

QWL AND ORGANIZATION EFFICIENCY: A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

Tripti Singh^{*}, Sumit Kumar Srivastav^{**}

^{*}Assistant Professor, SMS, Motilal Nehru National Institute of Technology, Allahabad, India

^{**}SMS, Motilal Nehru National Institute of Technology, Allahabad, India

Abstract Quality of work Life (QWL) has evolved as an important aspect, which affects an organizational efficiency and productivity (Gorden, Judith R. 1987). The purpose of this paper is to understand and develop the concept of QWL in organization and to identify factors especially in the internal environment of an organization that leads to QWL. A qualitative approach is used to develop a conceptual model, depicting the difference in the total perceived level of QWL amongst employees and employers in organizations. SERVQUAL model is adapted in assess the QWL Level, in terms of its adequacy and superiority.

Executive Summary Quality of Work Life (QWL) has evolved as an important aspect, which affects an Organisational efficiency and productivity (Gorden, Judith R. 1987). QWL is a multi dimensional term which provides a good work life balance and gives a qualitative boost to total work environment of any organisation (Neerpal Rathi, 2010). The success of any organization is dependent on how it attracts, develops, and retains its workforce. Further the efficiency of any organisation depends on their work environment, working methodology and degree of employee satisfaction. The level of employee motivation is dependent on elements like job security, reward system, job satisfaction, satisfaction of social, physical and personal needs. The proposed model provides a good justification for determining the level of satisfaction with QWL in an organization whether it is adequate or superior. A superior level of QWL in an organization suggest that the gap between the employee and employer/organization perception on various factors of QWL is less or negligible while Quality of work life adequacy in an organization suggest that the gap is quite prominent and needs to be amended or reduced for organizational efficiency. The QWL level can be related to measurable Organizational efficiency variables in terms of either employee own perception of Organizational efficiency related to various factors or their satisfaction on them. The proposed conceptual model on QWL and Organizational Efficiency provides a further impetus for empirical research. The present paper identifies work related aspects of employees working in organizations. It talks about employees as well as organizational perception and their related gaps in QWL aspects, which is manifested through various life domains, including personal and professional aspects. The proposed conceptual model on QWL and Organisational Efficiency provides a further impetus for empirical research. It not only hypothesized and proposed a conceptual model; it also provides a basis for development of a research instrument, i.e. a questionnaire for survey purpose. A questionnaire can be developed using the dimensions which have been redefined and identified factors can be measured on them. A sector or an industry can be studied and surveyed to empirically test the model and relate the level of QWL and Organisational efficiency.

Keywords: Quality of work life, SERVQUAL, Organizational efficiency, Worker Satisfaction, Working Environment.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life (QWL) has evolved as an important aspect, which affects an Organisational efficiency and productivity (Gorden, Judith R. 1987). QWL is a multi dimensional term which provides a good work life balance and gives a qualitative boost to total work environment of any organisation (Neerpal Rathi, 2010). The success of any organization is dependent on how it attracts, develops, and retains its workforce. Further the efficiency of any organisation depends on their work environment, working

methodology and degree of employee satisfaction. The level of employee motivation is dependent on elements like job security, reward system, job satisfaction, satisfaction of social, physical and personal needs.

An exhaustive literature review from secondary sources viz is carried out with the following objectives:

- To understand the concept of QWL in Organisation
- To identify the factors especially in the internal environment of an organization that lead to QWL

- To develop a conceptual model, depicting the difference in the total perceived level of QWL amongst employees and employers in organisations.

The research paper has been divided into 3 sections.

Section 1: Deals with the conceptual development of the terms QWL in terms of its definition, role, function and factors and its relationship with organizational efficiency

Section 2: Deals with identifying the factors and dimensions of study, development and adoption of instruments, developing an operational definition, formulating hypothesis and the methodology that can be adopted for empirical research. A conceptual model based on qualitative research is proposed.

Section 3: The paper concludes with proposed methodology for empirical research and future scope of the study.

2. CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF TERM

2.1. Concept and Definition of QWL

Some of the important references on the concept and definition of QWL is given in the *Annexure 1, Table 1: Definition and Concept of QWL*

Exhaustive Literature review is carried out to tabulate chronologically, various definitions of QWL. Related terms like, 'Quality of Work life, Work life Balance, Standard of Working Life, Humanization at Work Place, routinization at work Place', are also discussed in relation to it.

Thus we conclude that, the concept of QWL has evolved over a period of time. However it has gained importance recently. It has been related to job satisfaction, higher motivation & higher productivity of employee on one hand and enhanced organizational productivity and cost efficiency on other hand. This can be attributed to various intrinsic or internal factor

like work environment, job security, reward system, working methodology as well as extrinsic environmental factors, that create a well being in the society and lead to satisfaction of different levels of needs of an individual. These intrinsic and extrinsic factors ultimately lead to superior QWL.

It is important to understand the role, function, and relevance of QWL in organizational efficiency.

2.2. Role and Function of QWL in Organisational Efficiency

An organisation can enhance their efficiency by providing a good work environment and systems in the organisation. QWL is a tool to create a good work system by which organisation maintain their efficiency level and capacity to cope with competitors. It is important to know that QWL has a positive impact on the productiveness and effectiveness of any organisation (Gorden, Judith R. 1987, Glaser, E.M., 1976, Macrow, D. 1982, Walton R.E. 1974). The importance of QWL can also be delineated by studying the relationship between QWL and Organisational Efficiency, as given in *Annexure 2, Table 2: Role and Function of QWL in Organisational efficiency*

A good QWL leads to enhanced organisational efficiency as well as individual efficiency of employees. Organizational efficiency is enhanced through better working condition, improvement in organizational environment, reduction in cost and improved productivity. Individual Efficiency and productivity is enhanced and leads to development of competencies at work through HR practices leading to enhanced motivation, job commitment and satisfaction. Considering its importance it is further imperative to identify various factors internal and external, that ultimately leads to superior QWL in an organization.




Figure 1:- Role and Function of QWL and Organizational Efficiency

As explained in the figure above a good QWL leads to enhanced organisational efficiency as well as individual efficiency of employees. Organizational efficiency is enhanced through better working condition, improvement in organizational environment, reduction in cost and improved productivity. Individual Efficiency and productivity is enhanced and leads to development of competencies at work through HR practices leading to enhanced motivation, job commitment and satisfaction

2.3. Factors that Lead to Quality of Work Life

QWL is an aspect which indicates us about the Organization and its working environment and whether the employees are satisfied with their job or not. There are number of factors which lead towards improvement of QWL in an organization. These factors are either related with organizational environment or employee's perception toward their work. *Factors that lead to QWL and their relationship with QWL are given in Annexure 3: Table 3.*

An organisation works in an external environment where the macro environmental variables have an impact on the overall working of the organisation. The political system of the county, their interference in the organisation, the laws and policies further affect the management in the organisation (Pukeliene, Starkauskiene, 2009). The competitive framework provided by the other players in the market also affects the organisational systems (Chitakornkijsil Pranee, 2010). However for practical purposes we can assume these factors to be static for a particular organisation as a section chosen for study. Keeping the research objectives in mind the focus of our study is on the difference in the perception of employees and employers related to QWL in organisations i.e., the organizational factors.

The Internal environment of an organisation is defined not only in terms of its culture (Hofstede, 1980), leadership role (Carayon P et al., 2000) but also the Human resource (HR) functions and practices (Walton, R.E., 1975, Kahn, 1981, Dalia A. Juožas R., 2007). HR functions of an organisation includes adequate appropriate HR planning in terms of job and man fit, and utilization of employee at right place at right time is a key indicator of QWL. Conflicts and grievances redressal mechanism in the organisation (Carayon P. et al., 2000), safe and healthy environment for the work is an important factor by which organization can improve its Quality Of work life (Walton, R.E., 1975, Kalra S. & S. Ghosh, 1984). A good social relationship, better understanding between employees and cordial industrial relation in the organizational system leads to Quality of work life. A reliable, accessible and comfortable compensation management systems, performance appraisal systems, and career management & development in the organisation creates a good QWL in the organisation

A summary of the factors and their items can be drawn given in *Annexure 4, Table 4: factors and their items that lead to QWL*

3. CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR QWL AND ORGANISATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Various literature references as discussed in the previous section, concludes that QWL is an important concept for Organisational efficiency. Employees are considered as internal customers and are an important factor that determines, decides, and evaluates the level of Quality of Work life. Similarly Organisational Factors in terms of how an Organisation perceives, translates, implements and deliver it is an important criteria for QWL. However it is hypothesized that some gaps exist between an employee perception and an organization framework. Keeping the research objective in mind, the focus of the study is how HR policies and programs in the internal environment affect QWL. The extrinsic environment is assumed to be static, for the purpose of study.

3.1. Employer and Employee Relation in an Organisation

An Organisation can be interpreted as a service provider while employees as recipients of services. Some of the characteristics that justify Organisational work place as service institutions and employees as service recipients are as follows:

An organisation provides various tangible and intangible options so that the employees can provide products and services to its clients and customers. An Organisation facilitates the work systems in the organisation through its well defined job, task & work planning, human resource policies & programs, ensuring that an organisation has good work relations, and has good standard of physical work environment as well as good coherence with other life domains which include family life and social life. Thus an organisation exhibits all classical features of services: it provides intangible and heterogeneous products by creating various combinations of employable contracts which involves not only finances but also psychological contract between an employer and employee (Reboloso, Fernandez-ramirez and canton, 2001, Lethinen and Lethinen 1991). An employee evaluates desires, perceives and expects a level of QWL from its organisation. An organisation interprets, understands, designs and implements various work systems and employment contracts for its employees. Thus it leads to a give and take relation between an organisation and an employee where the exchange is both of tangible and intangible options. An organisation exists as a service

provider to its employees and they are in turn called as internal customers. Thus employer and employee relationship can be gauged in terms of various level and types of services and its quality that is interchanged.

3.2. Instrument Development: Identifying Factors and Dimensions of Study

Instruments for measuring service quality have been developed and validated, despite the fact that service quality is more difficult to be measured than goods (Parasuraman et al. 1985). *SERVQUAL* has emerged as perhaps the most popular standardized questionnaire to measure service quality (Frost and Kumar, 2001 p.372). This Model has also been studied for measuring Employees Job Satisfaction by various researchers and academicians. Parasuraman et.al 1995 developed *SERVQUAL* to measure customer appraisal together with service quality. The use of *SERVQUAL* model to measure the QWL level seems to be most closely related factors that can form the basis of this study. The same has

been adopted here for study purpose.

We further need a set of dimensions that could be classified into different factors to measure the level of Quality of work life. Also these factors will need to be more context specific than the basic *SERVQUAL* model. Various dimensions that have been used by various researchers through literature review are given in

Annexure 5, Table 5 Literature review on Dimensions of QWL

3.2.1. Selected Dimensions for QWL

In the light of various factors identified for QWL viz. physical work environment, job and task aspects, HR policies and programs, social relationships in the organization, and keeping in mind other life domains for an employee, various dimensions are defined to understand how each of these factors can be measured on these dimensions. These dimensions have been selected, redefined in the light of identified factors for QWL as concluded from literature review.

Table 5- Definitions of Selected Dimensions for the Study on QWL

Dimensions	Definition
Tangibles	It includes all the physical facilities, benefits and assets that are provided or are available to employees for usage at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.
Responsiveness	Responsiveness concerns the willingness of the organization and its employees to be promptly available to provide solutions at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.
Safety	Safety comprises physical and financial safety, confidentiality related to employees and usage at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.
Communication	Communication means informing the employees in an understandable way and listening to them at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.
Reliability	Reliability means that the organization is committed for employee oriented policies and services with high accuracy, fair treatment and equality at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.
Empathy	The ease of access, approachability and effort taken to understand employee's requirements, the provision of caring, individualized attention to employees.
Assurance	Is the competence of the Organisation system and its security, credibility, and ability to convey trust and confidence at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domain.
Comfort	Is defined in terms of comfort of various physical facilities, benefits and assets that are provided or are available to employees for usage at individual, organizational level as well as for other life domains.

3.3. Proposed Conceptual Model for QWL and Organisational Efficiency Based on *SERVQUAL*

According to Christou and Sigala (2002) there exist numerous instruments to explain the nature of service quality. He identified two major dimensions of quality: that of the service offering, as perceived by the service provider, and that of the received service, as perceived by the guest (Nightingale 1985; Jones 1989). Based on the concept quality dimensions of services offering and services received

as perceived by both the parties (Christou & Sigala 2002, Nightingale 1985; Jones 1989), Parasuraman et al. 1985, developed the "gap model of service quality" and proposed *SERVQUAL* as an instrument to measure service quality. *SERVQUAL* is an instrument that could be used to fulfil the purpose of measuring perceived service quality from the customer's perspective, here in this case internal customer i.e., the employees.

SERVQUAL Model has been adopted to measure the gap existing between employer and employee.




Figure 3: Conceptual Model for QWL and Organisational Efficiency based on SERVQUAL

The gap between employer/organisational perception and employees perception can be based on the disconfirmation paradigm. (1994 a,b). In SERVQUAL perceived quality is measured by difference in scores between perception rating and expected rating.

Level of QWL in an organisation: Three levels of QWL in an organisation can be assessed, in terms of perceived quality, expected quality and desired level of quality.

Perceived quality is subjective, enduring and less specific situation. It is an attribute to reflect an employee's own judgement of the excellence of QWL in an organisation. Literature references also suggest that the perception may differ from employee to employee and is influenced by various personal attributes and personality characteristics. Age, education level, personality type and expectation of need level may create different perceptions in the mind of employees related to QWL.

Expected level of QWL may be defined in terms of what an employee expects from the organisation. These expectations may be framed related to both extrinsic and intrinsic factor that is related to personal as well as other life domains. An individual progresses and concludes on the basis of various interactions it has at different levels which may be personal, professional as well as social. It is a blend of what employees behave in terms of, 'What can be and should be provided'.

The desired level of QWL of an employee is basically a manifestation of not only what he has, what he interacts but also what he can imagine or may be goes beyond imagination. It creates ultimate well being and superiority in the organisation. Adequate level is the minimum level of

QWL that an employee is willing to accept.

Hypothesis: The basis assumption of the model as discussed above is that, there exists a gap between, what an employee perceives of QWL in organization in term of desired level of QWL and adequate level. There is a region called 'Zone of Tolerance' that separates the desired level and the adequate level. Any performance in this zone is termed and considered satisfactory. The indirect measure (difference score) of the perceived quality of work life construct is operationalized as the difference between the perceived level and the expected level (Parasuraman et al. 1994 a). This determines the level of QWL; whether QWL is adequate or superior, in an Organisation as hypothesized below.

H1-Measure of Quality of work life adequacy (MQLA) is defined as the difference between Perceived Quality of Work Life Performance (PQLP) and minimum acceptable level of expected Quality of Work Life (MALEQL)

$$MQLA = PQLP - MALEQL$$

H2- Measure of Quality of Work Life superiority (MQLS) is defined as difference of perceived quality of work life performance (PQLP) and desired level of expected Quality of work life (DLEQL)

$$MQLS = PQLP - DLEQL$$

Where

PQLP= perceived quality of work life performance

MALEQL=minimum acceptable level of expected Quality of work life

DLEQL= desired level of expected Quality of work life

4. CONCLUSIONS

This model provides a good justification for determining the level of satisfaction with QWL in an organisation whether it is adequate or superior. A superior level of QWL in an organisation suggest that the gap between the employee and employer/organisation perception on various factors of QWL is less or negligible while Quality of work life adequacy in an organisation suggest that the gap is quite prominent and needs to be amended or reduced for organisational efficiency. The QWL level can be related to measurable Organisational efficiency variables in terms of either employee own perception of Organisational efficiency related to various factors or their satisfaction on them.

The proposed conceptual model on QWL and Organisational Efficiency provides a further impetus for empirical research. It not only hypothesized and proposes a conceptual model; it also provides a basis for development of a research instrument, i.e. a questionnaire for survey purpose. A questionnaire can be developed using the dimensions which have been redefined, and identified factors can be measured on them. A sector or an industry can be studied and surveyed to empirically test the model and relate the level of QWL and Organisational efficiency. This information can be utilised by organisations to improve and enhance individual and organisational efficiency, leading to HR value creation in terms of improved working condition, organizational environment, reduction in cost and improved productivity. Individual Efficiency and productivity is enhanced and leads to development of competencies at work through HR practices leading to enhanced motivation, job commitment and satisfaction amongst employees. Less desirable dimensions can be ignored and a better use of resources can be done to meet/exceed, adequate expected level rather than pursuing an 'ideal standard' on less essential dimensions.

5. REFERENCES

- Adreine E. Eason, M. E. (1992). The impact of Quality of work Life Programs and greivances system effectiveness on union commitment. *Industrial and labour relation review*, Vol. 45, No.3.
- Allen, W. a. (1976). Transit Services evaluation preliminary identification variables charactersterizing level of service. *transportation tresearch Record*, Vol. 606, pp.47-53.
- Anuradha, S. a. (1995). Organizational Commitment and QWL: Perception of Indian Manager. *Abhigyan*, pp.39-44.
- Baba Vishwanath, V. j. (1991). Routinization of Job context and job content as related to employee's quality of work life: A Study of Canadian nurses. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 12, pp.379-386.
- Bar-Haim, A. (1984). "The desire for workers" Participation: Conflicting Forces in the Work places. *Relations industrielles*, Vol. 39, No.2, pp.301-312.
- Bruce., H. (1983). Quality of Work Life Studies: their implication for social and market researchers. *European Research*, pp.55-67.
- Buekema, L. (1987). Quality of reduction of workingn hour. *Groningen:Karstapel* .
- Catling, D. S. (1996). Increasing the attractiveness of light rail system. *Public Transport International*, No.4, pp.60-62.
- Cooper, C. (1988). Humanizing the work places in Europe: An Overview of six countries. *personal Journal*, Vol. 59, pp.488-491.
- D., M. (1982). Worker Productivity. *Baverly Hill* .
- Dalia Akranaviciutus, J. R. (2007). Quality of work Life and its componetnt. *measurment Engineering Economics*, Vol. 2, No.52, pp.44-49.
- Danna K., A. G. (1999). Health and well being in the work-place: A Review and synthesis of the litrature. *Jouranal Of management*, Vol. 25, No.3, pp.357-384.
- Day, N. E. (1997). Staying in the closet versus coming: Relationship between communication about sexual oreintation and work attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 50, pp.147-163.
- Delamotte, Y. a. (1984). Quality of Working Life in International Perspective.
- Don, R. (1981). quality of work Life movement Employee Relation . pp.2-6.
- Donnelly, M. a. (1996, october). ' The portability and validity of the SERVQUAL scale in measuring the quality of local public service provision. *Proceedings of the ICQ-1996 International conference on Quality*, pp.15-18.
- Du Plessis, M. k. (1984). Monitoring quality of Services from the passengers prespective. *transportation research Record*, Vol. 992, pp.28-31.
- Dukerich, J. G. (2002). Beuty is in the eye of the beholder: the impact of organization identification, identify, and image on the cooperative behaviour of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 47, pp.507-533.
- E.M., G. (1976). Productivity Gains Through Work level Improvement.
- Edmann, T. a. (2005). Unpacking commitment: multiple loyalties and employee behaviour. *Journal of management studies*, Vol. 42, No.2, pp. 301-328.
- Elivesta, S. (2006). Relationship among Perception of Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction. *Management and Organizational review*, Vol. 2, No.3, pp.459-460.
- F.W., T. (1947). *Scientific Management*. Harper and Brother.

- Fuller, J. H. (2006). Perceived external prestige and internal respect: new insight into the organizational Identification process. *Human Relations*, Vol. 59, pp.815-846.
- Gilgeous. (1998). The Quality of Work Life. *Integrated Manufacturing System*, Vol. 9, No.1, pp.173-181.
- Glowson, J. (1971). A Measure of Work Group Autonomy. *Oslo: Tanum Press*.
- Goodman, P. (1980). Quality of Work life projects in 1980' spring meeting. *Industrial relation Research Association*, pp.487-494.
- Gorden, J.R. (1987). A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behaviour. pp.651-663.
- Greenhus, J. H. (1990). Effects of Race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluation and career outcomes. *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 33, No.1, pp.64-86.
- Gunna Seelan Rethinam, M. I. (2008). A Basic Concept on QWL. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No.1, pp. 60.
- Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work Redesign. Reading, M.A. . *Addison-Wesley*.
- Hagerty, M. e. (2001). Quality of life Indexes for National Policy: Review and Agenda for Research. *Social Indicator Research*, Vol. 55, No.1.
- Havlovic, S. (1991). Quality Of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 30, No.3, pp.469-479.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences. *Beverly Hills*. In: Suzanne, E. A., & Ad Kerkstra, J. V. (2001). Quality of working Life and Workload in Home Help Services: A review of the Literature and a proposal for a research Model. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Society*, Vol. 15, pp.12-24.
- J., A. E. (2001). Quality of Working Life and workload in home help services. pp.12-22.
- Josnston, c. P. (1978). Quality of Working Life: The Idea and its Application. *Ottawa*.
- Kahn, R. (1981). Work and Health.
- Kalra, S. a. (1984). Quality of Work life: A study of associated factors. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, pp.45-54.
- Kirkman, F. (1981). Who cares about job design? *International journal of operations and Production Management*, Vol. 2, pp.3-13.
- Klandermans, P. J. (1989). Union Commitment Replication and Tests in the Dutch Context. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 74, No.6, pp.869-875.
- Knox, S. a. (1997). An interactive Quality of Work Life model applied to organizational behaviour transition. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 27, No.1, pp.39-47.
- Kochan thomas A., H. C. (1984). Worker Participation and American Union: Threat or Opportunity . *Kalamazoo Mich: W. E. Ujohn*, pp.118-123.
- L, C. P. (2000). Psychosocial Work Factors and Work Organization.
- L.E., D. (1983). *The Quality of working ife and the 1980s*. New York: Praeger Publisher.
- Lau, W. C. (2001). Inforamtion Technology and Work Environment- Doers it change the way People Interact at work. *Human System Management*, Vol. 20, No.3, pp.267-280.
- Lau. R.S. M. & Brue, E. M. (1998). A win win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. *Human Rsource envelopment Qualrterly*, Vol. 9, No.3, pp.211-226.
- Lehto, A. M. (2004). Coorelate with the Definition of Quality of work Life. *Finnish Quality of work Life surveys*.
- Levine, M. F. (1983). Self developed QWL measures. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, Vol. 4, No.1, pp.35-46.
- Lippitt, G. a. (1977). Living with work the search for quality in work life. *Optimum*, No.8, pp.34-43.
- Lippitt, G. (1978). Quality of work life: Organizatiponal Renewal in action. *Training & Development Journal*, No. 7, pp.4-10.
- Loscocco, K. a. (1991). Influences on the Quality of work and non work life: two Decades in review. *J. Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 39, pp.182-225.
- Maccoby, M. (1984). The Quality of work life in Bell System. *Monthly labour Review*, Vol. 10, No.3, pp.31-32.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper; New York.
- Mills, T. (1981). what is the working life? *Ottawa*.
- Mirvis, P. a. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, No. 5, pp.197-212.
- Moodie, P. (1997, November). A fresh approach to customer care. *Passenger rail management*, No.19.
- Nadler, D. a. (1983). Quality of Work Life; Prespectives and Direction. *organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 11, No.3, pp.20-30.
- Olkonnen, M. a. (2006). Relationship Between Organizational Justice Identificationship with organization and work unit and group-related outcomes. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, Vol. 100, pp.202-215.
- P.R., L. j. (2009). perdictor f Quality of Work life of Sales Force in Dercet Selling Organizations. *ICFAI Journal of Managemnt Research*, Vol. 8, No.6, pp.51-59.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1985). A conceptual Model of Service Quality and its implication for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 64, No.1, pp.12-40.

- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1991a). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 67, No.4, pp. 42-50.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 64, No.1, pp.12-40.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1991b). Understanding customer expectation of services. *Sloan management Review*, pp.39-48.
- Pranee, C. (2010). Correlate with Definition of QWL. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, Vol. 2, No.3, pp.124-137.
- Pullen, W. (1983). Definition and measurement of quality of services for local public transport management. *Transport Review*, Vol. 13, No.3, pp.247-264.
- R.E., W. (1975). Criteria for Quality of working life. in L.E. Davis, A. B. Cherns and Associates (eds). *The Quality of Working life: new York*, No.1, pp.91-104.
- Rathi, N. (2010). Theoretical basis for the QWL Concepts. *Relationship of Quality of Work Life With Employee's Psychological well Being*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp.52-60.
- Reboloso, E. F.-R. (2001). Satisfacción de usuarios con un Servicio universidad, Elaboración de un instrumento de evaluación. *Revista de Psicología*, Vol. 11, No.3, pp.27-46.
- Roslan Abdul Hakrim, R. I. (2010). The Impact of Social capital on Quality of Life: Evidence from Malaysia, European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administration Sciences. ISSN 1450-2887, No.22, pp.113-122.
- Rouseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, No. 19, pp.217-233.
- S.P., R. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour* (8 ed.). New Jersey: Simon & Schuster.
- Saklani, D. (2010). Non-managerial Perspective of Quality of work Life. *Journal of management Research*, No. 10, pp. 87-102.
- Scanlan, B. R. (1976). Determinants of job Satisfaction and Productivity. *Personnel Journal*, No. 55, pp.12-14.
- Scobel, D. N. (1975). Doing Away with the factory Blues. *Harvard Business Review*, No. 53, pp.132-142.
- Seashore, S. E. (1975). Defining and measuring the Quality of Work life: In the Quality of work life problem and prospects and state of the Art, No. 1.
- Serey T.T. (2006). Choosing Robust Quality Of Work Life. *Business Forum*, Vol. 27, No.2, pp.7-10.
- Silock, D. T. (1981). Measure of Operational performance for urbanbus services. *Traffic Engineering and Control*, Vol. 22, No.1, pp.645-8.
- Sirgy, E. S. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) based on Satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 55, pp.241-302.
- Sklani, D. (2004). An Basic Concepts of QWL. *Journal of management research*, Vol. 10, No.2.
- Srivastava, S. P. (1975). An Evaluation of Policy Related Research and Productivity, Industrial Organization and job satisfaction: Policy Development and Implication. Case Western University.
- Stacey, N. a. (1983). The Educational implications of QWL, in D. Skrovan (Ed.). *Quality of work life*, Reading, Mas: Addison-Wesley, pp.137-145.
- Starkauskiene, V. P. (n.d.). Quality of Life concept, measurement and challenges. *Taiko moji ekono mik A: Sistemianityrimai*.
- Straw, R. &. (1984). QWL: New Working relationship in the Communication industry. *Labour Studies Journal*, No. 8, pp.261-274.
- Sutela, H. (2006). Correlate with the Definition of QWL. *Statistical journal of the United nations*, No. 23, pp.57-67.
- Suttle, J. (1977). Improving Life at work: Problem and Prospects. *behavioral Science approaches to organizational Changes*, pp.1-29.
- T, N. W. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of Personality Attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer Nomination Personality Rating. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, No.66, pp.574-583.
- W, R. P. (1998). Belastung und Beanspruchung Heidelberg, Asanger.
- Walton, R. E. (1974). QWL indicators: Prospects and problems', In a Portugal (ed.), Measuring the quality of working life. pp.57-70.
- Walton, R. (1973). Quality work life: What is It? Vol. 11, pp.11-21.
- Warr, P. C. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitude and aspects of psychological well being. *Journal Of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp.129-148.
- Wyatt, T. A. (1988). Quality of Working Life: Cross Culture Considerations. *Asia pacific journal of Management*, Vol. 6, No.1, pp.129-140.

ANNEXURES

Annexure 1: Table 1; Definition & concept of QWL

Author	Key words	Definition
Glowsen, J.(1971)	Responsibility	Quality of work life is basically permitting “ every employee to develop himself through his work and to take on responsibility. ”
Walton, R.E. (1973)	Humanization of Work Place, productivity	Quality of work life thinking stands at the confluence of two separate streams of thought: one to humanize the workplace and the other to improve productivity . It is most commonly directed at private-sector organizations with a view to “improve both productivity for the organization and the quality of working life for its members.
Srivastava, Suresh, et al. (1975)	Job Satisfaction, <i>Intrinsic nature, Autonomy, Democratic, Supervisory Style. Communication.</i>	In an extensive review of the QWL literature several correlate with job satisfaction were extracted including the intrinsic nature of the work, autonomy, democratic and Supportive supervisory style and an organisation climate which reflect support, open communication and autonomy.
Suttle, J.L., (1977).	QWL, basic Needs, experience	QWL is defined as the degree to which work is able to satisfy important personal basic needs through their experience in the organisation is no longer relevant.
Johnston, Carl, P. et. al. (1978) Mills, Ted, Ottawa: Labour Canada (1981)	QWL, Problem Solving, mutual benefit.	Quality of work life (QWL) consists of opportunities for active involvement in group working arrangement or problem solving that are of mutual benefit to employee and employer.
Lippitt, G.L. (1978)	Personal Need, Security, Achievement, Skill and knowledge	A term broadly referring to the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs: to survive with some security , to interact with others , to have a sense of personal usefulness, to be recognized for achievement , and to have an opportunity to improve one’s skills and Knowledge.
Warr, P, Cook, J and Wall (1979), Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel et al. (2001)	Work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, Self rated anxiety	Quality of working life is considered as a range of apparently relevant factors, including work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, higher order need strength, perceived intrinsic job characteristics, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, happiness, and self-rated anxiety.
Nadler, D. A. And Lawler, E.E. III (1983)	QWL, total working environment, satisfaction	QWL refers to an individual’s perception of, and attitudes towards, his or her work and the total working environment. In simple words, QWL can be defined as an individual’s evaluative reactions to, and satisfaction with, his/her work and the total working environment.
Nadler, D.A and E.E. Lawler III (1983), Robbins, S. P. (1998)	Decision making, Individual Needs	QWL refers to methods which attempt to serve both individual needs and organizational effectiveness by involving employees in decision-making and problem-solving activities
Beukema, L., (1987). Groningen et al.	QWL, degree of power, needs	QWL is defined as the degree to which employees are able to shape their jobs actively, in accordance with their options, interests and needs. It is the degree of power an organization gives to its employees to design their work.
Baba, Vishwanath V. Jamal, & Muhammad (1991)	Routinization, Employee participation, Work, task autonomy.	This study proposes that Routinization of job context as indicated by employee participation in routine or non-routine shifts and Routinization of job content as indicated by task variety, significance , autonomy, identity and feedback would have an impact on the individual’s perceived quality of working life
Havlovic, S. J. (1991) Scobel, D. N et al.	Security, Better reward System, higher pays opportunity.	QWL include job security, better reward systems, higher pay , opportunity for growth, and participative groups among others.
Knox, S. and J.A. Irving. (1997)	Organizational Environment, employee Perception.	QWL practices and policies determine the organizational environment, and organizational development interventions operationalize the Constructs. Individual employee perceptions concerning strengths and weaknesses in the total work environment and what is or is not desirable in the workplace are other foci for research.

Author	Key words	Definition
Gilgeous, (1998)	Value System, Cultural Environment	Quality of life could be defined as an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life. Evaluation of the quality of life depends on individual's value system and on the cultural environment where he lives.
Lau, Wong, Chan and Law (2001)	QWL, favourable Working Condition, reward, Job security	It is the favourable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities.
Hagerty, M. R., et al. (2001)	Whole Life Separate component part	QOL a term that implies the quality of a person's whole life, not just a separate component part.
Saklani D.R.,(2004).	QWL, Workplaces	QWL is closely related to the more general term quality of life in that life at the workplace affects life outside the workplace as well
Hanna Sutela, (2006)	Physical Working Environment, Physical and Social Factor, health symptoms, Labour market	Quality of work life is evaluation about four categories: - Physical work environment, Psychic and social factors in the work environment, Health and stress symptoms, Labour market position, and family background variables.
Elisaveta, S. (2006)	Humanization, democratization, intervention	QWL is the correlative relationship between quality of work life and satisfaction with definite job attributes in regard to job contents and Work environment.
Dalia Akranavičiūtė, Juozas Ruževičius, (2007).	Place Strategies	Quality of life could be defined as an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life. Evaluation of the quality of life depends on one's value system.
Guna Seelan Rethinam, Maimunah Ismail (2008)	Wide ranging, Adequate remuneration, Fair Remuneration.	QWL is viewed as a wide-ranging concept, which includes adequate and fair remuneration, safe and healthy working conditions and social integration in the work organization that enables an individual to develop and use all his or her capacities.
Saklani D. R.,(2010)	QWL, Qualitative	Qualitative aspect of working life at the work place is QWL.
Neerpal Rathi, (2010).	QWL, Work Life balance	QWL is defined as the satisfaction of an individual's various needs, such as health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetic needs from his/her participation in the workplace
Roslan Abdul-Hakim, Russayani Ismail, Nor Azam Abdul-Razak, (2010)	Environment, Health, education private amenities Religious belief.	Quality of life refers to feeling good about one's life. It covers many aspects of human life such as environment, health, education, public and private amenities, religious belief and so on. On the other hand the term standard of living only captures a narrow dimension of life satisfaction which normally refers to the level of consumption and thus income. It is basically the satisfaction in meeting basic needs. Thus high standard of living doesn't mean high QOL and vice versa.

Annexure-2, Table-2 Role and Function of QWL in organizational Efficiency

It leads to increase in productivity and/or decrease in absenteeism.	Glaser, E.M. (1976); Macarov, D. (1982); Walton, R.E. (1974).
Increase the worker Satisfaction	Goodman, Paul (1980)
Reduction in Grievances	Ronchi, Don (1981).
Democratization of work.	MARK F. LEVINE (1983),
The organisation's health improves as employees become more knowledgeable about and more active in company matters. It alters the level of involvement of organizational members.	Stacey, N., and Wise, R. (1983).
Differentiate between participants' and nonparticipants at work place	Kochan, Thomas A., Harry C. Katz, and Nancy Mower. (1984).
Fair treatment of employees work at work place	Delamottee, Y. and Takezawa, S. (1984),
Development of "management consciousness"	Parker, Mike. (1985)
It reduces costs and improves productivity	Gorden, Judith R. (1987)

Degree of authority or power distance is altered between the leader and subordinate	Thomas A. Wyatt,(1988).
Increase the resourcefulness and innovativeness of the organizational enterprise.	Thomas A. Wyatt,(1988).
Increase in employee turnover at work place	Klandermans, P. J. (1989).
Increment in Internal firm environment	Stephen j. havlovic (1991),.
Reduced in work stoppage bargaining power	Adrienne e. Eaton, Michael e. Gordon, and Jeffrey h. Keefe, (April 1992).
Helps in formation of an exchange-based relationship.	Rousseau, D.M. (1998).
It leads to more discretionary behaviour and improved task performance.	Edman, T. and Snape, E. (2005).
Leads to positive, distinctive and enduring characteristics in the organisation	Dukerich, J.M., Golden, B.R. et al. (2002)
Lead to higher levels of identification	Olkonnen, M.E. and Lipponen, J. (2006).
It Leads to high motivation, morale, healthy industrial relations and cooperation. Leads to better Competence, Operational Climate, Managing Systems,	Pranee C (2010).
Minimization of the conflicts	hEDRICK

Annexure 3: Table 3: Factors that lead To QWL

Factors	Reference
Survival needs: Security, Social, Ego, self-esteem, autonomy and Self-actualization needs.	Maslow, A.H.: (1954).
Five factor model of Personality Neuroticism (N) Extroversion (E) Openness to Experience (O) Agreeableness (A) Conscientiousness (C)	Norman W T (1963).
Constitutionalism, Work relevance to society, Adequate and fair compensation Social integration, Opportunity to use abilities, Future growth opportunity	Walton, R., (1974).
conceptual categories related to QWL are: Adequate and fair compensation Safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capacities, continued growth and security, Social integration in the work organization, Work and total life space and Social relevance of work life.	Walton, R.E., (1975).
Participative Supervision, High wages	Scanlan, Burt, R. (1976). Bar-Haim, Avid. (1983), Headey, Bruce. (1983).
Interest in the Job, Interaction With Peers	Scanlan, Burt, R. (1976). Bar-Haim, Avid. (1983). Headey, Bruce.(1983).
Organizational environment, Features of job itself, Healthy social relations	Lippitt, G., and J. Rumley, (1977).
Interaction between work environment and Personal needs	Hackman, J.R., and G.R., Oldham, 1980.
Power distance, Masculinity, Uncertainty avoidance, Cultural differences in value, Dimensions	Hofstede, G., (1980).
Task content, Supervision, Resources, Promotion, Work conditions, Organizational context, Autonomy and control, Relations with co-workers; wages	Kahn, R., (1981).
Job mobility, Quantity and quality of leisure time created by job	Kirkman, F., (1981).
Supportive management & favorable work Nature of the job, stimulating Opportunities, co-workers, Equitable pay, Personal growth and autonomy	Davis, L., (1983).
Safe and healthy working conditions;	Kalra, S., and S. Ghosh, (1984).
Chance to advance, Seniority	Maccoby, Michael, (1984).
Work environment, Employee welfare	Mirvis, P., and E. Lawler, (1984).

Absence of undue work stress, Job security	Kalra, S., and S. Ghosh, (1984).
Democratic set up, Security, Equity	Cooper, C., (1988).
Individuation	Cooper, C., (1988).
Career Satisfaction	Greenhus, J. H., Parasuranman, S. P., & Wormley, W. M. (1990).
Attitude toward work	Loscocco, K.A. and A.R. Roschelle, 1991.
Diversity Management	Day, N. E., & Schoenrade, P. (1997).
Job demands, job control, social support, Job content,	Carayon P, Haims M C and Yang C L (2000). Richter P and Hacker W (1998).
Role conflict, and role ambiguity	Carayon P, Haims M C and Yang C L (2000), Richter P and Hacke.
Job satisfaction, Involvement in work performance, Health, Work load	Arts, E. J.(2001)..
Work considerations, Learning and improvement, Social relationship in the organization, Environmental quality	Dalia Akranavičiūtė, Juozas Ruževičius,(2007)
Self-realization	Dalia Akranavičiūtė, Juozas Ruževičius,(2007).
CORE Domain which lead to QOL Material well-being; Social well-being; Physical well-being (health); Emotional well-being; Productive well-being Political stability and security Job security	Violeta Pukelienė, Viktorija Starkauskienė, (2009).
Competence, Operational Climate, Managing Systems, Technology	Chitakornkijisil Pranee, (2010).

Annexure: 4 Table4: Identified Factors and items for QWL

Factors	Items
Social Relationship in the organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With Co workers • With Superior • With Subordinate
Task and Job Aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task variety • Nature of the Job • Job Security • Job Equity
Physical Work Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Healthy and Favourable Working condition • Resource Utilization • operational climate • Technology • Managing system • Time Schedule
HR Policies and programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning System • Promotion scheme • Training and Development • Salary and Compensation
Other Life Domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning • Family/Friends • Leisure(quality & quantity) • Health

Annexure: 5 Table 5: Dimensions of SERVQUAL.

Dimensions of SERVQUAL	Sources
Tangibles	Parasuraman et al. 1988,Reboloso et al. (2001) Donnelly and Dalrymple, 1996,Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Reliability	Parasuraman et al. 1988,Reboloso et al. (2001),Donnelly and Dalrymple, 1996, Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Responsiveness	Parasuraman et al. 1988,Reboloso et al. (2001),Donnelly and Dalrymple, 1996
Assurance	Parasuraman et al. 1988,Reboloso et al. (2001),Donnelly and Dalrymple, 1996
Empathy	Parasuraman et al. 1988 Reboloso et al. (2001) Donnelly and Dalrymple, 1996 Moola & du Plessis, 1997
General satisfaction	Reboloso et al. (2001)
Courtesy	Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Credibility	Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Competence	Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Understanding to customer	Parasuraman, Berry et al. 1985
Safety and security	Allen and Di cesare (1976).Silock
Convenience	Allen and Di cesare (1976), Silock, catling (1996), Moodie (1997), Pullen (1993), Silock (1981)
Comfort	Allen and Di cesare (1976), Silock, catling (1996), Moodie (1997), Pullen (1993), Silock (1981)