

## FACTORS AFFECTING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: Empirical Evidence From Indian Organizations

Chandranshu Sinha, D.Phil. in Psychology

Assistant Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University Campus,  
F3 Block, Sector 125, Post Box – 503, Noida 201303 India

[chandranshu.sinha@gmail.com](mailto:chandranshu.sinha@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*The study undertaken explored the factors of quality of working-life experiences in organizations. The study focused on 100 employees holding middle managerial positions in various organizations. The Cronbach's alpha of the questionnaire was found to be 0.862 & Pearson correlation was 0.924 ( $p < 0.001$ ). The factor analysis of the component 'quality of working-life experiences' led to the extraction of 3 factors from various organizations. The three emerging factors were "relationship-sustenance orientation", "futuristic and professional orientation" and "self-deterministic and systemic orientation". The results indicate that these factors have substantial roles to play in satiating the needs of the employees and how at middle managerial level different aspects are valued and employed for developing a unique and inimitable quality of working life within their socio-technical systems for eliciting favorable job-related responses..*

**Keywords:** *Quality of Working Life; High-Quality-Work-Life Experiences;*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations are continuously looking for new ways of doing business in order to meet the challenges of today's dynamic business environment. Given the amount of time and energy people expend at the workplace, it is important for employees to be satisfied about their life at work. Time pressure is a serious problem in today's workforce, with ever-increasing numbers of workers bearing major responsibilities at home and meeting higher job expectations and heavier demands at work (Glass & Finley, 2002; Van der Lippe, 2007). A mismatch between family and work roles can be disadvantageous for both employees and employers. In fact as early as 1960's researchers had begun to study and connect the dots between work and family. Numerous works on work life thereafter proved that what happened in the workplace have significant impact on individuals and their families. (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Lewis & Cooper, 1987). The combination of a fluctuating work environment with competing job and family commitments has negatively affect employees in the form of lowered morale and motivation, reduced productivity, and increased burnout and turnover (Galinsky & Stein, 1990, Benedict & Taylor, 1995). Moreover the inability of employee to balance the equally challenging demands of their work and personal life has contributed to the escalating stress and conflict of today's workforce (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). This in turn leads to significant rise in stress related health problem, which translates to financial cost both to the employer as well as the government (Johnson, Duxbury & Higgins, 1997, Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1997).

These days, for an organization to be successful and achieve its organizational objectives it is imperative that its employees are satisfied with their work, since work occupies an important place in many people's lives, such conditions are likely to affect not only their physical but also a high level of social, psychological and spiritual well-being. It is well established in the literature that employees with a high level of psychological well-being are better, more committed, and more productive than employees with a low level of psychological well-being (Wright and Bonett 2007, Wright and Cropanzano 2004). Nonetheless, employees are likely to have higher wellbeing if they are satisfied with their work and organization and they perceive their Quality of Work Life (QWL) positively, since an employee's experiences in the workplace and his/her QWL influence his/her health and psychological well-being (Chan and Wyatt 2007, Srivastava 2007).

While there are many studies and emphasis on QWL in North America, it seems that the concept has been less popular in South East Asia, especially India. Given that India is now undergoing dramatic changes in its social and economic structure, it will want to pay attention to factors that will improve its ability to compete in the business world. Improving the QWL may be one of those competitive factors needing attention in business organizations. Although the constructs of QWL have been studied in recent times, it is felt that the research is incomplete as most of the studies on work environment have focused primarily on domain-specific or job-related outcomes rather than context free outcomes of work and the working environment. Though there are studies that have explored the significant associations between various job features and global distress, anxiety, and well-being of employees (e.g. Barnett and Brennan 1997, Hart 1999, Wilson et al. 2004). However, little

empirical research work has been carried out to understand the construct of QWL on context-free or general well-being of employees. This study aims to fill the niche by studying the perceptions of employees for quality of working life experiences.

In other words, this study examines the reasons behind what employees perceive about high-quality working-life experiences employed by organizations in India. This research focuses on the employees at middle managerial level working in various organizations. Thus, we propose that understanding the reasons behind peoples' perception of QWL experiences for organizations is an important goal, to satisfy the various needs of the employees and in return eliciting favorable job-related responses.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The term 'Quality of Work Life (QWL)' is reputed to have originated from an international labor relations conference in 1972 at Arden House, Columbia University, New York (Davis & Cherns, 1975). While there seems to be no agreed upon definition of quality of work life, it has been used as a construct which relates to the well-being of employees. Some say that Mills (1978) may have first coined the term 'quality of work life' and he suggested that QWL had moved into the permanent vocabulary of both unions and management. From a business perspective, quality of work life (QWL) is important since there is evidence demonstrating that the nature of the work environment is related to satisfaction of employees and work-related behaviors (Greenhaus et al., 1987). QWL is also found to affect employees' work responses in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation (Carter et al., 1990; Efraty & Sirgy, 1990; Efraty et al., 1991).

QWL is said to differ from job satisfaction (Quinn & Shephard, 1974; Davis & Cherns, 1975; Hackman & Suttle, 1977; Kabanoff, 1980; Near et al., 1980; Staines, 1980; Champoux, 1981; Kahn, 1981; Lawler, 1982) but QWL is thought to lead to job satisfaction. QWL refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life (job satisfaction), satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life (Sirgy et al., 2001). Some researchers (Danna & Griffin, 1999) see QWL as a hierarchy of concepts that include non-work domains such as life satisfaction (at the top of the hierarchy), job satisfaction (at the middle of the hierarchy) and more work-specific facets of job satisfaction including such things as pay, co-workers, and supervisor (lower in the hierarchy). Although QWL originated over three decades ago, the interest in the construct has not waned entirely. During the 1990s, scholars and practitioners regained an interest in the study of QWL and this concept has become of renewed concern and increased importance to the organization and its human resources both in terms of employee job satisfaction and in terms of the ultimate performance of the organization. People began to know more about quality of work life when the United Auto Workers and General Motors introduced a QWL program for work reform (Beer et al., 1985; May, 1999). The list of QWL factors and literature review is not meant to be exhaustive of all possible theories or variables rather the emphasis in this study is placed on testing the relative frequency with which various QWL factors emerge while analyzing employees' versions of high-quality working-life experiences.

A brief introduction and review of the 12 QWL factors working towards the development of organizations most valuable assets (employees) for gaining competitive advantage in the market, examined in this study are provided in the following section.

**2.1 Communication:** Achieving some level of personal growth may be quite related to the quality of communication in the organization. Proper communication plays a pivotal role to achieve results in this priority area. King (1992) proposed that organizations could improve the quality of working life through improving the nature and quality of communication of the mission and vision through the use of team briefings as a first step in the process of employee participation. Besides the traditional methods of information sharing through house journals, notice boards, shop campaigns, etc., novelty can be experienced for orienting shop communication in tune with the process of work, the starting point is that new work practices have deeply changed the way firms operate (e.g., Ichniowski et al. 1996). Traditional "Taylorist" organizations were based on hierarchical communication and required from their employees specialized skills consistent with the standardization of the production process. On the contrary, reorganized enterprises have more horizontal communication channels and favor multi-skilling as opposed to specialization. Despite the difficulty of identifying what is really "new" in terms of communication, some workplace practices respond to globalization and changes in the technological environment, which make information processing, adaptability, and product quality keys for firm competitiveness.

**2.2 Career Development & Growth:** The purpose of career planning as part of an employee development program is not only to help employees feel like their employers are investing in them, but also help people

manage the many aspects of their lives and deal with the fact that there is a clear promotion track. Employers can no longer promise job security, but they can help people maintain the skills they need to remain viable in the job market (Moses, 1999). It has been found that there are numerous literatures available on this concept in relation to QWL. Gallie (2003) suggests that there is a comparison of employees' perceptions of the quality of working tasks, the degree of involvement in decision making, career opportunities, and job security to see whether the Scandinavian countries have a distinctive pattern from other European Union countries. Another empirical study was done to predict QWL in relation to career-related dimensions (Aduan Che Rose et al. 2006). The sample consists of 475 managers from the free trade zones on Malaysia for both multinational corporations (MNCs) and small and medium industries (SMIs). The results indicate that three exogenous variables are significant: career satisfaction, career achievement, and career balance, with 63 per cent of the variance in QWL. In fact a high-quality work life was perceived to be one in which there was an opportunity to develop close personal ties and achieve career goals with an absence of excessive job stress. To the extent that when organizations have an understanding attitude toward employees who combine work and family roles (family responsive culture), employees are not likely to worry about career opportunities if they reduce their working hours due to family responsibilities (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999).

**2.3 Organizational Commitment:** The relationship of organizational commitment with work life quality is another aspect of working life that is often investigated by researchers. Studies have concluded that committed employees' remains with the organization for longer periods of time than those which are less committed have a stronger desire to attend work, and a more positive attitude about their employment. Steers (1977) concluded that "commitment was significantly and inversely related to employee turnover." According to Arthur (1994) when organizations seek to foster a philosophy of commitment, then the likelihood of an employee searching for employment elsewhere is lowered. Owens (2006) had a similar finding that employees that had a higher level of commitment also had a higher level of "turnover cognitions". A higher score in "turnover cognitions" indicated that the employee had a more favorable attitude and was less likely to consider turnover representing an inverse relationship of commitment and turnover. The aforementioned studies are representative of much of the research available relating to commitment and turnover. Commitment has a significant and positive impact on job performance and on workforce retention. The underlying belief is that a more committed employee will perform better at their job (Walton, 1985).

**2.4 Emotional Supervisory Support:** It has been suggested that emotional support at work helps balance work and family roles because it contributes to the employee's energy level (Van Daalen et al., 2006). A supportive supervisor may help boost an employee's energy level by discussing family-related problems, reinforce the employee's positive self-image by giving feedback, and reduce stress by showing understanding for the employee's family life (Halbesleben, 2006; Lapierre & Allen, 2006). Using insights from the enrichment approach (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Greenhaus and Powell (2006), we expect that such emotional resources help boost employees' work outcomes most when they replace resources that employees lack at home. On the basis of the conflict approach (Friedman, Christensen, & DeGroot, 1998), one could argue that employees have more need for supervisor support because they have heavier family demands. Supervisor support, however, is not aimed primarily at combining work and family tasks. Instead, it helps employees in general function better at work and find a work life fit (Anderson et al., 2002). We therefore expect that employees with the fewest resources at home profit most from supervisor support.

**2.5 Flexible Work Arrangement:** Flexible work arrangements (flexitime and telecommuting) are thought to contribute to job motivation and dedication. They also enable the employee to use time more efficiently by scheduling activities in a way that suits his or her situation best (Hill, Ferris, & Martinson, 2003). Telecommuting actually saves the employee time, as it saves time commuting that cannot be used for work or family activities. Following the conflict approach, flexible work arrangements pay off most among parents as they have heavier demands for which they need time and energy to balance multiple roles. Previous studies, however, have shown that flexible work arrangements can have disadvantageous side effects because they blur the boundaries between family and work, thus increasing work-family conflict (Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, 2005). For example, Peters and van der Lippe (2007) showed that flexitime and telecommuting led to more time pressure in the long run among employees with children, and Hill, Hawkins, and Miller (1996) reported that some telecommuters experienced more work-family interference, increasing stress. We expect, therefore, that the enrichment approach is more applicable for explaining the effects of flexible work arrangements on work outcomes. According to this approach, employees without other household members may have most need for flexible work arrangements. For example, when unexpected situations arise at home, such as plumbing repairs, an employee with a partner and children may be able to count on family members to stand in. Moreover, telecommuting for single employees is presumably more efficient, assuming that these employees have fewer interfering family tasks.

**2.6 Family-Responsive Culture:** In addition to providing flexible work arrangement and emotional supervisor support, the organization's culture toward combining work and family roles is at least as important for employees seeking work-family balance (Thompson & Prottas, 2006). A supportive work environment provides the employee with emotional resources, such as understanding, advice, and recognition (van Daalen et al., 2006). When organizations have an understanding attitude toward employees who combine work and family roles (family-responsive culture), employees are not likely to worry about career opportunities if they reduce their working hours due to family responsibilities (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999). In line with the conflict approach, we expect that a family-responsive culture is only relevant for employees who have substantial family responsibilities, such as parents and couples. The enrichment approach, expected to be most effective for employees with the fewest family resources, is less applicable in this case, because singles do not need this particular resource (Muse et al., 2008). A family-friendly culture may even lower singles' work outcomes if they feel excluded by such a culture (Casper et al., 2007).

**2.7 Employee Motivation:** The general perception is that people leave organization for higher pay. This hypothesis, though intuitively quite appealing, is often not sufficient in describing the entire picture with regard to sales force turnover. Because the Hawthorne studies (19th century) have already proved long back that money is not the only motivator (Mayo 1960), where as other environmental factors also play a significant role for employee motivation and performance. It is important to recognize that individuals have unique motives for working (Haim 2003) and quite often it is complex to know what motivates employees (Mishra & Gupta 2009). Though there is no universally accepted definition of the term QWL, yet there is consensus in the research literature that QWL involves a focus on all aspects of working life that might conceivably be relevant to worker satisfaction and motivation, and that QWL is related with the well-being of employees (Davis and Cherns 1975, Nadler and Lawler III 1983, Ryan 1995, Sirgy et al. 2001).

**2.8 Organizational Climate:** Various facets of organizational climate have been measured and used in previous researches on QWL. Literature suggests three of them primarily, viz. affective, cognitive and instrumental (Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000; Spreitzer, Kizilos & Nason, 1997; Carr Schimdt, Ford & DeShon, 2003). The affective facet of organizational climate primarily comprises of the quality of relationships in the organization. This is a critical component of the social relations aspect of climate and has been used in past climate studies. The cognitive climate facet consists of a sense of deriving intrinsic rewards from one's work comprising of meaningfulness, competence, self-determination, impact and work-family interference (Gutek, Searle & Kepa, 1991). Meaningfulness has been described as the "engine" of empowerment, which gives the feeling that you are doing something that is worth your time and effort and it is worthwhile in the large scheme of things; competence is the confidence you feel in your ability to do your work well; self-determination is the freedom to choose how to do your work; and impact involves the sense that the task is proceeding and that you are actually accomplishing something and making a difference in the organization. Together these individual dimensions of cognitive climate suggest that if employees do not experience these cognitive elements of their work, they may become dissatisfied along with the level of work-family interference which describes the extent to which an employee's work demands interference with family responsibilities. The instrumental climate facet is defined as follows: work processes, structure, and extrinsic rewards (Carr Schimdt, Ford & DeShon, 2003) including access to resources and time control. Access to resources includes access to work space, funds, support staff, supplies and materials. Time control on the other hand denotes the ability of employees to control the time at work and give priority to what they perceived to be the most important task at hand.

**2.9 Organizational Support:** Besides, organizational climate, the level of support offered by the organization is also an indication of the work-life quality in organizations. Organizational Support is defined as the extent to which employees perceive that the organization values their contributions and cares about their wellbeing. This is a key factor in influencing employee commitment to the organization, job satisfaction, and general quality of work life. Many researchers have studied the relationship between perceived organizational support and work-life quality of workers and have found it to have a positive impact on organizational commitment, employee performance as well as job satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Dixon & Sagas, 2007).

**2.10 Job Satisfaction:** The relationship of job satisfaction with work life quality is another aspect of working life that is often investigated by researchers. Job satisfaction is one of the central variables in work and is seen as an important indicator of working life quality (Cohen, Kinnevy & Dichter, 2007; Aryee, Fields & Luk, 1999) determining the extent to which the employee is satisfied or is enthusiastic about his job (Aryee et al., 1999). This part of feeling enthusiastic or having sense of enjoyment in one's work is reflective of Herzberg's Hygiene factors in his theory of motivation. (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1967; Herzberg, 1968).

**2.11 Rewards & Benefits:** Hackman and Oldhams (1980) highlighted the constructs of QWL in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. They emphasized the personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organization such as compensation, promotion, recognition and development meet their expectations, which will lead to an excellent QWL. Later, Maccoby (1984) identified the job satisfaction of employees and supervisors of Bell System over a five-year period. He found that the employees and supervisors were satisfied with their pay and benefits and were also motivated to work productively, but they were dissatisfied with the technology in use and felt too much supervisory control. Sinha and Sayeed (1980) designed a full-length QWL inventory relevant for the Indian sample and have validated it based on the item correlations. Lowe et al. (2003) conducted a study to explore the relationship between work-life experiences and personal life of employees. In their study, they observed that workers are likely to perceive their workplace in a positive way if certain conditions exist in the workplace. The conditions identified by them include having reasonable demands, high intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, good social support, influence over workplace decisions, and available resources to do the job. Based on their research, Lowe et al. (2003) argued that all of the above mentioned conditions contribute in enhancing the health and well-being of employees.

**2.12 Compensation:** Besides rewards and benefits the level of support created by the compensation structure is also an indication of the work-life quality in organizations. Many organizations claim to base pay raises on performance, but that is not actually the case. Some companies try to emphasize a team environment, but continue to reward people for individual achievement (Feldman, 2000). These inconsistencies can cause frustration and cynicism by employees. It is especially difficult when employees are not seeing significant pay raises, yet company leaders are richly rewarded (Feldman, 2000). The entire organization must buy into the culture of employee development. Sears created a new compensation system when they got into the business of employee development. Whereas they used to only offer pay increases to employees who were promoted, they have moved to a system where people may see a pay increase for lateral moves that are appropriate for their own development (O'Herron and Simonsen, 1995).

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive survey design. The purpose of descriptive surveys, according to Ezeani (1998), is to collect detailed and factual information that describes an existing phenomenon. A thorough review of literature was conducted before selecting the topic of the study. In this study, we focused on understanding the factors affecting quality of working life that is working towards the development of organizations most valuable assets (employees) for gaining competitive advantage in the market. In other words, this study examines the reasons behind what employees perceive about high-quality working-life experiences employed by organizations in India. The target populations of the study were 100 middle level managers who were selected from various organizations to participate because very little empirical research work has been carried out for this group to understand the construct of QWL on context-free or general well-being of employees. As a result, they are in better position to observe and experience the work behaviors and attitudes towards factors affecting quality of working life in organizations. This study aims to fill the niche by studying the perceptions of employees for quality of working life experiences. It is hoped that this would provide more realistic and reliable data and information about the impact of efforts made by the organization for continuous individual employment on themselves and those they supervise. Moreover, because by understanding the reasons behind peoples' perception of QWL experiences, organizations would be able to satisfy the various needs of the employees and in return elicit favorable job-related responses. Therefore, the findings regarding this group adds another perspective to the management literature regarding factors that affect the construct of QWL on context-free or general well-being of employees. The population was taken for survey from middle level managers employed in various organizations, based in north India. A total enumeration sampling technique was used to select 100 middle level managers.

#### 3.1 Instrument

A set of twelve measures were selected for the study after going through the literature. A structured questionnaire was constructed utilizing these twelve measures of communication, career development & growth, organizational commitment, emotional supervisory support, flexible work arrangements, family-responsive culture, employee motivation, organizational climate, organizational support, job satisfaction, rewards & benefits and compensation with appropriate instructions for each section of the questionnaire for the collection of data on the study. The questionnaire was specifically designed to accomplish the objectives of the study. The first section collected information such as age, sex, experience, professional status, marital status and position. The second section was supplemented by items based on the studies of Kings (1992); Aduan Che Rose et al. (2006); Owens (2006); Lapierre & Allen, (2006); Desrochers, Hilton, & Larwood, (2005); Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, (1999); Mishra and Gupta (2009); Wanous, Reichers & Austin, (2000); Spreitzer, Kizilos & Nason, (1997); Carr Schimdt, Ford & DeShon, (2003); Dixon & Sagas, (2007); Kinnevy & Dichter, (2007); Sinha and

Sayed (1980); Feldman, (2000). To assess the validity of the questionnaire, expert judgment method was applied. So, the developed questionnaire, along with explanations regarding terms and concepts were presented to three university professors, eight managers from the various organizations. As such, they were asked to express their views about its construct, content, formal appearance and writing model. Many inputs were given by them that were included while finalizing the questionnaire. It was also noticed that some of the questions needed revision along with some additions and deletions. The necessary amendments were then made and its content and construct validity were assured and finally confirmed by other experts. The questionnaire consisted of 48 items in which the perception of the participants was central. The items measured the participants' perception, work behaviors and attitudes towards high-quality working-life experiences employed by their organizations. All 48 items were scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "I strongly disagree" to 5 "I strongly agree". Then, to determine the reliability of the questionnaire, it was sent to various organizations. The questionnaire was filled out by the research community belonging to middle managerial level. After the mentioned questionnaires were filled out, the reliability of the questionnaire was determined using Cronbach's alpha and Pearson correlation. The overall reliability co-efficient of the modified instrument after the pilot survey yielded an  $r = 0.862$  cronbach alpha while Pearson correlation was 0.924 ( $p < 0.001$ ) showing that the questionnaire was reliable.

#### 4. ANALYSIS

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin was used to determine the sufficiency of the sample size, and Bartlett test of sphericity was applied to calculate the meaningfulness of the correlation matrix. Then, the exploratory factor analysis was performed with maximum probability approach to identify the rate of loading of variables recognized in the component, and Varimax orthogonal approach was used to interpret the variables. Subsequently, the confirmatory factor analysis was used, with application of Lisrel 8.7, to verify the fitness of factors achieved during the explanatory factor analysis. The fitness indexes are as follows: Chi square index, goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI), normed fit index (NFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), incremental fit index (IFI), related fit index (RFI), adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and root mean square residual (RMR). However, if CFI, GFI, NFI, NNFI, IFI, RFI and AGFI are higher than 0.90, and RMSEA and RMR are less than 0.50, it proves a desirable and appropriate fitness (Alexopoulos and Kalaitzidis, 2004).

##### 4.1 Results

In the first step, the correlation of each identified variable and the internal consistency of all variables were calculated in the component "Quality of working life" for the data.

##### 4.1.1 Quality of Working Life Experiences

Before the explanatory factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin approach was used to determine the sufficiency of the sample size for the component, while Bartlett test of sphericity was used to establish whether the correlation matrix has meaningful difference with zero or not. The sufficiency of sampling and meaningfulness of the correlation matrix for the ( $p < 0.001$ ), respectively. It showed that the exploratory factor analysis was permissible. Then, the explanatory factor analysis was performed with maximum probability approach and the variables were interpreted with Varimax rotation approach. The results showed that three factors came out from the "Quality of Working Life Experiences" component with special values bigger than 1. The first, second and third factors explained 46.322, 12.982 and 11.9800% of the total variances of variables, respectively. Therefore, these three factors explained 62.865% of the total variances of variables for the component "Quality of Working Life Experiences" from various organizations.

Regarding this component, the following variables formed the 1<sup>st</sup> factor:

1. Job Satisfaction
2. Family-Responsive Culture
3. Employee Motivation
4. Organizational Support
5. Compensation

The 2nd factor was formed by the following variables:

1. Career Development & Growth
2. Flexible Work Arrangements
3. Emotional-Supervisory Support
4. Rewards & Benefits

The 3rd factor was formed by the following variables:

1. Communication
2. Organizational Commitment
3. Organizational Climate
4. Emotional-Supervisory Support

In Table 1, the confirmatory factor analysis was made with the use of the software “Lisrel 8.7” for ‘Quality of Working Life Experiences’ and then the fitness of the factors achieved was determined (Table 2). Subsequent to the earlier stated stage, the first, second and third factors of the component “Quality of Working Life Experiences” were the approved factors named: “Relationship-Sustenance Orientation”, “Futuristic and Professional Orientation” and “Self-deterministic and Systemic Orientation”, respectively.

## 5. DISCUSSION

Findings of this research showed that three factors each have been identified regarding quality of working life experiences. Levering (1988) argued that the profit of successful organizations is not to be achieved at the expense of its employees and one method for developing a unique and inimitable workplace is for organizations to create a special quality of work life (QWL) within their socio-technical systems. The latter part of his argument is important because it suggests that QWL experiences need to be created by the organization within their socio-technical systems for success. Further, Nadler and Lawler III (1983) stated that 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.

The assertions of Lockwood (2006) and Nadler and Lawler III (1983) are in consonance with the findings of the present research that proposed to examine that what the employees perceive about high-quality working-life experiences employed by organizations in context-free situations. The first factor was called “relationship-sustenance orientation”, the second one was “futuristic and professional orientation” and the third one was “self-deterministic and systemic orientation”. The confirmatory factor analysis for the data, too, indicated that the structural model of these factors was proper.

The findings of this research proved that the components identified and the structural relations presented as regards the component, “quality of working life experiences” were suitable. The factors emerging from “quality of working life experiences” also indicate that how they are employed differently to satisfy the various needs of the employees by various organizations, which in turn elicit favorable job-related responses. Based upon an understanding of employees’ various needs and their QWL experiences, management can identify the strategic gap (if any) in the organization and can take further necessary actions to improve the QWL of employees. This may be helpful for an organization to be successful and to achieve organizational objectives since employees’ QWL experiences are directly related with a variety of desirable organizational outcomes, such as reduced rate of absenteeism, turnover, tardiness frequency and health care utilization (thus, reduced health care costs), and increased job performance (Warr 2005, Wright and Bonett 2007, Wright and Croppanzano 2004). Thus signifying that employees’ QWL experiences are limited not only to them but is a matter of concern for the employers as well the only thing that will maintain today’s source of competitive advantage is high quality personnel instead of merely capital, technology or long-lived products Caudron (1994). In fact, employees are the soft assets and are the hidden value of a company (Abdeen, 2002). Hence, if organizations are concerned about developing their human resources and gaining a competitive advantage in the marketplace, it seems necessary that they attend to one of their most precious assets, namely, their human resources by employing high-quality working-life experiences in consonance their various needs eliciting favorable job-related responses in return.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdeen, T. (2002) Company performance: does quality of work life really matter?, *Management Research News*, 25, pp. 8–10.
2. Alexopoulos DS, Kalaitzidis I (2004). Psychometric properties of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQ-R) short scale in Greece. *Person. individual Diff.*, 3(7): 1205- 1220.
3. Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 787–810.
4. Arthur, J. B. 1994. Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *The Academy of Manufacturing Performance*, 37(3): 670-687.
5. Aryee, S., Fields, D. & Luk, V. 1999. 'A cross-cultural test of model of the work-family interface', *Journal of Management*, 25(4): 491-511

6. Barnett, R.C. And Brennan, R.T. (1997), Change in Job Conditions, Change in Psychological Distress, and Gender: A Longitudinal Study of Dual Earner Couples, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp 253-274.
7. Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P. R., Mills, D. Q. & Walton, R. E. (1985) *Human Resource Management: A General Manager's Perspective* (New York: The Free Press).
8. Carter, C., Pounder, F., Lawrence, F. & Wozniak, P. (1990) Factors related organizational turnover intentions of Louisiana extension service agents, in: H. Meadow & M. Sirgy (Eds) *Quality-of-Life Studies in Marketing and Management*, pp. 170–181 (Blacksburg, VA: International Society for Quality-of-Life Studies).
9. Carr, J. Z., Schmidt, A. M., Ford, J., & DeShon, R. P. 2003. Climate perceptions matter: A metaanalytic path analysis relating molar climate, cognitive and affective states, and individual level work outcome, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 605–619.
10. Casper, W. J., Weltman, D., & Kwesiga, E. (2007). Beyond family-friendly: The construct and measurement of singles-friendly work culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70, 478–501.
11. Caudron, S. (1994) HR leaders brainstorm the profession's future, *Personnel Journal*, 73(8), pp. 54–62.
12. Champoux, J. (1981) A sociological perspective on work involvement, *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 30, pp. 65–86.
13. Chan, K.W. And Wyatt, T.A. (2007), *Quality of Work Life: A Study of Employees in Shanghai, China*, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp 501-517.
14. Cohen, B. J., Kinnevy, S. C. and Dichtera, M. E.. 2007, The quality of work life of child protective investigators: A comparison of two work environments, *Children and Youth Services Review* vol 29 (4),
15. Davis, L. & Cherns, A. (Eds) (1975) *The Quality of Working Life* (New York: Free Press).
16. Desrochers, S., Hilton, J., & Larwood, L. (2005). Preliminary validation of the work-family integration- blurring scale. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(4), 442–466.
17. Dixon, M. and Sagas, M. 2007. The relationship between organizational support, work family conflict, and the job-life satisfaction of university coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 78, 236-247.
18. Edwards, J., & Rothbard, N. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relation between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178–199.
19. Efraty, D. & Sirgy, M. (1990) The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioural responses, *Social Indicators Research*, 22(1), pp. 31–47.
20. Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. & Claiborne, C. B. (1991) The effects of personal alienation on organizational identification: quality-of-work life model, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 6(1), pp. 57–78.
21. Ezeani, S.I. (1998). *Research methods: A realistic approach*. Ibadan: Elohim Publishers.
22. Friedman, S. D., Christensen, P., & DeGroot, J. (1998). Work and life: The end of the zero-sum game. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 119–129.
23. Feldman, D. (2000). The Dilbert syndrome: How employee cynicism about ineffective management is changing the nature of careers in organizations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 1286-1301.
24. Gallie, Duncan, (2003), 'The Quality of working life: Is Scandinavia Different?', *Oxford Journal*, 19, pp. 61–79.
25. Glass, J. L., & Finley, A. (2002). Coverage and effectiveness of family-responsive workplace policies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 313–337.
26. Greenhaus, J., Bedian, A. & Mossholder, K. (1987) Work experiences, job performances, and feelings of personal and family well being, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 31, pp. 200–215.
27. Greenhaus, J., & Powell, G. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92.
28. Gutek, B., Searle, S., & Kelpa, L. 1991. Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560-568.
29. Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, R.G. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Reading, M.A: Addison-Wesley
30. Hart, P.M. (1999), Predicting Employee Life Satisfaction: A Coherent Model of Personality, Work and Nonwork Experiences, and Domain Satisfactions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 84, No. 4, pp 564-584.
31. Hackman, J. & Suttle, J. (1977) *Improving Life at Work* (Glenview, IL: Scott- Foresman).
32. Haim, A. (2003), *Motivational Management: Inspiring You People for Maximum Performance*, New York: ebrary, Inc
33. Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1134–1145.
34. Herzberg, F. (1968), "One more time: how do you motivate employees?", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 46 No. January-February, pp.53-62.

35. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. B. 1967 *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
36. Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., & Miller, B. C. (1996). Work and family in the virtual office: Perceived influences of mobile telework. *Family Relations*, 45(3), 293–301.
37. Hill, E. J., Ferris, M., & Martinson, V. (2003). Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues influence aspects of work and personal/family life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 220–241.
38. Ichniowski, Casey, Thomas A. Kochan, David Levine, Craig Olson and George Strauss. 1996. “What Works at Work: Overview and Assessment.” *Industrial Relations* 35(3): 299–333.
39. Kabanoff, B. (1980) Work and non-work: a review of models, methods and findings, *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, pp. 60–77.
40. Kahn, R. (1981) *Work and Health* (New York: John Wiley).
41. King, N., (1992), ‘Improving the quality of working life through communication’, *Asia Pacific Journal of Quality Management*, 1, pp. 51–8.
42. Lapiere, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(2), 169–181.
43. Lawler, E. (1982) Strategies for improving the quality of work life, *American Psychologist*, 37, pp. 66–73.
44. Lowe, G., Schellenburg, G. And Shannon, H.S. (2003), Correlates of Employees’ Perception of a Healthy Work Environment, *American Journal of Health Promotion*, Vol. 17, No. 6, pp 390-399.
45. May, B., Lau, R. & Johnson, S. K. (1999) A longitudinal study of quality of work life and business performance, *South Dakota Business Review*, 58, pp. 1–7.
46. Mayo, E. (1960), *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Viking Press, New York.
47. Mishra, S. & Gupta, B. (2009), “Work Place Motivators and Employee’s Satisfaction: A Study on Retail Sector in India”, *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, 44(3): 509-17.
48. Moses, B. (1999). Career planning mirrors social change. *The Globe and Mail* [On-Line]. Retrieved January 18, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.bbmcareerdev.com/careerplan.html>
49. Muse, L., Harris, S. G., Giles, W. F., & Feild, H. S. (2008). Work-life benefits and positive organizational behavior: Is there a connection? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 171–192.
50. Nadler, D. A. And Lawler, E.E. III (1983), *Quality of Work Life: Perspectives and Directions*, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp 20-30.
51. Near, J., Rice, R. & Hunt, R. (1980) The relationship between work and nonwork domains: a review of empirical research, *Academy of Management Review*, 5, pp. 415–429.
52. O’Herron, P., & Simonsen, P. (1995). Career development gets a charge at Sears Credit. *Personnel Journal*, 74 (5), 103-106.
53. Owens, P. L. 2006. One more reason not to cut your training budget: The relationship between training and organizational outcomes. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(2): 163-171.
54. Peters, P., & van der Lippe, T. (2007). The time-pressure reducing potential of telehomeworking: The Dutch case. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(3), 430–447.
55. Quinn, R. & Shephard, I. (1974) *The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey* (Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan).
56. Rhoades, L and Eisenberger, R. 2002. Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 87, Issue 4, August 2002, Pages 698-714
57. Ryan, G.M. (1995), *Theoretical Basis for the QWL Concept*, Qualit (Esprit Project 8162) (Working Paper), University of Siena.
58. Sirgy, M.J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. And Lee, D.J. (2001), A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp 241-302.
59. Sinha, P & Sayeed O.B. (1980), “Measuring Quality of Working Life: Development of an Inventory”, *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 41: 219-26.
60. Spreitzer, G.M., Kizilos, M.A., Nason, S.W. 1997, "A multidimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment, and effectiveness, satisfaction, and strain", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 23 No.5, pp.679-705
61. Srivastava, A.K. (2007), Perceived Work Environment and Employees’ Health, *Psychological Studies*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp 345- 347.
62. Staines, G. (1980) Spillover versus compensation: a review of the literature on the relationship between work and non-work, *Human Relations*, 33, pp. 111–129.
63. Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1): 46-56.

66. Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 329–415.

67. Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2006). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 100–118.

68. Van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work-family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 462–476.

69. Van der Lippe, T. (2007). Dutch workers and time pressure: Household and workplace characteristics. *Work, Employment and Society*, 21(4), 693–711.

70. Walton, R. E. 1985. From control to commitment in the workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(2): 77-84.

71. Wanous, J.P. Reichers, A. E and Austin, J. T., 2000, "Cynicism about organizational change: Measurements, antecedents and correlates," *Group & Organization Management* 25, 132-153

72. Warr, P.B. (2005), Work, Well-Being, and Mental Health, in J.Barling, E.K. Kelloway and M.R. Frome (ed.) (2005), *Handbook of Work Stress*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 547-573.

73. Wilson, M.G., DeJoy, D.M., Vandenberg, R.J., Richardson, H.A. And McGrath, A.L. (2004), Work Characteristics and Employee Health and Well-Being: Test of a Model of Healthy Work Organization, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 4, pp 565-588.

74. Wright, T.A. And Bonett, D.G. (2007), Job Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being as Non-additive Predictors of Workplace Turnover, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp 141-160.

75. Wright, T.A. And Cropanzano, R. (2004), The Role of Psychological Well-Being in Job Performance: A Fresh Look at an Age-Old Quest, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 33, No 4, pp 338-351.

**Table 1: Quality of Working Life Experiences**

Code Variable	1st factor	2nd factor	3rd factor	t-value	R2
1. Communication			0.687	5.57*	0.56
2. Career Development & Growth		0.557		5.26*	0.45
3. Organizational Commitment			0.400	4.70*	0.41
4. Job Satisfaction	0.656			5.42*	0.58
5. Flexible Work Arrangements		0.678		6.79	0.89
6. Family-Responsive Culture	0.567			6.62 *	0.20
7. Employee Motivation	0.760			5.68*	0.53
8. Organizational Climate			0.994	4.66*	0.69
9. Organizational Support	0.503			5.82*	0.50
10. Emotional-Supervisory Support		0.447	0.470	6.51*	0.64
11. Rewards & Benefits		0.965		5.45	0.86
12. Compensation	0.471			6.40*	0.32

\* t>1.96.

**Table 2: Fitness indexes calculated for the component “Quality of Working Life Experiences”.**

Component/ Index	Root Mean Square error of approx (RMSEA)	Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	Normed Fit Index (NFI)	Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI)	Incremental Fit Index (IFI)	Relative Fit Index (RFI)	AGFI	RM R	X <sup>2</sup>	P Value
Quality of Working Life Experiences	0.0015	0.93	0.91	0.86	0.90	0.91	0.82	0.75	0.032	21.11	p>0.05