

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE- A QUANTITATIVE STUDY ON PUBLIC AND SCHEDULED PRIVATE SECTOR BANK EMPLOYEES IN KOTTAYAM DISTRICT

¹Abin Jose, ²Rinu Mathew, ³Rosemary Jacob

¹Assistant Professor, ²Assistant Professor, ³Assistant Professor

¹Department of Business Administration, ²Department of Commerce, ³Department of Commerce

¹ St. Albert's College, Ernakulam, India, ²Bharata Mata College, Trikkakara,

³St Antony's College, Peruvanthanam³

Abstract : Quality of Work Life (QWL) is a relatively new concept which is coined as the level of happiness or dissatisfaction in individual's working life. Now, QWL is viewed as an alternative to control, as a means of managing people. In a wider sense, Quality of work life denotes all the organizational inputs which aim at the employee's satisfaction and enhancing organizational effectiveness. The basic purpose of QWL is to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for employees as well as economic health of organization. . Success of any organization highly depends on how an organization attracts a person to the organization and the way it recruits, motivates and retains its work force. This study has made an attempt to analyses the quality of work life among public and scheduled private sector bank employees.

IndexTerms - Quality of Work Life, Job satisfaction, organisational effectiveness.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life is a philosophy, a set of principles which holds that people are the most important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and are competent of making significant contribution and they should be treated with dignity and respect. Employees are the force and backbone behind every successful organization. No organization can become successful with technology only because for the use of technology also, organizations need to have strong work force. The concept, Quality of Work Life was introduced in the late 1960's and continued to gain more and more importance at every work place. Initially quality of work life focused on the effects of employment on the general well-being and the health of the workers. But now, its focus has changed to ensuring quality in work place and enabling decision making abilities thereby leading to motivation and better performance. In order to satisfy the 21st century work force, organization needs to concentrate not only on economic needs but also on job designs and organization of work. Moreover, today's workforce places importance to relationships and constantly tries to strike a balance between career and their personal life..

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Quality of work life plays a vital role in not only bringing the employees close to the company, but also in identifying the changing behavioural pattern of the employees. So it is necessary to measure the satisfaction level of employees towards quality of work life. The outcome of the study can be of great importance to bank management and bank employees in Kottayam district especially when banks spend a lot of money to provide good environment to workers for improving their quality of work life. Moreover, this study aims to understand if the two major sectors i.e. public and private sector banks share the same perception towards quality of life. So this study would be helpful in identifying the factors influencing quality of work life and also to measure the satisfaction towards it.

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Quality of work life is becoming an increasing popular concept in recent times. Quality of work life is the way in which the people are living in the organization in which they are working. It includes the work standard, welfare facilities, safety, security and compensation measures etc. The performance of the organization can be improved only when the human resource are satisfied with the higher quality of work life. Thus the purpose of the study is to identify the level of satisfaction of bank employees and factors influencing quality of work life among public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees in Kottayam district.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To identify various factors influencing quality of work life among public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees.
- To identify the level of satisfaction regarding quality of work life among public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees.

V. HYPOTHESIS

H₀: There is no significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to factors influencing quality of work life.

H₁: There is no significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to level of satisfaction regarding quality of work life.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

VI.I Population and Sample

The population consist of 4080 bank employees, out of which 80 employees were selected by using simple random sampling. The collection of data is done through structured questionnaire. The data is collected from 80 respondents of which 40 are from public sector bank employees and rest from scheduled private sector bank employees in Kottayam district.

VI.II Data and Sources of Data

The present study is based on the primary as well as the secondary data. Secondary data is collected from various books, newspapers and internet. Primary data is collected through structured questionnaire.

VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

VII.I Profile of the sample

Table 6.1: Profile of the sample

Basis	Public sector		Scheduled private sector	
	In No	%	In No	%
1. Age				
<25 years	4	10	13	32.5
25-35	8	20	10	25
35-45	20	50	11	27.5
45& above	8	20	6	15
2. Gender				
Male	25	62.5	22	55
Female	15	37.5	18	45
3. Designation				
Manager	7	17.5	5	12.5
Deputy manager	3	7.5	3	7.5
Head cashier	7	17.5	4	10
Computer operator	6	15	8	20
Cashier	2	5	7	17.5
Clerk	10	25	10	25
Officer	5	12.5	3	7.5
4. Nature of employment				
Permanent	40	100	40	100
Trainee	0	0	0	0
Contract	0	0	0	0
5. Experience				
<5 years	3	7.5	14	35
5_10	6	15	13	32.5
11_20	17	42.5	6	15
Above 20	14	35	7	17.5

VII.II Testing Of Hypothesis

6.2.1 Hypothesis No:1

H₀: There is no significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to factors influencing quality of work life.

H₁: There is significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to factors influencing quality of work life.

Table 4.2.1: Factors affecting quality of work life

Factors	Bank	N	Mean	S.D	T	Sig(2tailed)
Pay package	public sector bank	40	2.32	1.492	1.356	.179
	Private sector bank	40	2.78	1.476		
Good working Atmosphere	public sector bank	40	2.42	1.430	2.319	.023
	Private sector bank	40	3.30	1.911		
Career prospects	public sector bank	40	3.52	1.396	.080	.937
	Private sector bank	40	3.55	1.413		
Job security	public sector bank	40	3.40	1.566	.921	.360
	Private sector bank	40	3.05	1.825		
Work life balance	public sector bank	40	4.00	1.633	1.482	.030
	Private sector bank	40	3.18	1.708		
Participation in decision making	public sector bank	40	6.22	1.423	0	.142
	Private sector bank	40	6.68	1.289		
Free Communications	public sector bank	40	6.18	1.796	3.195	1.000
	Private sector bank	40	6.18	1.647		
Stress level	public sector bank	40	7.05	.483	3.195	.002
	Private sector bank	40	7.65	1.085		

To test the above hypothesis, Independent samples t-test was used. Since P value < 0.05 in case of good working atmosphere and stress level, H_1 was accepted and concluded that there is a significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to good working atmosphere and stress level. H_0 was accepted in case of other factors and concluded that there is no significant difference between public and scheduled private bank employees with regards to pay package, career prospects, job security, work life balance, participation in decision making and free communications.

6.2.2 Hypothesis No:2

H₀: There is no significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to level of satisfaction

H₁: There is significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to level of satisfaction

Table 4.2.2 Level of satisfaction regarding quality of work life

Bank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.(2-tailed)
Public sector bank	40	28.4250	2.61051	3.523	.001
Private sector bank	40	24.5000	2.26455		

To test the above hypothesis, Independent samples t-test was used. Since P value < 0.05 in the case of level of satisfaction between public sector and scheduled private sector, H_1 was accepted and concluded that there is a significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to level of satisfaction.

VII. FINDINGS

The main objective of the study is to compare of public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees. The study is conducted among employees and the data collected has been analysed by using various statistical tools. The main findings of the study one: -

- There is a significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to level of satisfaction regarding QWL. The public sector bank employees are more satisfied than scheduled private sector banks.
- There is significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to good working atmosphere and stress level. While there is no significant difference between public sector and scheduled private sector bank employees with regards to pay package, career prospects, job security, work life balance, participation in decision making and free communications.

IX. CONCLUSION

QWL has become the need of the hour. Quality of work life is not a concept, that deals with one area but it has been observed as incorporating a hierarchy of concepts that not only include work based factors but also factors that broadly focuses on life satisfaction and general feelings of wellbeing. To retain a good atmosphere in the organisation it is important to the organisation to have a high QWL and low stress level. The study confines its scope to various factors involved in the QWL of employees in relation to banks only and it covers the core aspects of QWL.

A majority of the Work culture in public and private sector banks was found to be entirely different. The employees working in banks were found involving themselves personally in their work, which indicates personal commitment. The personality structure of the employees working in banking sector was found to be superior to that of public sector bank employees. They don't consider work as compulsion, but they see it is an integral part of their lives and as a means of obtaining satisfaction through personal achievement. Employees working in banks were mostly satisfied with the salaries, amenities, nature of work, and other allowances. But, they were complaining against long working hours.

An assured good QWL will not only attract young and new talent but also retain the existing experienced talents. The success of any organisation depends on the efficiency of the employees. The organisation must promote quality of work life in order to increase the efficiency of the employees.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cunningham, J., & Eberle, T. (1990). *A Guide to Job Enrichment and Redesign*.
- [2] Bindu, J., & Yashika, S. (2014). Quality Of Work Life with Special reference to Academic Sector. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 14-17.
- [3] Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. (Oct.1981). Work Redesign. *The Academy of Management Review*, 687-689.
- [4] Levine, M., Taylor, J., & Davis, L. (1984). Define Quality of Work Life.
- [5] Rethinam, G. S. (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*.
- [6] Saraji, G. N., & Darghai, H. (2006). Study of Quality of Work Life. *Iranian J Publ Health*, 9-14.
- [7] Walton, R. (1980). Quality of work life activities: A research agenda. *Professional Psychology*, 484-493.
- [8] Basu, S. 1997. The Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to their Price to Earnings Ratio: A Test of the Efficient Markets Hypothesis. *Journal of Finance*, 33(3): 663-682.
- [9] Bhatti, U. and Hanif, M. 2010. Validity of Capital Assets Pricing Model. Evidence from KSE-Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 3 (20).