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Abstract

Purpose
The study aims at finding out the overall Quality of work life of Generation Y and Generation Z employees in Private Sector Organizations in India. The study further investigates the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Quality of work life. The study also checks whether there is any relationship between demographic variables viz. experience, gender and Quality of work life.

Design/methodology/approach
Sixty Generation Y and Generation Z employees from various private sector organizations participated in this study. To analyze the data, One Way ANOVA, One Sample T Test, Chi Square test, Cramer’s V, Pearson Correlation Test and Spearman’s Correlation were used.

Findings
The result of the study revealed that there is a high Quality of work life for the employees of Private sector organizations in India. More importantly, the findings revealed that there is a strong positive relationship between Quality of work life and Job satisfaction. Further it was proved that there is a relationship between Quality of work life and Experience as well as gender.

Research Implications
Managers need to understand that quality of work life can improve job satisfaction among employees so that they can take measures to improve quality of work life. It is essential to identify HR practices like Quality of work life that are crucial to success of an organization.

Originality/value
Despite the academic interest in Quality of work life there is a dearth of research work in Quality of work life particularly in private sector organizations in India.
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Introduction

Human Resource is the most vital resource of an organization as they are capable of making valuable contribution to any organization. They do not deteriorate like other resources and technology and hence they should be treated with dignity. Management has to look into various aspects of employees to make sure that they are retained in the organization. Quality of working life (QWL) is one such multidimensional construct which enable the organization to retain the employees. It encompasses employee’s perceptions of how they are able to satisfy their important personal needs while employed in the organization (Chib, 2012). Quality of work life can attract and retain the talented employees, increase job satisfaction and commitment towards the job which can result in overall effectiveness of the organization.

Literature Survey

Quality of Work-Life
Quality of work life has its roots in the theories of motivation and leadership put forward by Maslow, Herzberg and McGregor. QWL gained importance in the mid of 60s. In 1970 the term QWL was introduced by Louis Davis. The concept received more attention after United Auto Workers and General Motors initiated a QWL program. Hackman and Oldhams (1980) emphasized the relation of QWL with the interaction between work environment and personal needs. According to them the work environment that can fulfill employees’ personal needs will lead to an exceptional QWL. They also stressed that the personal needs are satisfied when the organization gives rewards like compensation, promotion, recognition to the employees. Cunningham, and
Eberle (1990) purports that QWL covers various elements which include the individual’s specific tasks, the physical work environment, the social environment within the organization, administrative system and the relationship between life on and off the job. QWL is a process by which an organization responds to employee need by developing mechanisms which allow the members to share fully in making decisions that design their lives at work (Robbins 1998).

Several researchers have put forward various factors that lead to quality of work life. Walton(1975) has put forward eight factors that include Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, Social Integration in the Work Organization, Constitutionalism in the Work Organization, Work and Total Life Space and Social Relevance of Work Life. Later Walton (1980) divided QWL main components into four categories which include: work meaningfulness, work social and organizational equilibrium, work challenge and richness. Mosharraf (2000) measured QWL among bank employees using the following elements: the security of employment, job/role clarity, understanding supervisors, work not stressful, access to relevant information and social and welfare facilities to measure the QWL in banks. According to Brooks and Anderson (2005) work–life balance, work design, work content, and work world are the critical elements which determine QWL.QWL can be affected by factors like the tasks, physical work environment, social environment in the organization, administrative system, and work–life balance (Che Rose et al., 2006).

A good quality of work life would help employees’ well being thereby the well being of the organization as a whole. This study attempts to find out the overall QWL of Generation Y and Generation Z employees in Private Sector Organizations. The study also investigates the impact of demographic variables viz. experience and gender on QWL. For the purpose the following hypotheses were formulated.

**H1:** There is a significant difference between Experience and QWL.

**H2:** There is a significant difference between Gender and QWL.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is the feeling an individual has about his or her job (Smith et. al., 1969). Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state arising from the evaluation of an employee’s job or job experiences. Vroom (1982) defined job satisfaction as employees’ emotional orientation toward their current job roles. It involves the emotional response and attitude of workers toward their jobs (Lawler, 1994). According to Spector (1997) job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their jobs. Robbins (2005) defines job satisfaction as a collection of feelings that an employee holds towards his or her job.

Evidence from previous research has proved that job satisfaction influences various factors. Atchison (1999) purports that many organizations are spending much time on employee satisfaction initiatives in order to reduce turnover, improve productivity and to lead the organizations to success. According to Loveman (1998), Silvestro and Cross (2000), loyal and satisfied employees are more eager to provide higher level of service quality. They are also more capable of delivering a better service quality. Hartline and Ferrell (1996) from their study found that job satisfaction felt by service employees is associated with service quality. Job satisfaction has an impact on physical and mental well being of employees (Oshagbemi 2000). Studies have also proved that job satisfaction is an important predictor of organizational commitment (Williams & Anderson, 1991; Knoop, 1995). These studies shows what impact job satisfaction can have on the organization and its employees.

Suttle(1977) suggested that QWL programs can lead to a greater self-esteem and improved job satisfaction. A study conducted by Che Rose et al. (2006) in Malaysia concluded that the antecedents of QWL are organizational climate, career achievement, career satisfaction and career balance. Studies of Royuela, Jordi, & Jourdi, 2009 proved that Quality of work life is one of the most significant factors for improving job satisfaction. According to several research like Cohen et al. (2007), Tabassum (2012) job satisfaction is an important indicator of work life quality. Hence the study aims at understanding the relation between Quality of work life and Job satisfaction among employees of private sector organizations. The alternate hypothesis is:

**H3:** There is a significant association between Job Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life.

**Methodology**

**Sample**

Respondents for the study were Generation Y and Generation Z employees working in various private sector organizations in India. Hundred questionnaires were distributed to the employees. Usable questionnaires were sixty. Convenient sampling method has been used to collect the data. Among the respondents, forty two were male (ie.70%) and eighteen female (ie.30%).
Measures
To measure the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, a biographical questionnaire was administered with questions covering age, experience, organizational position and gender. A self-developed questionnaire was used to measure Quality of work life. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreeableness towards each Quality of work life question. Respondents indicated their perception about each question on a scale ranging from strongly agree (4) to strongly disagree (1).

A single item question was asked to measure Job Satisfaction (1 represented Highly Satisfied while 5 represented Highly Dissatisfied).

Result
The level of QWL was identified through descriptive statistics. The Table 1 shows that mean is 48.22 and standard deviation is 10.95. From the result it can be understood that the overall QWL of Generation Y and Generation Z employees of Privates Sector Organizations are high.

Table 1 showing Descriptive Statistics of Overall QWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Work Life</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>48.2167</td>
<td>10.94995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience and QWL

Table 2 One Way ANOVA showing QWL based on Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6432.048</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2144.016</td>
<td>186.978</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>642.135</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7074.183</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to the differences in QWL on the basis of experience, a one way ANOVA was utilized to compare the mean scores of QWL. The difference of QWL on the basis of experience is depicted in the above Table. The table shows that there is a significant difference in QWL based on Experience as the F=186.9788 and p value.000 (P-value is >.05). Hence we can reject the null hypothesis thus accepting the alternate hypothesis that there is a significant difference in QWL based on experience.

Gender and QWL

Independent Sample T-test was conducted to find out the impact of gender on QWL.

Table 3 showing Group Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.5476</td>
<td>7.75604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61.4444</td>
<td>2.52569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 showing Independent Samples T Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Work Life</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>19.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed from the statistical table that female have a better mean (61.44) when compared to that of male (42.54). The significance of mean values of QWL for male and female employees are tested with an independent sample t-test. The difference between the scores is presented in above Table. Analysis of t-test revealed that there is a significant difference as t=10.067, df=58 and p > 0.05., indicating that there is a difference in QWL based on gender.

Job Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life

Table 5 Chi-Square Tests showing the relation between Job Satisfaction and QWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>1.233E2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>112.468</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>41.378</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi square analysis result showed a significant correlation (P<0.01) between QWL and Job satisfaction. The analysis result proved the alternate hypothesis that there is a relationship between Job Satisfaction and QWL. Hence Cramer’s V, Contingency coefficient and co-relation where used for further checking the strength of association between these two variables.

Table 6 showing Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymp. Std. Error</th>
<th>Approx. T</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Coefficient</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval by Interval Pearson's R</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>11.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>16.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The coefficient result of Cramer’s V test was 0.828 (0.30-0.49 means moderate, 0.50-0.69 means strong and 0.70-1.00 means very strong association). This means that there is a very strong association between QWL and Job Satisfaction. Pearson’s r value also shows that there is high co-relation (>0.50) between Job Satisfaction and QWL. Spearman correlation analysis result showed the coefficient value of correlation between the relationship of Job satisfaction and QWL was 0.000(P<0.10). It indicates that there is positive correlation between QWL and Job satisfaction. This means that the higher the QWL, the higher will be the Job satisfaction and Lower the QWL lower will be the Job satisfaction of employees.

The mean of overall Quality of Work Life of employees in the private sector organizations are high. The difference in Quality of Work Life based on experience was tested using a one way ANOVA. It was proved that there is a significant difference in Quality of Work Life on the basis of experience. This is consistent with the study of Bolhari et al. (2011) that found that there is a relation between work experience and QWL. Hossain (1997) also explored the relationship between QWL and experience among workers in Bangladesh and found a positive correlation between experience and QWL. Independent Sample t-test revealed that there is a significant difference in QWL based on gender. The findings of the study of Ganesh & Ganesh (2014) also corroborated the result of the present study. In their study gender emerged as a significant predictor of QWL. Gender also moderated the relationship between masculinity-femininity and Quality of work life. But there are other studies (Balachandar et al, 2013) which state that there is no significant relationship between QWL and gender.

This research attempted to find out the relationship between Quality of work life and Job satisfaction. Chi square analysis was used to determine the relationship. When it was found that there is significant relationship, Cramer’s V test, Spearman’s Correlation and Pearson Correlation was done. It indicates that there is positive correlation between Quality of work life and Job satisfaction. This means that the higher the Quality of work life the Higher the Job satisfaction and Lower the Quality of work life lower will be the Job satisfaction of employees. These findings are consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Cohen et. al. (1997) and Conklin (2008). The result of the present study also strikes a similarity with the study of Zakerian (2012), which states that there is a direct and positive relation between Quality of work life and Job satisfaction.

Further Research
In this study, the relation between gender and experience with QWL were investigated. Further research may include other demographic variables like age, qualification, designation etc. More complex interrelations of quality of work life with demographic characteristics in other sectors can also be conducted. Here, even though data were collected from Generation Y employees and Generation Z employees, a comparative study between the two were not conducted. A comparative study between the two generations may also be conducted in future research.

Conclusion
Quality of Work Life varies based on gender among Private sector employees. This indicates that male and female employees have different level of QWL in Private sector organizations. QWL also shows a variation based experience. So, more emphasis should be given to improve the Quality of Work Life based on gender and experience among Private sector employees. The study very clearly proves that QWL can have an impact on job satisfaction which can reduce turnover, improve and service quality productivity. So job satisfaction should be improved through the improvement and manipulation of the quality of work life elements. Thus, it is essential that organizations take measures to improve the overall quality of work life of employees by giving more space for them at work, providing training programs and providing them time so that they can spend with their family. After all, along with the organizational objectives their personal interest should also be fulfilled which can take them to a higher level of satisfaction at work thus leading the organization to success.
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