

BVIMR Management Edge

An Empirical Study on Factors Affecting Consumer Preferences of Shopping at Organised Retail Stores in Punjab (Dr. K.C. Mittal, Dr. Mahesh Arora, Anupama Prashar)

Measurement of Service Delivery in Selected Banks-A Perception & Expectation Analysis (Dr. Biranchi Narayan Swar, Prof. (Dr.) Prasant Kumar Sahoo)

Corporate Governance in India : An Empirical Study of Boards' Practices & Procedures (Prof. (Dr.) S. L. Gupta, Dr. B. S. Hothi, Abhishek Gupta)

Danger of Burning Out (Dr. Supriya Jha)

Reorientation of Learning System for Sustainable Development – Change from Brick Mortar Learning to E-Learning (Dr. Neeru Mundra, Karishma Gulati, Renu Vashisth)

Process Capability Validation - An effective tool (Dr. S.Suja)

Risk Management in Banks: Assurance for Returns (Dr. Pavan Mishra, Payal Sharma)

"E-Banking, is it safe, secure & private"-Technology and Security Standards for E-Banking (Prof. Virender Singh Solanki)

Construction of Portfolios using CAPM in Indian Stock Market (Dr. Vibha Dua Satija, Sakshi Saxena)

Goods and Services Tax (GST) (Shrawan Kumar Singh)

Overreactions in Financial Markets: A Critical Examination (Dr. Ranjit Singh)

Lok Sabha Elections 2009 – A New Beginning? : using the Multiple Regression Model for determining Possible Influence of Factors Influencing the Results (SK Samim Ferdows, Abhijit Aditya)

Consumer Impulse Buying Behavior in Hyderabad and Secunderabad markets (Rambabu Pentyala)

Developing Strategies for Emerging Economies (Taru Baswan)

Agricultural Growth and Instability in West Bengal: Some Issues and Facts (Samik Shome)

Consumer Loyalty of Indian Consumers towards Indigenous Fashion Brands (Dr. Bilal Mustafa Khan)

Analysis of Competition in Power Generation Sector in India and Argentina (Vebhav Gupta, Yogesh Singla)

Loyalty Programs for Hospitals : An Insight for E Commerce Companies (Anupama Prashar)

HRD in Insurance Sector (Special Reference to Life Insurance Corporation of India) (Dr. Santosh Singh Bais)

Fostering Transformational Leadership - A Research Based Development Plan (Vivekananda Suri)

Market reaction around the Announcement of Stock Split and Bonus Issues in India: An Empirical Analysis (Dr. Vibha Dua Satija, Dr. Harsh Purohit, Haritika Sabharwal Chhatwal)

An Inclusive Look on Quality of Work Life (QWL) in Medium Scale Unionized Organizations (Dr. Sarang S. Bhola, Jyoti J. Nigade)

Book Review-Human Resource Development & Management (Dr. Rupali Kumar)

BVIMR Management Edge is Indexed & Listed at:

- EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A. (Business Source Complete and Business Source Corporate Plus)
- Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A.

1964-2014
celebrating



Golden Jubilee

BHARATI VIDYAPEETH

Founder Hon'ble Dr. Patangrao Kadam



BHARATI VIDYAPEETH
DEEMED UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF
MANAGEMENT &
RESEARCH, NEW DELHI

A-4, Paschim Vihar, Rohtak Road,
New Delhi-110 063

An Inclusive Look on Quality of Work Life (QWL) in Medium Scale Unionized Organizations

Dr. Sarang S. Bhola
Jyoti J. Nigade

ABSTRACT

QWL is the quality of the content of relationship between human beings and their work. Term QWL may be conceptualized as a sub-set of quality of life since life at work is an integral part of total life space. Present research examined the impact of trade union on degree of Quality of Working Life in medium scaled organizations in Satara industrial estate. The research was focused on awareness and satisfaction of workers about eight broad criteria and eighty eight micro-parameters of QWL in the presence and absence of trade union. It is comparative study of QWL between medium scaled unionized and non-unionized organizations. Data was collected using Likert Scale and analyzed by using mean, rank and standard deviation and hypothesis is tested using independent sample 't' test.

The study find out that QWL in medium scaled unionized organization is better than non-unionized organization. It also concludes that union plays crucial role in the improvement of QWL in organization.

Keywords: QWL, Unionized Organization, Non-Unionized Organization, Satara.

Introduction

Quality of Working Life is not a unitary concept, but has been seen as incorporating a hierarchy of perspectives that not only include work-based factors such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay and relationships with work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999). QWL is a shared responsibility of management and workers which represents significant dimension in industrial relations. To be meaningful, workplace reform must take place within a context of changing power relations between union and managements. Otherwise it may be overwhelmed by events occurring in external environment. Labour unions, therefore, need to participate in QWL initiatives while simultaneously making new types of demands

during bargaining. (Gordon DiGiacomo.1987)

Concept of QWL and Trade Union:

In 1972 Louis Davis has coined this term first. Quality of Working Life is conceptually similar to well-being of employees but differs from job satisfaction which solely represents the workplace domain (Lawler, 1982). There are various definitions existed on QWL.

The American Center for the Quality of Working Life (1977) define QWL, 'Quality of work life improvements are defined as any activity which takes place at every level of an organization which seeks greater organizational effectiveness through the enhancement of human dignity and growtha process through which the stakeholders in the organization management, unions and employees – learn how to work together better

...to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve the twin and simultaneous goals of an improved quality of life at work for all members of the organization and greater effectiveness for both the company and the unions'.

Many scholars defined the term in their own perspectives, few to mention.

Balch, David E., et.al. (1989), defines QWL as it is the state or condition of work life that employees experience within their company. In the article ' Measuring the Quality of Work Life' he mentioned evidence of high QWL as; increased productivity and loyalty, increased levels of morale, frequent participation in cost saving suggestions, and employees who feel they do not need union representation to achieve their goal of having a good place to work.

Much broader concept of QWL stated by Richard E. Walton (1985) encompassing eight categories in it viz. Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security, Social Integration in Work Place,

Constitutionalism in the Work Organization, Balanced Role of Work in Total Life Space, Social Relevance of Work etc.

According to Jenkins (1981) The quality of work life is a broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories, and management styles through which organizations and jobs are designed so as to grant workers more autonomy, responsibility, and authority than is usually done. To simplify somewhat, the general objective is to arrange organizations, management procedures, and jobs for maximum utilization of individual talents and skills, in order to create more challenging and satisfying work and improve organization effectiveness.

From these definitions one finds broad as well as narrow approach towards QWL. A clearer understanding of the inter-relationship of the various facets of quality of working life offers the opportunity for improved analysis of cause and effect in the workplace.

The researcher made an attempt to assess QWL in medium scaled unionized and non-unionized organization in present study.

Review of Literature

A large chunk of most peoples' lives will be spent at work. Most people recognize the importance of sleeping well, and actively try to enjoy the leisure time that they can snatch. But all too often, people tend to see work as something they just have to put up with, or even something they don't even expect to enjoy. The allegation is between employer and employees generally found that are, employers feel that employees are more conscious about their rights and not the responsibilities. While employees feel that employer is only concern with the yield and profits and not the benefit of employees. Such allegation grows internal

strife in the work environment not only in unionized organizations but also in non-unionized organization.

The movement of unions earns importance for human as a factor of production. Cognizance was given to the culture, ethical aspects, values, organizational development and behavioral aspects of employees. Due to setting up of corporate culture and policies many issues of unions are already be taken into consideration. The ethical and moral values established in the organization matters to the QWL of organization (Singh A.P. 1995). Existence of better working environment in an organization encourages creativity, reduces anxiety, build a positive attitude and

increase job satisfaction which contributes significantly towards improved performance and efficiency of human resource Prasad et.al (2008).

Ample of opinions found on the relationship between union and QWL. An anonymous (1979) expressed the fear that, 'If unions and companies do not meet their needs, they will have to cope with alienated workers.'

New reform into organization bicker suspicion into the mind of employees and the suspicion also prevails with management as to acceptance of reforms by workers. The reforms through which management intends to attain efficiency. Employees and unions are expected to march hand-in-hand to attain organizational goals. (Cohen et.al 1979) argued that, QWL is a process of joint decision making, collaboration, and building mutual respect between management and employees, which seems to cause a change in how people feel about their work and each other. It is this change in the human climate that QWL advocates maintain increases satisfaction and facilitates better solutions to management and production problems." He further state that "managers and supervisors are sometimes threatened by a loss of control; union members are often suspicious that QWL is just a work speed-up in disguise or a threat to their adversary solidarity. For these reasons, and others, all QWL efforts involve extensive education and training. Having a higher degree of QWL indicates that more effective and democratic ways of using people in work.

The success of management reforms is depending on mutual faith and collective work. QWL should be treated as a joint venture of management and unions via the collective bargaining process (Lewin, David 1981). So that both the representatives can manifest adversarial as well as integrative attitudes when dealing with QWL issues which contributes more integration among experts of organizational behavior and industrial relations. Organization must accept the unions involvement in its operation, and management and unions must work together to assure that new programs are undertaken with good planning to improve the QWL of it (Beck, Al 1988). Both union and management have equal credit for the success of QWL in the organization (Thacker et.al 1987). Labor-management relations are improved through joint union-management QWL projects (Bushe, Gervase R 1988). Decisions on implementations taken in joint union-management committee should diffuse down to lower levels of the organization but union leadership

may send mixed messages to the rank-and-file about the extent of union support for QWL (Gilbert, Beth 1989).

QWL programs in unionized organization leads to several expectations as,

1. The two goals of an effective QWL program should be improved working conditions and greater organizational effectiveness. The changing aspirations and needs of today's employees require unions to adapt and adjust or face the prospect of extinction (Hian et.al 1990).
2. QWL involvement in and of itself should improve employee's job satisfaction; their reactions to the employer i.e. company commitment and also union commitment because it fulfills a need of the membership. The specific behaviors of union officials associated with participation in a QWL intervention result in improved attitudes. Members react positively when union officials show an active interest in work-related issues. Participation in a QWL process does not in and of itself influences reactions, but the perceived success of the endeavor does do so, Fields, Mitchell W.et.al. (1992).
3. In unionized organizations, QWL refers to a cooperative effort on the part of union and management representatives to involve employees in the day-to-day decision-making process at work which can affect both the company-and union-related attitudes of participants. In a company context, it is participation in work decisions, but in a union context, members interaction with union officers and the latter's responsiveness to member demands are key (Fields et.al 1992).
4. Cooperation between labour and management in the workplace is favourable to implement the QWL programs effectively and have been successful in meeting their varied goals of better working conditions, job security, employee satisfaction, employee participation in decision-making which reveal a pattern of steady improvement in productivity, profitability etc. QWL is a vehicle for gaining managerial, employee, and union commitment that would result in long-term benefits for both the Company and its employees (Peterson et.al 1992).

The expectations are fetching benefits to both

management and unions and the diffusion of experience of QWL program may create an environment in the industry to adopt QWL programs.

Eaton, Adrienne and et.al (1992) argued that, unions have viewed the increasing use of QWL programs in unionized workplaces with a great deal of caution and concern because reduced member identification, commitment, and activity stemming from QWL might make it more difficult for the union to conduct a work stoppage and therefore reduce its bargaining power. Finally, to the extent that union commitment and bargaining power are weakened by participative programs, the very existence of the union may be threatened. Both union and company commitment increased after employee's involvement in a joint QWL process.

Several researches focused attention towards benefits of QWL program in unionized organizations.

1. Porter, Nelson D (1984) in their article, 'Union Endorses Quality of Working Life' states that, the QWL program has led to create mutual trust between labor and management and also strengthened union members' attitudes toward the union. Workers become more self-confident, committed, and freer from job-related stresses. Workers of relatively low seniority benefited more than, and sometimes at the expense of workers with relatively high seniority. Senior workers suffered negative effects (i.e., lost ground), whereas junior workers remained unchanged (Gene Socialetti 1987).
2. One anonymous (1981) focused on benefits like smoother and less adversarial collective bargaining for entire company as well as all participants in a QWL program.

Unlike advantages of any management reforms QWL programs is not free from disadvantages. QWL programs have to introduce work changes that would decrease dissatisfaction in the work area (Rubinstein, Saul 1984), and need to increase workers participation in problem solving with QWL program. One anonymous (1981) expressed the fear of some unions about exploitation of the rank and file membership, after management has won union cooperation in a QWL program.

Martin D Hanlon, David A Nadler (1986) noted that,

organized labour cannot be benefited from union participation in QWL programmes until such programmes have spread rapidly.

There is scarcity of research on QWL addressing to the relationship between management and unions in Indian scenario. Hence, researchers have addressed this issue with the help of present research.

Research Methodology

Present research used diagnostic research methodology and required quantitative data is collected using inferential approach. The study of QWL and trade union is undertaken to test following hypothesis.

H0 – A QWL in medium scaled unionized organization does not differ than QWL in medium scaled non-unionized organization.

Primary data is collected with the help of structured schedule. Structure includes eighty eight variables depicting QWL in engineering units. These variables were organized in 8 broad criteria viz. Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunity to Develop Human Capability, Continued Growth and Security, Social Integration, Constitution at Workplace, Balanced Role of Work and Social Relevance of Work. Eight medium scale engineering units situated in MIDC Satara, State of Maharashtra, India were selected for research. Purposive sampling technique is used to select sample units. Five workers samples are selected from each sample unit using random sampling lottery method. Classification and analysis is done thereon. Data is collected using five point Likert scale. Using this scale satisfaction for each variable from every sample is assessed. These comments then converted to mean and ranks are given to the mean score. The higher mean denotes more satisfaction of samples about that variable. Consistency in the opinions of samples is measured by using standard deviation. Further hypothesis is tested by independent sample 't' test.

Data Analysis and Discussion

This section of paper discusses data analysis.

Table 1. Adequate and fair compensation:

Following table depicts mean, ranks and standard deviation for seven variables of adequate and fair compensation:

Sr	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Organization pays workers a s per Minimum Wages Act.	3.40	3	0.50	2.35	4	0.88
2	Payment of Bonus as per Bonus Act.	3.60	2	0.50	2.90	3	0.45
3	Overtime pay at double rate	2.55	6	1.00	1.55	6	1.00
4	Productivity based incentive	2.60	5	0.99	1.00	7	0.00
5	Provision of provident fund	3.65	1	0.49	3.10	1	0.31
6	Provision of Medical Fund or E.S.I.	3.25	4	0.44	3.05	2	0.39
7	Other employees welfare schemes	2.45	7	1.00	1.75	5	0.91

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

The greater mean score of sample workers shows more satisfaction among samples of unionized organization about adequate and fair compensation than of non-unionized organization.

Both types of organizations follow statutory

compliances firmly and there is more consistency in the opinions of unionized as well as non-unionized workers about provision of P.F. and E.S.I since both parameters have lowest standard deviation. But on another hand both types of organizations are lagging to provide productivity based incentives.

Table 2. Safe and healthy working conditions:

Following table contain information regarding satisfaction of samples towards different safe and healthy working conditions of the organization.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Floor cleanness	3.60	6	0.75	2.60	14	0.50
2	Sanitary and drainage cleanness	3.55	8	0.51	2.20	23	0.89
3	Disposal of wastes and effluents	3.75	3	0.64	2.55	15	0.51
4	Adequate light arrangement	3.95	1	0.60	3.25	1	0.64
5	Ventilation and temperature	3.15	17	0.49	2.50	16	0.69
6	Dust and Fumes	2.65	25	0.49	2.40	18	0.60
7	Overcrowding	1.35	29	0.67	2.30	22	0.47
8	Latrines and urinals	3.45	11	0.51	3.00	2	0.46
9	Fencing of machinery	3.85	2	0.59	2.65	11	0.81
10	Work on/ near machinery in motion	3.00	22	0.46	2.00	26	0.56

11	Striking Gears and devices for cutting off power	3.30	14	0.47	2.85	4	0.59
12	Casing of new machinery	3.60	6	0.50	2.80	9	0.52
13	Hoists and lifts	3.10	20	0.64	2.15	24	0.81
14	Lifting machines, chains, ropes and lifting tackles	2.85	24	0.49	2.05	25	0.76
15	Revolving machinery	3.15	17	0.49	2.40	18	0.50
16	Pits, sumps, openings in floor	3.70	5	0.47	2.45	17	0.69
17	Excessive weights	1.50	28	0.89	2.35	21	0.59
18	Explosive/inflammable dust & gases	2.60	26	1.10	1.60	28	0.75
19	Safety Limit Marking	3.50	9	0.51	2.85	4	0.49
20	Safety space between machine	3.30	14	0.66	2.90	3	0.55
21	Safety goggles and shoes etc.	3.75	3	0.44	2.65	11	0.81
22	Site Development	3.50	9	0.51	2.40	18	0.50
23	Dinning and Rest room	3.00	22	0.32	1.70	27	0.80
24	Drinking Water	3.45	11	0.51	2.85	4	0.67
25	First Aid Box	3.05	21	0.69	2.85	4	0.37
26	Industrial Uniform	3.20	16	0.52	2.65	11	0.67
27	Canteen Facilities	2.50	27	1.00	1.00	29	0.00
28	Formal Safety Training	3.45	11	0.76	2.70	10	0.47
29	Fire Fighting Equipment's	3.15	17	0.59	2.85	4	0.49

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Samples in unionized organization are more satisfied than non-unionized organization as their mean score is greater for most of the parameters.

Samples in unionized and non-unionized organization are highly satisfied with light arrangements in company, since it has highest mean score 3.95 and 3.25 respectively and 1 rank in both types of organizations. Samples in unionized organization shows more satisfaction towards Fencing of machinery, Disposal of wastes and effluents, Safety goggles and shoes since they are having 2 and 3 rank respectively while in case of non-unionized organization samples are satisfied with Latrines and

urinals facility and Safety space between machine which shows higher mean score i.e. 3.00 and 2.90 with lower standard deviation.

Workers in sample organizations are suffering from explosive/inflammable dust and gases, excessive weights as well as they are not happy with canteen facilities but there is much deviation in opinions of samples of unionized organization.

Table 3. Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacity:

Following table shows opinions of samples towards availability of immediate opportunities to use and develop human capacities.

Sr	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Workers participation in decision making	3.00	6	0.65	1.80	5	0.89
2	Workers require multiple skill to do the job	3.75	1	0.44	2.60	2	0.50
3	Workers perform complete job	3.50	2	0.61	2.55	3	0.60
4	Regular feedback about work to employees	3.30	5	0.73	2.85	1	0.59
5	Workers enjoys autonomy at work	3.40	3	0.60	2.10	4	0.79
6	Moderate delegation of authority to workers	3.40	3	0.60	1.40	6	0.75
7	Management practiced redesigning	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Management evaluated effects of redesigning	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Management diagnose job before redesigning	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Management consult workers before redesigning	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Samples in unionized organizations are more satisfied than non-unionized workers about immediate opportunities available in organization to use and develop human capacity as their mean score is greater than of non-unionized organization.

Samples in unionized as well as non-unionized organizations are highly satisfied with scope to use

multiple skills during tasks and performing complete job which has higher mean score, and their opinions are more consistent also, since standard deviation for scope to use multiple skills is 0.44 and 0.50 and for performing complete job 0.61 and 0.60 respectively.

Both organizations are lagging to implement the job redesigning policy.

Table 4. Opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security:

Following table shows opinions of all samples towards career development in the organization.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Challenging job opportunities	3.60	1	0.50	2.85	2	0.49
2	Internal Training	3.40	4	0.60	2.45	6	0.69
3	Promotion or upward move	2.85	7	0.59	1.65	8	0.81
4	Employed job rotation system	2.90	6	0.45	2.70	4	0.57
5	Arrangement for employment security	3.40	4	0.50	2.50	5	0.69
6	Chance for expanding knowledge	3.45	2	0.60	3.10	1	0.45

7	Personality development	3.45	2	0.60	2.85	2	0.37
8	Suggestion Scheme	2.45	8	0.94	1.90	7	0.97
9	Career planning system / policy	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Career counseling	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	Career development workshops	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	Mentoring programs	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Assessment centers	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	External Training	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

In unionized organization opportunities for continued career growth and security are available in plenty as compared to non-unionized organization as there is more satisfaction in the opinions of unionized workers. Samples in unionized as well as non-unionized organization shows highest satisfaction towards Challenging job opportunities having mean score 3.60 and 2.85 and for Chance for expanding knowledge it is 3.45 and 3.10 respectively with more consistency in opinions.

There is less satisfaction and less consistency in opinions of both types of workers towards suggestion

scheme since its mean score is less and standard deviation is large as compared to other parameters. Both types of organizations does not give importance to career building of their employees, since they do not have career planning system, career counseling, career development workshops, mentoring programs and availability of training and development program from external sources.

Table 5. Social integration in the work organization: Following table shows mean with ranks for different variables of social integration in the work organization.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Existence of natural work units.	3.60	1	0.50	2.85	1	0.49
2	Workers Meeting	3.20	5	0.62	1.35	9	0.67
3	Top executives involved in socio cultural activities	3.00	9	0.65	2.25	8	0.72
4	Celebration of different festivals	3.10	8	0.55	2.80	2	0.52
5	Sense of community	3.30	3	0.66	2.45	7	0.69
6	Inter personnel openness	3.30	3	0.47	2.65	4	0.49
7	Workers receive humanized treatment	3.60	1	0.50	2.55	5	0.51
8	Freedom from prejudice	3.20	5	0.52	2.50	6	0.69
9	Workers meeting with top officials	3.20	5	0.62	2.75	3	0.44
10	Workers meetings with owners / Directors	2.75	10	1.16	1.35	9	0.67

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Above table denotes more satisfaction among samples in unionized organization than non-unionized organization about social integration in the workplace as their mean score of all parameters is greater as compared to non-unionized organizations.

Most of the samples in unionized and non-unionized organizations are highly satisfied with natural work units since having 1 rank and minimum standard deviation i.e. 0.50 and 0.49 respectively, while dissatisfied with meetings with owners/directors,

involvement of top executives in socio cultural activities which has lowest mean score. Most of the samples in unionized organizations receive humanized treatment, enjoy inter personnel openness and sense of community since having higher mean score i.e. 3.60, 3.30 and 3.30 respectively with nominal standard deviation.

There is less consistency in opinions of unionized workers towards workers meetings with owners / directors as compared to non-unionized workers.

Table 6. Constitution in the work organization:

Following table shows views of respondents towards constitutional protection in the organization.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Privacy	3.05	2	0.60	2.40	1	0.68
2	Scope for free speech	3.45	1	0.60	2.20	3	0.83
3	Recruitment procedure	2.90	3	0.55	2.30	2	0.66
4	Promotion policy	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Disciplinary Procedure	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	Grievance Procedure	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Training & Development Policy	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Performance Appraisal Policy	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Above table depicts that samples in unionized organization are more satisfied with constitution in workplace than non-unionized organization as their mean score is greater and more consistent than of non-unionized organizations.

There is scope for free speech in sample unionized

organization since it is having mean score 3.45 and rank 1, while samples in non-unionized organizations are more happy with privacy at workplace having high mean score i.e. 2.40 than other parameters. Samples in both types of organizations are quite familiar with recruitment policy but they are unknown about the other policies and procedures.

Table 7. Balanced role of work in the total life space:

Following table shows satisfaction of all samples towards balanced role of work in the total life space.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Overtime work	2.25	5	0.85	2.60	4	0.50
2	Work during inconvenient hours	1.70	7	0.80	2.10	8	0.79
3	Overload of work	1.80	6	0.89	2.35	5	0.49
4	Employees enjoy weekly off.	3.65	1	0.59	3.05	2	0.39

5	Employees avail Government declared Holidays	3.25	3	0.64	3.10	1	0.45
6	Employees enjoy pay leaves	3.40	2	0.60	2.80	3	0.52
7	Equality In Work	1.00	8	0.00	2.35	5	0.67
8	Worker spare time for family balancing his work	3.00	4	0.56	2.35	5	0.75
9	Transfers	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

There is more satisfaction in the opinions of samples in unionized organization about their work-life balance as compared to samples in non-unionized organization as the mean score of all parameters is greater than of non-unionized organization expect equality in work.

Samples in both types of organizations enjoy the weekly off, holidays, paid leaves etc. since these parameters are having higher mean score than other

parameters and first three ranks respectively at the same time they suffers a lot due to work during inconvenient hours since its mean score is lowest i.e. 1.70 and 2.10 in unionized and non-unionized organizations respectively.

There is more inconsistency between opinions of samples towards work-life balance in both types of organizations since the calculated standard deviation for all parameter is high.

Table 8. Social relevance of work:

Following table shows satisfaction of all samples towards Social relevance of work.

Sr	Parameters	Unionised Org.			Non-Unionised Org.		
		Mean	Rank	SD	Mean	Rank	SD
1	Social relevance of work	3.05	-	0.22	3.00	-	0.00

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Table reveals that the satisfaction towards social relevance of work is more with unionized organization as compare to non unionized organization.

Hypothesis Testing:

Present research set to test following hypothesis
H0 – A QWL in medium scaled unionized organization does not differ than QWL in medium scaled non-unionized organization.

Independent sample 't' test is used for overall as well as category wise hypothesis testing.

Table 9. Hypothesis testing of overall QWL in unionized and non-unionized sample organization:

Following table shows hypothesis testing of overall QWL in unionized and non unionized organization by using independent sample 't' test.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	99% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.210	.647	7.508	142	.00	.6868	.0915	.4480	.9257

(Source: Compiled by Researcher)

Above table depicts that 't' score of overall QWL in unionized and non unionized organization is 7.50 at 0.00 'p' value with 99% confidence interval so the test is significant, hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 10. Hypothesis Testing Category wise:
To have a categorical view on the significance of difference into QWL in unionized and non unionized organization, the responses are tested with the help of independent sample 't' test.

Sr.	Parameter Category	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	99% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
1	Adequate and fair compensation	9.585	.004	7.637	38	.00	.82857	.10850	.53437	1.12278
2	Safe and healthy working conditions.	.544	.465	9.905	38	.00	.70517	.07120	.51212	.89823
3	Opportunity to Develop Human Capability	2.072	.158	10.279	38	.00	1.1750	.11431	.86504	1.48496
4	Continued Growth and Security	.112	.740	7.148	38	.00	.68750	.09619	.42669	.94831
5	Social Integration	.968	.331	9.771	38	.00	.87500	.08955	.63217	1.11783
6	Constitution at Workplace	1.238	.273	6.478	38	.00	.83333	.12865	.48450	1.18216
7	Balanced Role of Work	.663	.421	-1.004	38	.32	-.08125	.08089	-.30060	.13810
8	Social relevance of work	4.457	.041	-1.000	38	.32	-.05000	.05000	-.15122	.05122

(Source: Compiled by Researcher) | Note: the values of 't' are assuming equal variance.

Above table depicts that 't' score of adequate and fair compensation and Safe and healthy working conditions is 7.63 and 9.90 respectively at 0.00 'p' value with 99% confidence interval states the test is significant.

The 't' score of Opportunity to Develop Human Capability and Continued Growth and Security are 10.27 and 7.14 at 0.00 'p' value with 99% confidence interval states. Thus test is significant for both the categories.

Above table reveals that 't' test is significant for Social Integration and Constitution at Workplace also, since their 't' score are 9.77 and 6.47 respectively at 0.00 'p' value with 99% confidence interval states that there is significant difference existed in these parameters of both type of organization.

The t score of Balanced Role of Work and social

relevance of work are -1.00 at 0.32 'p' value with 99% confidence interval so the test is insignificant.

The test is significant with six categories except balanced role of work and social relevance of work which denotes there is significant difference into QWL category wise between unionized and non-unionized organizations. It confirms that null hypothesis is rejected.

Conclusion

Samples in unionized organization are found to be more satisfied with respect to eight structures of QWL than samples in non-unionized organization. Both types of organizations follow statutory compliances but ignore to implement employees welfare schemes, career building of their employees etc. There is more consistency in the opinions found with samples in unionized organizations towards safe and healthy

working conditions and constitution in work organization. From the present research it can be concluded that significant difference is found in the extent of QWL in medium scaled unionized and non unionized organization.

References

- Anonymous (1979), 'Hot UAW Issue: Quality of Work Life', *Business Week*, September. 17, Iss. 2603
- Anonymous (1981), 'Quality of Work Life: Catching On,' *Business Week*, Industrial New York: Sep 21., Iss. 2706, 72-75.
- Balaji Prasad M. and Vijaykumar R. (2008), 'Environmental Impacts: A Study on the Effects of Working Environment on the Performance of Executives,' *The Journal of Indian Management and Strategy*, January-March, 13(1), 28-33.
- Balch, David E., Blanck, Robert (1989), 'Measuring the Quality of Work Life,' *Quality Progress*, November, 22(11), 44-49.
- Beck, Al (1988), 'QWL and Unions in the 1990s,' *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 11(4), 20-25.
- Bocioletti Gene (1987), 'Quality of Work Life Some Unintended Effects on the Seniority Tradition of an Industrial Union,' *Group & Organization Studies*, December, 12(4), 386-411.
- Bushe, Gervase R (1988), 'Developing Cooperative Labor-Management Relations in Unionized Factories: A Multiple Case Study of Quality Circles and Parallel Organizations within Joint Quality of Work Life Projects,' *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24(2), 129-151.
- Cohen, Deborah Shaw (1979), 'The Quality of Work Life Movement: Does Working Together Work Better?,' *Training*, January, 16(1).
- Dale S. Beach, (1985), 'Personnel Management - The Management of People at Work', Macmillan publishing Company, New York, Collier Macmillan Publishers, London, 5th Edition, page no.325-326.
- Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999), 'Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature,' *Journal of Management*, 25, 357-384.
- Eaton, Adrienne E, Gordon, Michael E, Keefe, Jeffrey H (1992), 'The Impact of Quality of Work Life Programs and Grievance System Effectiveness on Union Commitment,' *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 45(3), 591-605.
- Fields, Mitchell W., Thacker, James W. (1992), 'Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment,' *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(2), 439-451.
- Gilbert, Beth (1989), 'The Impact of Union Involvement on the Design and Introduction of Quality of Working Life,' *Human Relations*, December, 42(12), 1057-1079.
- Hian, Chan Choon, Einstein, Walter O (1990), 'Quality of Work Life (QWL): What Can Unions Do?' *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 55(2), 17-23.
- Lawler, E. E. (1982), 'Strategies for improving the quality of work life,' *American Psychologist*, 37, 2005, 486-493.
- Lewin, David (1981), 'Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work Life,' *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(2), 37-54.
- Hanlon Martin D, Nadler David A (1986), 'Research Notes: Unionists' Attitudes toward Joint Union--Management Quality of Work Life Programmes,' *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, January, 7(1), 53-60.
- Peterson, Richard B, Tracy, Lane (1992), 'Assessing Effectiveness of Joint Committees in a Labor-Management Cooperation Program,' *Human Relations*, 45(5), 467-489.
- Porter, Nelson D (1984), 'Union Endorses Quality of Working Life,' *Canadian Business Review*, 11(4), 10-13.
- Rao Subba P. (2006) *Human Resource Management and Industrial Relation*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai.
- Rubinstein, Saul (1984), 'QWL, the Union, the Specialist and Employment Security,' *Training and Development Journal*, March, 38(3), 81-85.
- Singh A.P. (1995), 'Values-System and Quality of Work-Life - The IPCL Experience,' *Human Values for Managers*, Wheeler Publication, 1st edition, 17-25.

- Thacker, James W., Fields, Mitchell W (1987), 'Union Involvement in Quality-of-Work life Efforts: A Longitudinal Investigation,' Personnel Psychology, 40(1), 97-112.
- <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-189653414.html>
- www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1647153&show=html
- www.jstor.org/stable/3486655
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quality_of_working_life