05	0.33	1.66	0.80	1.55	0.14	1.15	0.360	1.669	1.162	0.330
Career Development	GLTTL	0.33	0.58	-0.38	1.87	-0.07	1.90	-0.66	2.05	-1.19	2.00	-0.356	1.925	1.245	0.294
	ML& Co	-1.75	2.47	-0.46	2.55	0.09	1.98	-0.39	2.01	-0.93	1.41	-0.240	2.081	1.531	0.196
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.67	0.58	0.39	1.23	0.33	1.33	0.22	1.35	-0.46	1.20	0.263	1.294	1.244	0.295
	ML&Co	-0.38	2.29	0.19	1.33	0.70	1.42	-0.07	1.50	-0.07	1.41	0.366	1.466	2.365*	0.056
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.83	2.08	-0.06	1.31	0.18	1.61	0.34	1.90	-0.62	1.72	0.056	1.616	1.172	0.326
	ML&Co	-1.25	1.26	0.24	1.40	0.19	1.58	0.00	1.34	0.61	1.52	0.166	1.502	1.306	0.271
Social Relevance	GLTTL	0.83	0.76	0.17	1.29	0.43	1.66	0.31	1.93	0.65	1.96	0.363	1.629	0.337	0.853
	ML&Co	-0.25	1.85	0.37	2.44	0.66	1.90	0.50	1.94	-0.29	1.92	0.466	2.010	0.811	0.520

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.13 Income Earners in the Family and Quality of Work Life

Number of the income earners in the family is considered as one of the variables that influences, the Quality of Work Life of the employee, as in the ultimate analysis, family income is to be considered for understanding the work life of family members including the employee. Table 9-13 presents the distribution of mean score of quality of work life parameters and their significance levels. Income earners in the family are considered as one person, and two persons for purposes of analysis, as is the normal practice in the households of women workers and women supervisors.

About health and safety parameter, the mean score of respondents in two categories, with one person as earner and two persons as earners, in GLTTL is 0.88 and 1.41, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.189 and p-value 0.236. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.62 and 1.70, respectively; the calculated t-value is -0.222 and p-value 0.824. As p-value in case of both the factories is higher than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between health and safety and number of income earners categorization in both the factories.

About the welfare facilities parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 1.44 and 1.56, respectively; the calculated t-value is -0.309 and p-value 0.758. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.50 and 1.71, respectively; the calculated t-value -0.728 and p-value 0.468. As p-value in case of both the factories is higher than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between welfare facilities and number of income earners categorization in both the factories.

Regarding working conditions parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 1.40 and 2.02, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.469 and p-value 0.144. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 1.99 and 2.30, respectively; the calculated t-value is 0.763 and p-value 0.447. As p-value in case of both the factories is higher than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys absence of association between working conditions and number of income earners categorization in both the factories.

Regarding the job security parameter, the mean score of respondents in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.46 and 0.45, respectively; the calculated t-value is 0.010 and p-value 0.992. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.33 and 0.74, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.257 and p-value 0.211. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in case of both the factories, the t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between job security and number of income earners categorisation in both the factories.

As regards the compensation parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is -0.13 and 0.20, respectively; the generated t-value is -0.97 and p-value 0.334. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.37 and 0.36, respectively; the calculated t-value is 0.029 and p-value 0.977. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in case of both the factories, t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between compensation and number of income earners categorization in both the factories.

As regards the career development parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is -1.00 and -0.17, respectively; the calculated t-value is -2.245 and p-value 0.026. As p-value is lower than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *The result conveys that association between career development and number of income earners categorisation in GLTTL is significant.* The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is - 0.62 and -0.04, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.617 and p-value 0.108. As p-value is higher than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between career development and number of income earners categorisation in ML&Co.

As regards grievance redressal mechanism, the mean score of respondents in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is 0.01 and 0.34, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.276 and p-value 0.204. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.13 and 0.49, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.476, and p-value 0.142. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in case of both the factories,

t-test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between grievance redressal mechanism and number of income earners categorisation in both the factories.

As regards the social integration at work parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is -0.07 and 0.09, respectively; the calculated t-value is -0.533, and p-value 0.595. Then mean score in the sequence mentioned, above in ML&Co is 0.13 and 0.49, respectively; the calculated t-value -1.476 and p-value 0.142. As p-value is higher than 0.05 in case of both the factories, t-test statistic reveals the acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between social integration at work and number of income earners categorisation in both the factories.

As regards the social relevance of work life parameter, the mean score of responses in the sequence mentioned above in GLTTL is -0.03 and 0.48, respectively; the calculated t-value is -1.607 and p-value 0.110. As p-value is higher than 0.05, the test statistic reveals acceptance of the null hypothesis, and conveys the absence of association between social relevance of work life and number of income earners categorisation in GLTTL. The mean score in the sequence mentioned above in ML&Co is 0.01 and 0.71, respectively; the calculated t-value is -2.050 and p-value 0.042. As p-value is less than 0.05, the t-test statistic reveals rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. *The result conveys that association between social relevance of work life and number of income earners categorisation in ML&Co is significant.*

9.13.1 Summing up

The analysis reveals that in respect of GLTTL, association between career development and number of earning members in the family is significant; and in respect of ML&Co, association between social relevance of work life and number of earners in the family is significant. In respect of all other parameters of GLTTL and ML&Co, absence of association is recorded.

Table 9-13
Mean Score Value of the Earners in the Family on
QWL parameters and their significance levels

Earning Members / QWL Parameter	Organization	One		Two		Total (150)		Significance	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t-Value	p-Value
Health & Safety	GLTTL	0.88	2.26	1.41	2.28	1.290	2.275	-1.189	0.236
	ML&Co	1.62	2.33	1.70	2.11	1.670	2.185	-0.222	0.824
Welfare Facilities	GLTTL	1.44	2.16	1.56	1.92	1.533	1.970	-0.309	0.758
	ML&Co	1.50	1.90	1.71	1.54	1.636	1.672	-0.728	0.468
Working Conditions	GLTTL	1.40	2.55	2.02	2.04	1.876	2.172	-1.469	0.144
	ML&Co	1.99	2.32	2.30	2.40	2.193	2.369	-0.763	0.447
Job Security	GLTTL	0.46	1.83	0.45	1.69	0.453	1.717	0.010	0.992
	ML&Co	0.33	1.98	0.74	1.92	0.600	1.942	-1.257	0.211
Compensation	GLTTL	-0.13	1.96	0.20	1.71	0.126	1.770	-0.970	0.334
	ML&Co	0.37	1.47	0.36	1.77	0.360	1.669	0.029	0.977
Career Development	GLTTL	-1.00	1.98	-0.17	1.88	-0.356	1.925	-2.245*	0.026
	ML&Co	-0.62	2.03	-0.04	2.09	-0.240	2.081	-1.617	0.108
Grievance Redressal Mechanism	GLTTL	0.01	1.12	0.34	1.34	0.263	1.294	-1.276	0.204
	ML&Co	0.13	1.36	0.49	1.51	0.366	1.466	-1.476	0.142
Social Integration at Work	GLTTL	-0.07	1.86	0.09	1.54	0.056	1.616	-0.533	0.595
	ML&Co	0.13	1.36	0.49	1.51	0.366	1.466	-1.476	0.142
Social Relevance	GLTTL	-0.03	1.73	0.48	1.59	0.363	1.629	-1.607	0.110
	ML&Co	0.01	2.12	0.71	1.92	0.466	2.010	-2.050*	0.042

*Significant at 0.05 level; ** Significant at 0.01 level

9.14 Summary

In this chapter, relationship between employees quality of work life (QWL) and their socio-economic and organisation variables has been examined through mean score, F-test, t-test and correlation, participants found significant in the analysis are a total of 31-18 in GLTTL and 13 in ML&Co, out of 117 features in 13 variables covered in this chapter. Parameters found significant are generally at 0.05 level. And shown for GLTTL and ML&Co separately. Where they are highly significant at 0.1 level, it is specifically mentioned. Suggesting following from the result of analysis are pooled in chapter 10 covering conclusion and suggestions. Details are given in this chapter Table-wise.

9.15 Correlation

Correlations are computed between various Quality of Work Life parameters, for GLTTL and ML&Co organisations. The parameters are: health and safety, welfare facilities, working conditions, job security, compensation, career development, grievance handling system social integration at work, and social relevance. The results are presented in tables 9.14 and 9.15. Highlights of the results are summarised in this section for GLTTL and ML&Co separately.

9.15.1 Correlation analysis for GLTTL Organisation (Table 9.14)

Health and safety features are highly significant in relation to working conditions, job security,   and social relevance. It is significant relation to welfare facilities, career development, and social integration at work, and insignificant in relation to compensation, and grievance handling system. Welfare facilities are highly significant in relation to working conditions, job security, compensation, career development, and social integration at work. It is significant in relation to grievance handling system, and social relevance.

Working conditions are highly significant in relation to job security, career development, social integration at work, and social relevance. It is insignificant in relation to compensation, and grievance handling system. Job security is highly significant in relation to compensation and career development and significant in relation to social integration at work, and social relevance. It is insignificant in

relation to grievance handling system. Compensation system is highly significant in relation to grievance handling system. It is significant relation to career development, and social integration at work, and insignificant in relation to social relevance.

Career development is highly significant in relation to grievance handling system, social integration at work, and social relevance. Grievance handling system is highly significant in relation to social integration at work, and significant in relation to social relevance. Social integration at work is highly significant in relation to social relevance.

Table 9.14
GLTTL Correlation (n=150)

QWL Parameter		Health and Safety Features	Welfare Facilities	Working Conditions	Job Security	Compensation	Career Development	Grievances Handling System	Social Integration at work	Social relevance
CH-1	Health & Safety Facilities	1								
CH-2	Welfare Facilities	170(*)	1							
CH-3	Working Conditions	.355(**)	.297(**)	1						
CH-4	Job Security	.285(**)	.349(**)	.217(**)	1					
CH-5	Compensation	.081	.436(**)	.127	.231(**)	1				
CH-6	Career Development	.173(*)	.499(**)	.307(**)	.330(**)	.203(*)	1			
CH-7	Grievance Redressal Mechanism	.127	.163(*)	.047	.124	.227(**)	.260(**)	1		
CH-8	Social Integration at work	.166(*)	.316(**)	.305(**)	.206(*)	.187(*)	.373(**)	.322(**)	1	
CH-9	Social Relevance	.214(**)	.167(*)	.234(**)	.193(*)	.066	.246(**)	.175(*)	.300(**)	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Continued)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

9.15.2 Correlation analysis for ML&Co Organisation (Table 9.15)

Health and safety features are highly significant in relation to working conditions, job security, career development, grievance handling system, social integration at work, and social relevance. It is significant in relation to welfare facilities, and compensation. Welfare facilities are highly significant in relation to working conditions, job security, career development, and social relevance. It is significant in relation to grievance handling system, and insignificant in relation to compensation, and social integration at work.

Working conditions are highly significant in relation to job security, career development, grievance handling system, social integration at work, and social relevance. It is significant in relation to compensation. Job security is highly significant in relation to compensation, career development, grievance handling system, social integration at work, and social relevance.

Compensation is highly significant in relation to career development, and social relevance. It is significant in relation to grievance handling system, and social integration at work. Career development is highly significant in relation to grievance handling system, social integration at work, and social relevance. Grievance handling system is highly significant in relation to social integration at work, and social relevance. Social integration at work is highly significant in relation to social relevance.

Table 9.15
ML&Co Correlation 150-300

	QWL Parameter	Health and Safety Features	Welfare Facilities	Working Conditions	Job Security	Compensation	Career Development	Grievances Handling System	Social Integration at work	Social relevance
CH-1	Health & Safety Facilities	1								
CH-2	Welfare Facilities	143(*)	1							
CH-3	Working Conditions	.355(**)	.257(**)	1						
CH-4	Job Security	.474(**)	.298(**)	.324(**)	1					
CH-5	Compensation	.177(*)	.064	.206(*)	.325(**)	1				
CH-6	Career Development	.522(**)	.285(**)	.482(**)	.517(**)	.268(**)	1			
CH-7	Grievance Redressal Mechanism	.382(**)	.196(*)	.366(**)	.438(**)	.202(*)	.420(**)	1		
CH-8	Social Integration at work	.327(**)	.134	.420 (**)	.251(**)	.167(*)	.315(**)	.252(**)	1	
CH-9	Social Relevance	.372(**)	.310(**)	.415(**)	.502(**)	.374(**)	.475(**)	.330(**)	.375(**)	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

9.16 Consolidated view of Nine Quality of Work Life Parameters

Analysis of individual parameters of Quality of Work Life in a consolidated form (covering all statements of each parameter) for GLTTL and ML&Co as prepared in Table 9.16 presents the ranking of performance of the companies in respect of each parameter. Ranking as presented above for GLTTL revealed as follows: Grievance redressal mechanism, Social integration at work, and social relevance are ranked as first, second, and third, respectively. Working conditions, Welfare facilities and Health and safety aspects are ranked the last as nine, eight, and seven, respectively. Three other parameters, namely, compensation, Career development, and Job security are ranked four, five, and six, respectively. These fall in between the highest and the lowest, showing moderate performance. Weighted mean score of all parameters in GLTTL is very low in comparison to the score recorded for ML&Co. Thus the overall performance of ML&Co can be considered much better compared to GLTTL in respect of the parameters.

The pleasant part of the weighted score is that all of them have shown positive picture, and none has shown a negative picture.

Ranking of parameters for ML&Co revealed as follows: Social integration at work, Grievance redressal mechanism, and Compensation are ranked first, second, and third, respectively. The parameter which are ranked the lowest are: Working conditions, Health and safety, and Welfare facilities as nine, eight, and seven ranks, respectively, it is clearly explaining the need and scope for further improvement of the lowest ranks. Three others fall in between in ranking; these are Career development, Job security, and Social relevance, ranked as four, five and six, respectively.

Over all comparison of the score of various parameters conveys that health and safety, working conditions, and welfare facilities offer scope for future improvement in both the factories. Those rated moderate can also be focussed upon for special attention in the near future. Conclusion in respect of both the factories shows that the performance in respect of all the parameters is satisfactory. Special attention needs to be devoted for improving the performance of indicators which have recorded the lowest score, followed by those which have recorded moderate performance. This is a need and scope for improvement to be given special attention

by the management of the two factories for improving the QWL of women workers and women supervisors.

Table 9.16
Consolidated view of QWL Parameters of Weighted Mean
and Ranking

Chapterisation	GLTTL		ML & Co	
	Total Weighted Mean	Rank	Total Weighted Mean	Rank
Welfare Facilities	0.403	8	0.881	7
Working Conditions	0.380	9	0.635	9
Health & Safety	0.409	7	0.761	8
Compensation	0.638	4	1.277	3
Job Security	0.613	6	1.048	5
Career Development	0.620	5	1.198	4
Grievance System	0.808	1	1.423	2
Social Integration at work	0.700	2	1.500	1
Social Relevance	0.642	3	1.041	6

CHAPTER – 10
SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER – 10
SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter an attempt has been made to consolidate the study findings, and more importantly present suggestions on various aspects of Quality of Work Life with reference to the selected industrial enterprises of Green Leaf Tobacco Threshers Limited and Maddi Lakshmaiah & Co. Ltd. Suggestions are given at the respective places where the issues are dealt with, and a few specific suggestions are offered in the second half of the chapter to facilitate action to be taken by the managements of the two organisations.

10.1 Introduction

Quality of work life (QWL) is a relatively new concept which is defined as the overall quality of an individual's work life. QWL is sometimes considered as a sub-concept of the broad concept of quality of life, which refers to the overall quality of an individual's life. QWL is the favorableness or unfavorableness of a job environment for people; it refers to the quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment.

The concept of QWL evolved in three phases, namely, "scientific management, human relations management, and socio-technical movement". The socio-technical system advocates such an organisation design which ensures high quality of work life.

The theories of motivation and leadership provide a sound base for the concept of quality of work life. *Maslow* depicted the complexity of human nature by describing various levels of human needs and satisfaction. The lower order needs are first satisfied, the physiological needs have to be satisfied before one moves up to the social needs. As soon as the lower order needs are satisfied, people seek higher-order needs. *Herzberg* describes hygiene factors and motivational factors. An employee would not experience long term satisfaction from favourable hygiene factors but unfavorable hygiene factors would lead to long-term dissatisfaction. Favourable factors can improve the employee performance. *Mc Gregor* stated theories 'X' and 'Y'. The theory 'X' is based on assumptions and beliefs. These assumptions imply that the supervisor

has a low opinion of the workers, and still lower expectations from them. Such beliefs reduce the superior's efforts to enhance the level of satisfaction. Theory 'Y' assumes that, under proper conditions, people have the potential to work with responsibility.

Quality of Work Life is philosophical which holds on a set of principles that people are the most important resource in the organisation as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making contributions and that they should be treated with dignity and respect. Quality of Work Life is an umbrella term which includes many concepts. It not only improves the economic needs but also social and psychological needs of employees. The employees expect that various economic and social needs should be fulfilled within the organisation. The organisation must have to adopt a lot of involvement programmes - flexible time, flexible place, alternative work schedule, part-time employment, compressed workweek, job design, social integration, and social relevance of work, work life balance, better career opportunities and fun at work places. The implementation of these programmes results in high and improved productivity, maximum satisfaction and the employees can balance their personal and professional lives.

10.2 Importance of the Study

The present study is to analyze the Quality of Work Life (QWL) of Women Workers in Tobacco Processing Industry of Guntur District in Andhra Pradesh. Tobacco cultivation is one of the chief occupations and mostly women workers are engaged in tobacco processing, grading and packaging works in Guntur District.

Guntur District is well known for production of tobacco by virtue of the availability of black soils. Similarly a good number of tobacco processing units were established in various parts of the district. Normally women workers are employed to pursue different phases of work in tobacco processing units. At different stages of the manufacturing process, women workforce is significant. Hence, the study of women workers is the focus of the present study on the Quality of Work Life; for that two units of tobacco processing were selected to conduct the study.

10.3 Aim of the Study

The main aim of the present study is to determine the quality of work life of women workers. At gross root level, women are facing low level of wages, poor

working conditions, long working hours, unfavorable terms of employment, discrimination at work and also observed their satisfaction at work. A good number of women employees are working in different tobacco units in Guntur district of Andhra Pradesh. To understand the practical relevance, designing and implementing the strategies and interventions to improve QWL among the women workers working in tobacco industries.

10.4 Scope of the Study

In order to measure the Quality of Work Life of Women Workers in Green Leaf Tobacco Threshing Ltd., and Maddi Lakshmaiah & Co, Ltd., *Walton's* eight-point formula has been identified with a few changes for the organisational environment. Both primary and secondary data were collected for this purpose. Primary data was collected through schedules; and secondary data was collected from text books, journals, periodicals and manuals relevant to the study.

The scope of the study is quality of work life in Tobacco Processing Units in Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh. However, keeping in view the limitations and availability of time, the researcher has selected two tobacco processing units, i.e., "Green Leaf Tobacco Threshers Pvt. Ltd., (GLTTL)", Guntur, and "Maddi Lakshmaiah & Co Ltd., (ML&Co.)", Chilakaluripet, which are reputed organizations, employing a large number of women workers for tobacco processing. The study focuses on "Quality of Work Life of Women Workers". To measure the QWL, nine important parameters have been selected by the researcher, i.e., (i) health and safety; (ii) welfare facilities; (iii) working conditions; (iv) job security; (v) wages; (vi) career development; (vii) grievance handling system; (viii) social integration; and (ix) social relevance at work. These parameters have been used to measure the QWL in the selected tobacco processing units. These parameters have been identified based on the review of literature of a number of studies carried out earlier, including a few Ph.D. Theses of recent years.

10.5 Objectives of the Study

The study has been carried out with the following specific objectives:

1) to study the socio-economic background of women workers in the selected tobacco processing units;

2) to examine the Quality of Work Life of women workers in tobacco industry in terms of the selected QWL parameters on the basis of employee perceptions;

3) to study the health, safety and welfare facilities offered by the selected organizations.

4) to identify the worker roles, working conditions, and job security aspects to implement QWL.

5) to understand the wage policies and practices, measures for career planning and growth and grievance redressal mechanism of women workers in the selected tobacco units; and

6) to know the social integration and social relevance of work aspects of QWL.

The present study has been carried out with focus on the above objectives for analyzing the quality of work life of women workers in tobacco industry, and to suggest measures for strengthening the overall effectiveness of the organizations. The managements will be able to introduce more conducive methods and processes to ensure higher level of QWL of the employees, and also to increase the profitability of the organizations through practising better industrial culture.

10.6 Sample Selection

All the women employees of the two organizations formed the universe. 300 women respondents were selected, using the stratified random sampling. The researcher has taken the sample of 150 respondents each from GLTTL and ML&Co. The total women respondents selected works out to 48 per cent of the universe in the two factories put together. Among 300 women respondents, 271 are workers and 29 supervisors. The selected sample is nearly 48 per cent of total women workers working in both the organisations.

The two factories selected for the study are reputed old and well established ones, in the district, which have introduced modern methods of processing tobacco leafs. Women workers and women supervisors have been specifically selected for sampling, as it is considers important to analysed there working environment in the factory, and safety and welfare measures adopted by the two factories.

10.7 Schedule Design

Interview Schedule has been used as an important tool for data collection in the present study. The purpose of this research is to know the opinions and perceptions of the employees towards various aspects relating to the job and working environment, and their impact on their Quality of Work Life. The total process of preparation and administration of the schedule was divided into 'three phases'.

Phase-I: Preparation of Interview Schedule

The researcher constructed a schedule using *Likert's* five-point scale method. Each statement in the schedule has five alternatives. The respondents were required to give their opinion selecting any one of the five alternatives. The schedule has two parts, the first part deals with the socio-economic background of the respondents, and the second part is related to quality of work life parameters. Socio-economic background of employees consists of 12 statements relating to age, education, religion, community, domicile, size of family, income, job category, length of service. The second part of the schedule consists of 78 statements relating to various parameters of quality of work life. The QWL parameters cover nine components; (i) health and safety, (ii) welfare facilities, (iii) working conditions, (iv) job security, (v) wages, (vi) career development, (vii) grievance handling system, (viii) social integration, and (ix) social relevance of work. Based on the important nine quality of work life parameters some important statements were prepared by the investigator among the total statements with the relevance and applicability of QWL in the selected tobacco industries 78 statements were including in the interview schedule for conducting the study.

Phase-II: Finalisation of the schedule

Before the administration of the schedule, the researcher has conducted a *'pilot-study'* in order to test the validity and appropriateness of the statements. Pilot study was undertaken to test the relevance and clarity of the interview schedule and to refine them as needed to avoid misunderstanding. A small sample of 'thirty women respondents' are randomly selected from two (GLTTL and ML&Co) tobacco units who was not included in the sample before beginning the main survey. The respondents were asked to define the most important issues affecting the overall quality of work life. Therefore, interview schedule was used for assess the implementation of elements of quality of work life in selected tobacco processing units. The suggestions from

women respondents interviewed in the pilot study have been incorporated in the finalised interview schedules.

To establish reliability and validity of the schedule, the researcher personally visited and conducted pre-test for administration of the schedule. The required data was subjected to statistical techniques by using the reliability test, method for establishing the validity and reliability of the instrument. It is proved after proper calculations that at 0.01 level of significance, all the statements were accepted. The pre-test helped the researcher to examine the suitability of various aspects of the schedule, and to improve the effectiveness of the final schedule.

Therefore, all the quality of work life parameters under study were covered through a number of statements as indicated here: health and safety (12), welfare facilities (9), working conditions (12), job security (7), wages (10), career development (7), grievance handling systems (5), social integration (7), and social relevance of work (9).

Phase-III: Administration of the Schedule

After preparation of the schedule and subjecting it for the pre-test, the schedule was finalised, and administered for data collection. The researcher personally visited the organizations, i.e., GLTTL and ML&Co., and administered the schedule among the selected women respondents (150 respondents from each organization) for conduct of the study.

10.8 Techniques of Data Analysis and Data Interpretation

Primary data were entered using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software and STATISTICA; uni-variate and bi-variate tables were generated and correlation, F-test and t-test were carried out to find out the relationships between variables.

10.9 Profile of the Respondents

The socio-economic profile of the respondents of GLTTL and ML&Co organisations reveals that out of 300 women respondents, 271 are workers, (90%), 29 are supervisors'(10%); permanent employees are 66 per cent, daily wage earners 15 per cent, and temporary workers 19 per cent. A study into the length of service shows that

nearly 31 per cent of the respondents have work experience between 4 - 6 years, and 20 per cent of the respondents have 6 - 8 years. Analysis of the age of the respondents reveals that nearly 28 per cent are in the age group of 35-45 years, while 24 per cent are in 45 – 55 years. About 15 per cent fall in the younger age group of below 35 years. Religious status of the respondents covers that nearly 60 per cent are Hindus, 27 per cent Christians, and the remaining 13 per cent Muslims.

Open category workers account for 47 per cent; backward category and SCs 25 per cent, and STs 4 per cent. Classification of workers by type and area show that 29 per cent are highly from urban area, 17 per cent are having from Semi-urban area, and the majority 54 per cent are having from rural area.

Among the respondents, 60 per cent are literate, and the rest are illiterate. Among the literates, 60 per cent have education level is below SSC, 30 per cent studied SSC, 7 per cent studied diploma/intermediate and only 4 per cent are graduates. Size of the family is distributed between 2-3 members, 3-4 members, and 5 and above. More than half of the respondents (54 per cent) own a house, and the remaining are living in rented houses. The majority of (74 per cent) of respondents are in good health, 23 per cent are in average health, and only small percent ages of 3 are in poor health. The study reveals that those with monthly income level of Rs.4000 and above constitute 75 per cent and 23 per cent fall in the category of Rs.3000-4000. Among the respondents, in 71 per cent of families, both wife and husband are earning members, and in the remaining 29 per cent families, only women are the earning members.

10.10 Findings of the Study

The investigator has presented the findings based on the study of QWL of Women Workers in Tobacco Processing Units in Guntur District.

10.10.1 Health and Safety

Health and safety is an important parameter and impacts on every work, and in every work place. Several health facilities are provided to employees by the organisations because they know that efficiency in work is possible only when an employee is healthy. If the employee is not healthy, there will be a higher rate of absenteeism and turnover, industrial discontent and indiscipline, poor performance and

low productivity in the organisation. Those charged with managing health and safety are having more and more tasks added to their portfolio. The most significant responsibility is environmental protection. The skills required to manage the health and safety are compatible with environmental protection, which is why these responsibilities are so often bolted onto the health and safety in working areas. Out of 12 statements; three statements received high modest positive responses both in GLTTL and ML&Co factories, and four statements received modest response, and the remaining five statements low response.

In GLTTL organisation, majority of the respondents have expressed low positive and moderate level of satisfaction. Low opinions are in respect of provision for medical facilities, compensation system in times of accidents, conducting safety training programmes (weighted average 0.07), and proper system, tools and equipments are provided by the organisation (weighted average 0.05). Moderate opinions are expressed by the respondents in respect of protection against harmful effects on health (weighted average 0.12), adequate safety equipments provided (weighted average 0.11), first aid treatment given by the organisation at the time of accidents is quite good (weighted average 0.10), high priority is given by the management at the time of accidents at the work place (weighted average 0.13).

In ML&Co most of the employees have expressed low positive and moderate opinions low moderate opinion are in respect of: safety instructions are given to the employees (weighted score 0.07), compensation paid to employees in the event of accidents, proper system, tools and equipments are provided by the organisation, (weighted score 0.09). Moderate opinions are expressed by the respondents in respect of the following aspects protection against harmful effects on health (weighted average 0.18), adequate safety equipments provided (weighted average 0.14), first aid treatment given by the organisation at the time of accidents is quite good (weighted average 0.11), high priority is given by the ML&Co management at the time of accidents at the work place (weighted average 0.16).

Health and safety is an aspect where there is not much difference among the opinions in GLTTL and ML&Co. These aspects do really matter for the employees who are working in the organisation. The management of the organisations should pay attention to these factors to score high on these parameters of quality of work life.

10.10.2 Welfare Facilities

The welfare facilities are helpful to develop loyalty among workers towards the organisation, and tend to make the employees happy. The welfare measures are important for every employee. Without welfare measures employees cannot work effectively in the organization. However, in organizations which are lacking in the provision of canteen facilities, medical aid facilities, and cleanliness facilities, the employees find it difficult to operate. They should take necessary steps to improve these measures, so that the employees can do their job more effectively. Out of the (9 statements), four are ranked high (including one very high) two are ranked modest, and three are ranked low (including two very low).

Low positive opinions expressed by the respondents in GLTTL organisation are in respect of the following aspects: adequate welfare facilities provided in the organisation (weighted score 0.04), feeling about work schedule and rest period (weighted average 0.09), statutory welfare facilities (weighted average 0.05). Modest opinions expressed by the respondents are in respect of concerned about the employees' well being (weighted average 0.14), welfare facilities are improving industrial relations (weighted average 0.15).

Low positive opinions expressed by the respondents in ML&Co organisation are in respect of the following aspects: adequate welfare facilities provided in the organisation (weighted average 0.06); statutory welfare facilities (weighted average 0.09). Modest opinions expressed by the respondents are in respect of organisation concerned about the employees' well being (weighted average 0.16), welfare facilities improve the industrial relations (weighted average 0.13).

Every organization should provide statutory and non statutory welfare measures but some organizations provide good welfare facilities to the employees and improve the women quality of work life. The prime aim of our nation is to achieve maximum possible economic development so as to achieve higher standard of living for workers in the country. Inspite of all the modern technology and all the systems of controls coming into wide spread use, man still remains the most important factor in production process. If people do not want to work, it is impossible for every organization to attain its goals. In this connection welfare measures is one of the

important aspects of HRM policy and philosophy towards improving the production of industry, conditions of the workers and income of the society. The overall performance with regard to provision of welfare facilities has been proved as better in ML&Co compared to GLTTL. Therefore, two statements have low score in ML&Co compared to GLTTL. Hence, management of the organisations should take greater care in improving the welfare measures to meet the needs of all the employees in both the organisations.

10.10.3 Working Environment

A good work environment is a *sine-qua-non* for the happy and healthy living of employees. Regarding working conditions as a factor of job satisfaction, there is a significant difference between workers who work in normal working conditions and those who work in different working conditions. Improved working conditions relate to improvement of safety at work, training of workers, control and improvement of machinery and tools, and to provide adequate equipment. Hence, favourable working conditions must be provided to the employees to achieve the desirable objective of an organisation. As a result of these improvements, it is possible that satisfaction with working conditions of workers who work in different working conditions increases. It may, however, be noted that the majority have appreciated the provision of a wide range of facilities including those provided on a voluntary basis. Out of 12 statements relating to working conditions, five are ranked moderate, four are ranked high-moderate, and three are ranked low (including one very low).

In GLTTL organisation, respondents presented low opinion on weekly work relay system (weighted average 0.03), freedom to complete your work in your own way without outside interference, freedom regarding working hours (weighted average 0.07).

In ML&Co organisation, respondents expressed low opinion on weekly work relay system (weighted average 0.06), freedom to complete work in your own way without outside interference, (weighted average 0.11). Between the two factories, ML&Co's performance in working conditions is rated better by the respondents.

In GLTTL and ML&Co organisations, high level of satisfaction has been expressed by the respondents and opinion on working conditions is quite good. Some

of flexibility regarding working conditions is requested by the employees. The employees' abilities and willingness to perform are influenced by work environment of an organisation. To remove stress among the employees, friendly work environment must be provided to the employees. This should be given priority by the management in addressing itself to the issue of providing a happy and healthy work environment to their employees.

10.10.4 Job Security

Job security is one of the central variables in work and seen as an important indication of quality of working life. Job security deals with the steadiness of employment, with the feeling that one has reasonable chance of working under conditions of organisation's stability. It represents the strength of the organisation to provide permanent and stable employment regardless of the changes in work environment. Job security includes opportunities of continuous growth. Individuals with security feeling will feel valued, self-adequate and will have the opportunity to learn trade or job. Out of 8 statements regarding job security, four are ranked moderately agree, two are ranked low agree (including one very low agree), and two are ranked low disagree (including one very low disagree).

In GLTTL organisation respondents disagreed and stated negative response with the opinion expressed regarding the following: sickness and maternity benefits (weighted average -0.12), satisfaction in life comes from work (weighted average -0.05). Low positive opinion statements are in respect of security with your earnings in the organisation (weighted average 0.03), and job in the organisation is secure (weighted average 0.06).

In ML&Co statements are disagreed and expressed by the respondents on sickness and maternity benefits (weighted average is -0.09), satisfaction on work life (weighted average is -0.04). Those ranked low agree secure with earnings (weighted average is 0.02), job in the organisation is secure (weighted average is 0.08).

The overall performance of ML&Co stated to be better when compared to GLTTL with regard to job security aspects. The areas that need considerable improvement are: making work pleasant to enable employees feel a greater degree of

satisfaction; and provision of medical benefits, including maternity benefits covering leave with pay and reimbursement of expenses.

It has been found on the basis of weighted average values that ML&Co is better compared with GLTTL. The job security is the highest followed by health security, economic security, and emotional security. The organisation can do well if it is able to address itself more to emotional security needs of the employees.

10.10.5 Compensation

Compensation and rewards are one of the mainsprings of motivation. No organisation can expect to attract and retain qualified and motivated employees unless it pays them fair compensation. Employees' compensation influences not only productivity and profitability of the company but also growth of the organisation. Quality of Work Life is associated with satisfaction with wages, working 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. The study reveals that out of various factors related to compensation, the employees are not satisfied with the fact that the remuneration paid to them is commensurate with their work and abilities.

Out of (10 statements) for five statements negative expression is given indicating different levels of dissatisfaction – one is of very low level, and four are of low level. Five statements revealed positive results – one each indicating very high moderate, high moderate, low moderate; and two indicating very low moderate. Five statements considered satisfactory by the employees as revealed through the positive weighted average are as follows:

In GLTTL organisation five statements present low level of dissatisfaction: (a) have you received any additional benefits (weighted average score -0.12), (b) the company adequately remunerates the employees in relation to their work and abilities (weighted average score -0.07), (c) The wage agreements/negotiations takes place from time to time (weighted average score -0.03), (d) The company's pay scale is better in comparison to other related organisations (weighted average score -0.06), (e) are you satisfied with the present wages in GLTTL (weighted average score -0.04). Two statements having low moderate opinions are, (a) the method of wage payment

followed in your organisation is good (weighted average score 0.03), (b) the company's pay scale is a motivating factor for work (weighted average score 0.04).

In ML&Co organisation five statements have expressed low level of dissatisfaction opinions. These are: (a) have you received any additional benefits (weighted average score -0.10), (b) the company adequately remunerates the employees in relation to their work and abilities (weighted average -0.03), (c) the wage agreements/negotiations take place from time to time (weighted average score -0.04), (d) The company's pay scale is better in comparison to other related organisations (weighted average score -0.03), and (e) are you satisfied with the present wages (weighted average score is -0.03). Two statements having low moderate opinions are, (a) the method of wage payment followed in your organisation is good (weighted average score 0.04), (b) the company's pay scale is a motivating factor for work (weighted average score 0.04).

Finally, based on the opinions expressed, it is noticed that the respondents are not happy with the compensation/rewards available for them in GLTTL and ML&Co industries. While the management in tobacco industries cannot pay on par with other industries, at least they should make employees get the feeling of equity. If not good, a sizable section of employees should consider their compensation to be fair. It is particularly important in view of the spiraling prices that impact the purchasing capacity of employees. The management of the organisations should pay attention to rewards and these factors relating to compensation management with a view to satisfy; the employees gave score high on these parameters of quality of work life.

10.10.6 Career Growth and Development

The employees' career growth and development is the parameter of quality of work life. A career is the sequence of work role or a sequence of a person's work experiences over a period. Career arises from the interaction of individuals with organisations and society. Career is not primarily a theoretical construct but is used in meaningful ways, given meaning and it creates meaning and also experience. More specifically, career is referred to as a succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered,

predictable sequence. There is also another side of career which is linked to the individual's "moving perspective" on their life and its meaning.

Out of 7 statements, the respondents, in both the factories have expressed low level of dissatisfaction in GLTTL and ML&Co organisations.

In GLTTL organisation low dissatisfaction is expressed in two statements: (a) have you attended any career counseling programmes from time to time (weighted average score -0.04); and (b) the company promotion policies are highly motivating (weighted average score -0.04).

High and very high level of dissatisfaction is expressed in terms of four statements: (a) the company operates good schemes of potential appraisal (weighted average score -0.08); (b) has the organisation conducted participatory appraisal programmes (weighted average score -0.10); (c) is your company providing training for skill upgradation and career development (weighted average score -0.08); and (d) promotions are handled in a fair way (weighted average score -0.11).

In ML&Co low dissatisfaction is expressed in two statements: (a) have you attended any career counseling programmes from time to time (weighted average score -0.03); and (b) the company promotion policies are highly motivating (weighted average score -0.05).

High and very high level of dissatisfaction is expressed in terms of four statements: (a) the company operates good schemes of potential appraisal (weighted average score -0.07); (b) has the organisation conducted participatory appraisal programmes (weighted average score -0.07); (c) is your company providing training for skill upgradation and career development (weighted average score -0.07); and (d) promotions are handled in a fair way (weighted average score -0.06).

However, career development is a process and activity to prepare the workers for positions in the organisation which will be occupied in future. A worker not only wants to get what is appropriate to him/her but expects change, progress and opportunities to progress to higher position at a later date. Career development can be pursued by the organisation in three ways, namely, through career education, providing career information and guidance. In the overall assessment, career growth and

development is an important factor influencing the quality of work life, organisation's efforts do not mach with the other parameters considered in this study. These levels of dissatisfaction as expressed by the employees need to be kept in view for improving the career development policies, which constitute the base for personnel development in the organisations.

10.10.7 Grievance Redressal Mechanism

Grievance is a symbol of dissatisfaction among employees, employers and management. It is the difference between employee expectations and organisational rewards, which normally creates grievance in an organisation. Dissatisfaction of employees regarding their wages, and benefits, overtime by employees, unhealthy working conditions, unpleasant relations are the causes of grievance in an organisation. To eliminate the causes, there is a need for grievance redressal procedure. An affective grievance redressal procedure creates truth, confidence and satisfaction among employees.

As indicators of organizational health, grievances are very important for the tobacco processing units as well because they can be aware of employee frustrations, problems and expectations through this medium. The parameters of grievance redressal mechanism contains five statements. All the five statements result in low moderate level of satisfaction from the employees.

In GLTTL organisation, five statements have expressed low moderate level of satisfaction (a) the company has an adequate grievance redressal mechanism (weighted average 0.04); (b) grievance redressal system is good and fair (weighted average 0.05), (c) the company attempts to redress the grievances quickly (weighted average 0.05), (d) our organisation wants to take feedback on redressal of grievances (weighted average 0.05), (e) the company encourages employees to ventilate their grievances (weighted average 0.08).

In ML&Co organisation respondents have expressed low moderate opinion on (a) grievance redressal system is good and fair (weighted average 0.06); (b) the company has an adequate grievance redressal mechanism (weighted average 0.06); (c) the company attempts to redress the grievances quickly (weighted average 0.07); (d) the company encourages employees to ventilate their grievances (weighted average

0.09); and (e) our organisation wants to take feedback on redressal of grievances (weighted average 0.09). Grievance redressal mechanism is implemented in these two organisations has received appreciation from the employees as revealed through the level of satisfaction on all the statements.

Thus the institution of formal grievance procedures does not automatically guarantee employee satisfaction. In view of the high percentage of employees indicating low moderate level of satisfaction in both the organisations; much attention needs to be paid for the improving the systematic grievance procedure in the organisations. Informal discussions with employees had revealed that management took nearly a month to redress their grievances. Though management claimed that the procedure adopted was formal it was not uniform on all occasions. A certain amount of informality crept into the way of redressal. Prompt redressal of grievances through a formal grievance procedure is one of the essential requirements for good practice for harmonious of industrial relations.

10.10.8 Social Integration at Work Place

Social Integration at work place can be established by creating freedom from prejudice, supporting primary work group a sense of community and inter-personal openness, egalitarian and upward mobility. The aspects of social integration at work have been analysed through seven statements. The results as revealed through the weighted average can be categorised statement wise.

In GLTTL organisation high dissatisfaction is expressed by the respondents by discriminatory treatment among employees based on various criteria (weighted average -0.18), and low disagreed statements are: (a) does your work in any way influence or adversely affect your family life (weighted average -0.02), and (b) my company helps employees in fulfilling their personal aspirations (weighted average -0.06). Low level of satisfaction is in respect of one: do you have economic independence when compared to other people (weighted average 0.04).

In ML&Co dissatisfaction is very high in respect of discriminatory treatment among employees based on various criteria (weighted average -0.12); and low in respect of (a) my company helps employees in fulfilling their personal aspirations (weighted average -0.04), and (b) does your work in any way influence or adversely

affect your family life (weighted average -0.05). Low level of satisfaction is in respect of one: do you have economic independence when compared to other people (weighted average 0.05).

The area where the management is requested to devote greater attention is as follows: (a) to eliminate discriminatory treatment among employees, (b) to minimise adverse consequences on family life through adjustments in the work pattern, and (c) for enabling people to realise their personal aspirations. On other areas where employees have expressed satisfaction, greater encouragement can be given by the management to bring about cordial work relations among employees, and for improving productivity.

10.10.9 Social Relevance of Work Life

Social Relevance is a distinct concept that relates to an employee's desire to remain with an organisation out of a sense of loyalty, emotional attachment and financial needs. This leads to organisational commitment which can be defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. This covers a broad array of actions such as behaving ethically, supporting the work of non-profit organizations, treating employees fairly, and minimising damage to the environment. Out of the (9 statements) one statement received very low level of dissatisfaction (negative result). The remaining are low moderate opinions as expressed by the respondents.

In GLTTL respondents have expressed negative opinion on one statement (a) Involvement of employees in planning and decision making (weighted average -0.03). Very low level of satisfaction in respect of the following aspects: (a) the company is respecting the workers' rights (weighted average 0.03); (b) find any difficulty in balancing your time between work and personal life (weighted average 0.04); (c) the company cares about the employees' human need (weighted average 0.04); (d) quite often you feel proud of being an employee of the organisation; (weighted average 0.04). (e) we have freedom to express our opinion at the work place (weighted average 0.04); (f) the company has been supporting the employees in times of emergency (weighted average 0.05); (g) has the company's goodwill and image helped you in

improving your status in the society (weighted average 0.06); (h) regarding your feeling proud of performing your work, how do you feel (weighted average 0.08).

In ML&Co respondents have expressed negative opinion on one statement (a) Involvement of employees in planning and decision making (weighted average is -0.04), very low level of satisfaction (a) the company is respecting the workers' rights (weighted average 0.04); (b) we have freedom to express our opinion at the work place (weighted average 0.04); (c) the company cares about the employees' needs (weighted average 0.05); (d) arranging self care facilities at the work place (weighted average 0.05); (e) quite often you feel proud of being an employee of the organisation (weighted average 0.06) (f) do you find any difficulty in balancing your time between work and personal life (weighted average 0.06); (g) has the company's goodwill and image helped you in improving your status in the society (weighted average 0.07); (h) the company has been supporting the employees in times of emergency (weighted average 0.07).

On the basis of the overall analysis, it may be found that there is need for greater attention needs to be paid by the management on the following aspects: (a) involving the employees' representatives in planning and decision making; (b) taking care of human needs of employees such as arranging self-care facilities at the work place; (c) giving greater freedom to employees to express their opinion at the work place; and (d) respecting workers' rights.

10.11 Testing of Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1: Health and safety features and welfare features are positively correlated.

This has be provided right through the data presented in table 5.1 and 5.2, and summing up presented in sections 5.13 and 5.23. Regarding health and safety features, it is found that the overall responses are considered as positive, with seven statements scoring modest and high modest positive, ML&Co has received better weighted score compared to GLTTL. Out of nine statements regarding welfare facilities, four are ranked high (including two very low). The overall performance with regarding to provision of welfare facilities can be stated to be better in ML&Co compared to

GLTTL. The two aspects mentioned in this pare move in the same direction, and are positively correlated.

Hypotheses 2: Working conditions and job security in an organisation are not directly related. They tend to be independent.

This has been proved right through the data presented in table 6.1 and 6.2 and summing up presented in section 6.13 and 6.22. Out of the 12 statements relating to working conditions, five are ranked moderate, four are ranked high moderate, and three are ranked low (including one very low). In both the factories, high level of satisfaction has been expressed by the respondents in respect of nine statements. Between the two factories, ML&Co's performance in working conditions is related better. Overall, it can be stated that working conditions in both the factories are rated quite good. The flexibility as requested by the employees may be considers by the management. Out of the eight statements regarding job security, four are ranked moderate agree, two are rated low agree (including one very low agree), and two are ranked low disagree (including one very low disagree). The overall performance of ML&Co can thus be stated to be better when compared to GLTTL with regards to job security aspects. Considerable improvement is needed in job security in a number of aspects in factories, working conditions and job security in an enterprise thus, to be independent.

Hypotheses 3: Compensation paid and career development planned in an organisation tends to be independent, though they move in the same direction occasionally.

The hypotheses has been proved right as shown through data given in table 7.1 and 7.2, and summing up presented in section 7.11 and 7.19. With regard to compensation paid to employees, out of ten statements, four five, negative expression is given indicating different levels of dissatisfaction – one is of very level, and four of low level. Four statements reveal positive results – one each indicating very high moderate, high moderate and low moderate; and two indicating very low moderate. The five areas where dissatisfaction has been expressed by the employees need careful attention by the management of both the factories to make service conditions of employees more attractive, and to reduce labour turnover. Between the two factories, ML&Co gets high score with regards to better terms of compensation compared to GLTTL. Regarding career development, out of seven statements, the employees have

expressed low - moderate – satisfaction on the overall Human Resource Policy. However, on all the specific aspects related to career development, which are part of the HR policy, the respondents have expectations from the companies, and having expressed different level of dissatisfaction. These levels of dissatisfaction need to be kept in view for improving with career development polices.

Hypotheses 4: Social integration and social relevance in an organisation tend to be positively correlated.

The hypotheses has been proved right as given by the data of Table 8.1 and 8.2, and summing up presented in sections 8.8 and 8.18. Out of seven statements indicating social integration at work, dissatisfaction to expressed in three statements (very high – one, and low – two). Low level of satisfaction is in respect of one and moderate level of satisfaction in respect of three statements. The management is requested to pay greater attention for those where dissatisfaction has been expressed, and give greater encouragement where satisfaction has been expressed. With regard to social relevance of work life, out of nine statements, one statement received very low level of dissatisfaction; and among the eight where positive response has been given, one statement received moderate level of satisfaction, three very low level of satisfaction, and four low level of satisfaction. The areas where greater level of attention need to be paid by the management in respect of social relevance of work life has been pin pointed. In respect of social integration of work life and social relevance of work life, the percent level of satisfaction is low, and need considerable improvement. The directions are similar; hence positively correlated.

10.12 Suggestions

Based on the findings of the study, the following suggestions are offered for the betterment of quality of work life of women workers in tobacco processing industries.

1) Health, safety and working conditions should be accorded top priority, while ensuring quality of work life in both the organisations. Quality of work environment is an essential element for quality of work life. The study reveals that the organisations are blind towards the employees with regard to health and safety, and working conditions. Irregular functioning of the safety committee brought out the inadequacy of the organisation regarding safety measures. No regular enquiry is

being made from the part of management to understand whether the employees are satisfied with the safety measures. Thus the working of the safety committee should be made regular, and it must be ensured that employees' use the safety equipment properly and in time. The organisation should go through the new requirement relating to safety measures. Working atmosphere should be structured in such a way that it is worker friendly, and provides a homely atmosphere. Annual medical checkups should be made compulsory for all employees, of both the organisations irrespective of their levels.

2) It is necessary to recommend preventive measures to overcome the occupational health hazards. Sophisticated tools must be used for creating awareness among workers. Research at the occupations will help to reduce and minimize the hazards and stress in a scientific way. Nose masks and goggles must be provided while working in dusty areas. Lung function testing before starting employment should be carried out. Good housekeeping, introducing dust emitting machines, exhaust fans and proper ventilations will reduce dust concentration. These preventive measures will help the workers to work in a hazard free, safe environment and to lead a healthy life.

3) There is need to improve the working environment in the organisations by ensuring that employees work under safe and healthy conditions. This can be achieved by developing highly professionalized occupational safety and health policies that guarantee the safety of all employees at work. The management of GLTTL and ML&Co should create an environment that it is sensitive to women employees so that they are able to enjoy their work life.

4) The pay should be competitive with the external labour market and responsive to the prevailing practices and changing economic conditions. A sound wage and salary structure is one of the prerequisites of good employer and employee relations. In order to develop such a structure, it is essential that pay is related to the nature of the job and experience of the persons. The study reveals that employees irrespective of leaves are least satisfied with the compensation. When employees are under - paid, it leads to a silent cold war between the management and the employees. As the stress and strain of employees are going on one side, and

stagnant compensation continues on the other, these lead the employees to be discontent in their job both physically and psychologically. Thus, opt for a fair return based on their work.

5) Opportunity to use and develop human capacity is an added aspect which contributes further to quality of work life. Positive feedback and habitual motivation is a part which boosts the efficiency of employees in their work. The employees should realise that individual contribution needs to be highlighted aptly, which will be a reward for the employees. Both financial and non-financial motivation schemes should be introduced in the organisation for the better performance of employees. Employee encouragement is a factor for maintaining better quality of work life in the organisation.

6) Superior-subordinate relationship is another important factor which maintains the quality of work life. Superiors and subordinates should work in tandem for the success of the organisation. Superiors should be understanding, provide positive feedbacks, and bind the employees together to retain, and enhance working conditions.

7) Career development is quite obvious for women workers as an ambition to growth in the hierarchy of the organisation. But unfortunately in the respondent units, no scope has been provided for career development. The companies need to pay attention to growth aspirations of workers. Now a day's organizations expect workers to be actively involved in the ongoing process of improvement and change in the organisations. They are expected to learn new concepts and skills like, kaizen, TPM, TQM etc., and continuously improve the quality of the company's products. It is desirable to provide them with opportunities for career growth, and motivate them for active participation in the change. Whenever workers experience stagnation and lack of motivation, they are likely to oppose such changes, and especially those in the manufacturing sector, should not ignore this issue.

8) The study units have the grievance redressal mechanism but the awareness of the employees about the system is low. Sometimes they approach the trade unions for grievance redressal instead of submitting their job related complaints to the appropriate authorities of the Grievance Redressal Mechanism. The women

workers must be encouraged to express their grievances freely and necessary awareness created among them, about various authorities at different levels who are concerned with the redressal of their grievances.

9) The management should provide opportunities annually for their families to participate in celebrations, and festive occasions or outings. This will keep the employees and his/her family satisfied, through improvement of the morale of employees and their family members. Periodic stock taking and enquiries should be conducted by the management to assess the level of satisfaction of employees with the welfare facilities provided to them, and other related aspects. Welfare of the organisation and also welfare of the employees should be given equal weightage for promoting better quality of work life, and smooth and harmonious industrial relations.

10) Social relationship plays a significant role for the employee job involvement and job satisfaction. Relation and cooperation between job employees is a direction for continuous learning and development. It also encourages the voluntary involvement of employees, and self-help through mutual cooperation.

10.13 Observations flowing from the field study

In GLTTL and ML&Co authorities have extended appropriate support in terms of allowing the permission of women respondents to share their views and answering the interview schedule during their duty time. In the initial stage of data collection, some of the respondents participated while on duty which took slightly more time because in between they attended to break of their schedule work. Most are expressed due to this work pressure some of the women respondents had to limit their discussion even though they had much to share even beyond the researcher's requirement. At the same time the researcher could not afford to miss any opportunity of interviewing the respondents because meeting the respondents second time would be an impossible task. So the researcher had to wait a long time to meet some of the respondents. Sometimes while conducting an interview in the rest rooms more than one worker are joined due to curiosity, and the researcher had to request the others staff to be cooperative by keeping themselves away. There are interviews that took more than one hour each because the respondents shared a lot of information while sparing considerable

working time. Overall, each interview schedule took an average of 30 minutes and in a day an average of 8 interviews was complished. The total time spent on conducting the data was three months.

Majority of the women respondents are rural and semi-urban background irrespective of the distance traveled and the duration of travel is longer. It is observed that the workers, supervisors had lack of knowledge on polices and programmes, participation in union's low bargaining power, need knowledge on safety, welfare and education on career programmes.

On the whole, it was an enriching experience, because the researcher could interview 300 women respondents in the selected two tobacco processing industries, which include women supervisors. However, a few supervisory staff did indicate lack of interest for giving interviews because they felt by sharing their information, they would not gain personally. Such staff were excluded from the study because the participation in this study is purely voluntary.

10.14 Suggestions based on the field study

Based on the field work objectives and interventions with women respondents the researcher offers the following suggestions:

- ➢ Women voice needs to be considered for participation in plant level decision making.
- ➢ Dialogue culture among the workers and supervisors/employees needs to be introduced. It is an effective tool for organizational culture change and for performance improvement and also reduces the absenteeism, dissatisfaction at work.
- ➢ Wage policy to be reviewed and monitored regularly and certain measure to be taken in time to time.
- ➢ Transport and housing facilities to be enhanced for all outside women workers from rural areas.
- ➢ To ensure employees satisfaction, and perceptions by Quality of Work Life tools.
- ➢ Employers need to embrace a certain level of employment security, job safety, free from job anxiety, reasonable wage, family day/leisure life, work life balance, social life, enjoyment opportunity, participation in decision making.

➢ Team work activities to be developed for more productivity, performance training to be introduced in all levels for performance and job satisfaction.

➢ Less overtime, off day, and weekly working hours not more than 48 (6 days in a week) for women employees.

➢ Working conditions of women, workers and other special categories will be improved.

➢ Labour management supportive relationship and adopting lifelong welfare policies, top management forum on labour management cooperation to be organized and establishing profit sharing between workers and management.

➢ Provide counseling for those with family problems, psychological problems.

➢ Paternity leave can be introduced along with maternity leave benefits. Further on site or near site child development centers may be provided.

10.15 Social Work Interventions to Improve the QWL of Women Workers

The researcher closely observed the problems of women workers in tobacco processing units in Guntur district, the practices like to organize and conduct the health camps, and to provide the treatment against bronchitis, breathing and cancer problems. The social work interventions like to create awareness on health problems and to give guidance on prevention. Social interaction and relations that enhance the employees share at work place with their superiors and subordinates. If the employee relations are strained with superiors or colleagues work life is naturally affected. The opportunity for socialisation with colleagues is an important aspects of quality of work life.

Social work interventions have to initiate by both the organisations as create freedom to employees to express their opinion at work place and give priority to women workers rights and treat all the employees fairly.

10.16 Conclusion

The success of an organisation depends on the well being of its employees and not merely on profit maximization. Today's organizations are in need of fast, flexible, dynamic, enthusiastic, motivation, creative and full self expressed employees marching at the forefront and record growth with excellence. In such a context employees satisfaction of job through better QWL is an essential factor. QWL denotes all aspects

of, organisational effectiveness. Regardless of sectors, organisations have to devote immense care and attention on all QWL parameters for the betterment of employees to maintain a conductive environment in the organisation. An employee centered organisation will maintain better quality of work life.

However, the success of the QWL programmes depends on the organisational culture and participation between management and employees. The goals of QWL programmes are to improve the work design and requirements, the working conditions and environment and organisational effectiveness. It aims to create more involvement, satisfying and effective jobs and work environment for the employees at all levels of the organisation. A decentralized organisational structure, and commitment between the management and employees result in high levels of employees' job satisfaction and low turnover. Employees' involvement and cooperation is a key factor in the success of QWL. Empowered employees have greater autonomy and control over their working conditions, and as a result are more likely to have higher job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and low job stress and turnover.

The results of the present study reveal some implications to managerial practice of industrial concerns. In dealing with women employees, the organisation's top management and HR department should review its compensation policy so that a fair compensation is in place including periodical salary revision and pay that is commensurate with the responsibilities. The company should review its policy on employees' rights. Among others, the management should be open and willing to listen to employees' views, exercise the right to equitable treatment in all matters including the employees' compensation scheme, reward and job security, and follow "rule of law" and not "rule of man". Besides the two mentioned above, the third strongest relationship is the opportunity for using and developing human resource capacity. The management should review its policy on the opportunity for using and developing human resource capacity. Among others, the management should allow freedom to do work effectively among employees, encourage the use of available skills and knowledge in running the jobs, encourage information channel through two-way communication, review the job design for effective job implementation, and encourage employees to plan and implement their daily activities in a planned way without any impediments.

10.17 Recommendations

It is recommend that the GLTTL & ML&Co organizations have taken more initiatives on women employees and fulfill their requirements, and enjoy their loyalty and commitment. Organizations also explore the dimensions of QWL and should work with employees to redesign the work, eliminate job stress, increasing job autonomy, providing learning and training opportunities and improve quality of work life.

Finally excellent QWL will result in happy and healthy employees who will provide better turnover, make sensible decisions and contribute towards organizational productivity. Moreover an assured QWL will attract more women workers and potential talent to organizations and also, help to retain the existing and experienced talent.

10.18 Scope for Further Research

Based on the design, coverage and findings of the present study, the researcher suggests scope for future research relating to Quality of Work life (QWL) in this section.

QWL and allied themes can be covered for research with men or women employees in a number of industrial and service enterprises, and organisations. Enterprises can be in the public, private and cooperative categories. These can be in the large, medium and small scale sectors, Specific industry groups of various product lines and organisations be considered, such as export oriented units, sub-contracting enterprises supplying to parent enterprises, large construction companies, educational institutions, and marketing organisations. A few organisations in which doctoral study was carried out in recent years are as follows: steel plant, railways, banking and insurance companies, hospitals, library of an educational institution or of the government, chit funds, etc.