

---

**A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG EMPLOYEES OF  
KOTHARI SUGARS AND CHEMICALS LIMITED IN KATTUR,  
TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT, TAMILNADU**

K. Rajam\*,

V.P.T. Dhevika\*\*

Dr. O.T.V. Latastri\*\*\*

Dr. D. Sivasubramanian\*\*\*\*

P. Priya\*\*\*\*\*

---

**ABSTRACT**

*The study of quality of working (QWL) life has been an important and critical area in management and organizational performance from last several years especially in the Kothari Sugars and Chemical Ltd (KSCL). This paper aims to study the extent of QWL in the KSCL and explores the proposed link between the QWL and employees productivity. Hundred employees responded to the researcher's questionnaire. The study makes use of statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, median, t test. ANOVA analysis to process and analysis the data collected for this study. The demographic portion of the instrument was developed by the researcher to sort out the demographic information. To explore difference between the means of two group t-test was applied. One way ANOVA was used for exploring the difference among more than two groups. The paper ends by offering useful suggestions to the management involved in the operations of the company.*

**Keywords:** Quality of working life, Employees Productivity, Work-Life Balance.

---

\*Assistant Professor, Centre for Research, Department of Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College, Tiruchirappalli

\*\*Head (UG), Centre for Research, Department of Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College, Tiruchirappalli

\*\*\*Head (PG), Centre for Research, Department of Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College, Tiruchirappalli

\*\*\*\*Principal (Rtd.), Centre for Research, Department of Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College, Tiruchirappalli

\*\*\*\*\*Research Scholar, Centre for Research, Department of Commerce, Srimad Andavan Arts and Science College, Tiruchirappalli

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Any organization's success depends upon the proper functioning of its human resource management. An educational institution is no exception to this. Human Resource Management formerly called as personnel needs and recruitment, selecting the right people for the job, orienting and training, determining and managing salaries, providing benefits & incentives, appraising performance, resolving disputes communicating with all employees at all level.

The team work life balance has different meanings for different people. Some consider it as perceived important personal needs, which an individual tries to satisfy by working in an environment. Work life balance is about striking the right balance between forward by the need to change the way we work and live as a society. Flexibility is required for employees to access jobs that meet their expectations and potential as well as improving productivity. Businesses are more market driven and customers are more demanding about when they can access services and products. Effective work life balance policies and practices can benefit both Employers and Employees by changing traditional the combination of working, family and private lives.

## **2. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY**

Quality of work life is very important because most of people spend a major portion of their life in the working place. Moreover a Quality of work life has its impact, on the general life of the employee, as a contented and human being.

A highly satisfied worker has both better physical and mental well being. Though it is a debatable point as to which one is the cause and which the effective is but they are correlated to each other.

KSCL is one of leading industries, which provides highly satisfied and improved life standard. By earning a job in a well established industries like KSCL; one will be highly satisfied with his job and the living standard can be improved.

## **3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The success of the employee morale very much depends upon the ability of the firm which in turn depends upon the efficient of employees

The oxford dictionary defines employee morale as efforts to make like worth living fir workmen. These efforts have their origin either in some statute formed by the state or in some local customer or in a collective agreement or in the employers own initiative.

In this study, the tendency or researcher is to find out the effectiveness of the employee morale activities provided by the Kothari Sugars and Chemicals Ltd., Kattur.

#### **4. SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The study mainly focused on quality of work life employees and provides various finding and suggestions to achieve the optimal quality of work life of the employees to the company.

#### **5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- To study about Quality of work life of the employees at Kothari Sugars & Chemicals Limited.
- To study the factors that affect quality of work life.
- To analyze the benefits that are offered to motivate the assistant Employees/ Employees respondents.

#### **6. HYPOTHESIS**

- There is a significant association between age of the respondents and their overall quality of work life.
- There is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life.
- There is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life.
- There is a significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life.
- There is a significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life.

#### **7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Research is the systematic investigation to the establish new facts or principles or to collect information on a subject. Redman and Mory define research as a “systematize effort to gain new knowledge”. Thus research is the process of systematic and in depth study and search for any particular subject or area of investigation baked by collection, compilation, presentation and interpretation of relevant details or data.

The methodology note or chapter is perhaps the most crucial in the research as it indicates fellow researcher to know over the study and directs him to validity of its application and results their off. The validity of the research study lies to a great extent in the methodology followed. A

study would never be reliable unless and until it is not done along certain methodological guidelines. In this chapter an attempt is made to describe the methodological aspects of the present study.

## 8. DATA COLLECTION

Collection has mainly been from two sources namely primary and secondary data.

### 8.1 Primary data:-

Those data which are collected and for the first time and they happens to be original in character. The methodology used for the collection of primary data. Through questionnaire and direct personal interview.

### 8.2 Secondary data:-

For this research work the secondary data are collected from the previous information available with the company. Apart from this book, websites are referred.

### 8.3 Sample size:-

The total number of employee working in the company is 250. The researcher has selected 100 respondents for the study.

### 8.4 Research design:-

Since the study is not new in the field the researcher adopted descriptive cum diagnostic research method.

## 9. STATISTICAL TOOLS

The collected data were analyzed through percentage analysis,

Chi-square test, One way ANOVA 'f' and Student 't' test

## 10.PERIOD OF THE STUDY:-

The study during the period from January 2013 to March 2013.

## 11. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Bear field, (2003)** used 16 questions to examine quality of working life, and distinguished between causes of dissatisfaction in professionals, intermediate clerical, sales and service workers, indicating that different concerns might have to be addressed for different groups. The distinction made between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in quality of working life reflects the influence of job satisfaction theories. **Lawler, (2004)** Quality of Working Life is not a unitary concept, but has been seen as incorporating a hierarchy of perspectives that not only include work-based factors such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay and relationships with

work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being suggested that quality of working life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the “basic elements of a good quality of work life” as:

safe work environment,

equitable wages,

Equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement.

**Waddell Jane and Carr Paul (2005)** In addition to competition of globalization and products, organization face competition related to employee retention at the same time employees face competition for their time. As increasing number of employees face competing demands between work and family, the importance of maintaining a healthy work life balance is of paramount consideration. In spite of family- friendly policies, many employees perceive negative consequences associated with availing themselves of these policies. At the same time, over 50% of American employees fail to take their allotted vacation time. Failure to achieve a healthy work life balance can lead to overload, which may result in loss of employees. Encouraging a healthy work life balance benefits both the organization and the employees.

**Lawler and Porter (2006).** An individual’s experience of satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be substantially rooted in their perception, rather than simply reflecting their “real world”. Further, an individual’s perception can be affected by relative comparison – am I paid as much as that person - and comparisons of internalized ideals, aspirations, and expectations, for example, with the individual’s current state In summary, where it has been considered, authors differ in their views on the core constituents of Quality of Working Life (e.g. Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001 and Warr, Cook & Wall, 1979). It has generally been agreed however that Quality of Working Life is conceptually similar to well-being of employees but differs from job satisfaction which solely represents the workplace domain.

**Banerjee Indranil (2006)** Jobs are getting increasingly demanding, as the organization face competition and become leaner in structure, leading to conflict between people’s professional deliverable and personal requirements. It is acknowledged that continuous disregard of personal issues ultimately lead to employees’ underperformance and so people often discuss work life balance but seldom act on it. So, the focus now is “Who is going to bell the cat?” For tackling the problem, multi-pronged effort, comprising the organization, the employee, the Government, the Industry, the society, etc., is required.

**Tekuru Siva ram (2007)** Work- life balance is all about need for individuals having complete control over their work, i.e. deciding when, why, where and how to work. Finding these pressures encroaching into their private life and time, they are unable to do anything about it and are finally squeezed out. Organization should consider Work –life balance as an extension of the fringe benefits offered to the employees. This will help both the employees and the organization.

**Aggarwala Tanuja (2007)** Conflicting demands and pressures from works and life (family) can interfere with each other since the two domains are complementary, not conflicting priorities. Acceptance of this reality by the organization and new business and societal trends, have seen the growth of family-friendly practices at work place. Adopting a win- win approach, growing number of organization believe that helping employees balance and integrate their work lives with the rest of their lives leads to positive outcomes for both the employee and the employer. Work- family practices should be viewed as a part of overall HR and business strategy that is related to a firm’s competitive advantage.

**Swamy (2007)** In today’s business context the pressures of work have been intensifying and there is a growing feeling among employees that the demand of work being to dominate life and a sense of work-life imbalance is felt. The challenge of integrating work and family life is a part of everyday reality for the majority of employees. Organizations have to continually innovate and come up with programs that provide scope for employees to balance their responsibility at their work place and interest they have outside work.

**Suman Ghalawat (2010)** states that QWL is a Process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organizations’ environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved quality of the life at work for employees. Work is an integral part of our everyday life, as it is our livelihood or career or business. On an average we spend around twelve hours daily in the work place, that is one third of our entire life; it does influence the overall quality of our life. It should yield job satisfaction, give peace of mind, a fulfillment of having done a task, as it is expected, without any flaw and having spent the time fruitfully, constructively and purposefully. Even if it is a small step towards our lifetime goal, at the end of the day it gives satisfaction and eagerness to look forward to the next day. The factors that influence and decide the Quality of Work Life are: Attitude, environment, opportunities, nature of job, people, stress level, career prospects, growth and development, risk involved and reward.

**Rita Goyal (2011)** On the basis of her study she said that employees of LIC in Northern region are happy with the working conditions of the LIC. They feel that they are safe and secure in LIC. They feel that corporation should start their own transport facilities for the staff. However, the dissatisfaction among them is the less growth opportunities. They are not provided with extra care like health camps etc Poor work life balance leads to many disastrous things like tardy, bad performance, lack of motivation, more errors, absence from work and so on. The worst thing is that poor work-life balance reduces work quality and productivity without any doubt. When an employee won't be able to give time to his family at home, he will feel stressed out at work Sound work life balance will definitely have a positive impact on employee's productivity. The quality of work improves significantly as employees feel fresh and not stressed out at all.

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents.**

	Variable	Percentage of Respondents
Gender	Male	100
	Female	Nil
	Total	100
Age Group	20 - 30 years	36
	31 - 40 years	42
	41 - 50 years	18
	Above 50years	04
Monthly Salry	Below Rs.5000	2
	5001-10000	25
	10001-15000	61
	Above 15000	12

Table 2 – Various dimensions of quality of work life

Various dimensions of quality of work life	No. of respondents	Percentage
<b>Work environment</b>		
Low	33	33.0
High	67	67.0
<i>Mean: 7.58 / Median: 8.00 / S.D.: 1.037 / Min.: 5 / Max.: 9</i>		
<b>Organizational culture and climate</b>		
Low	53	53.0
High	47	47.0
<i>Mean: 25.12 / Median: 25.00 / S.D.: 5.370 / Min.: 12 / Max.: 34</i>		
<b>Training and development</b>		
Low	45	45.0
High	55	55.0
<i>Mean: 11.34 / Median: 12.00 / S.D.: 1.701 / Min.: 8 / Max.: 15</i>		
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>		
Low	38	38.0
High	62	62.0
<i>Mean: 7.53 / Median: 8.00 / S.D.: 2.172 / Min.: 3 / Max.: 10</i>		
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>		
Low	42	42.0
High	58	58.0
<i>Mean: 9.89 / Median: 10.50 / S.D.: 2.441 / Min.: 4 / Max.: 15</i>		
<b>Freedom of work</b>		
Low	65	65.0
High	35	35.0
<i>Mean: 74.36 / Median: 72.00 / S.D.: 9.732 / Min.: 57 / Max.: 98</i>		
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>		
Low	66	66.0
High	34	34.0



Table 3 – Chi – square test

Various dimensions of quality of work life	Age								Statistical inference
	20 to 30 yrs		30 to 40yrs		40 to 50 yrs		Above 50 yrs		
	(n=36)	(100%)	(n=42)	(100%)	(n=18)	(100%)	(n=4)	(100%)	
<b>Work environment</b>									
Low	11	30.6%	10	23.8%	10	55.6%	2	50.0%	X <sup>2</sup> =6.366 Df=3 .095>0.05 Not Significant
High	25	69.4%	32	76.2%	8	44.4%	2	50.0%	
<b>Organizational culture and climate</b>									
Low	25	69.4%	18	42.9%	10	55.6%	0	.0%	X <sup>2</sup> =10.201 Df=3 .017<0.05 Significant
High	11	30.6%	24	57.1%	8	44.4%	4	100.0%	
<b>Training and development</b>									
Low	19	52.8%	14	33.3%	10	55.6%	2	50.0%	X <sup>2</sup> =4.040 Df=3 .257>0.05 Not Significant
High	17	47.2%	28	66.7%	8	44.4%	2	50.0%	
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>									
Low	10	27.8%	14	33.3%	12	66.7%	2	50.0%	X <sup>2</sup> =8.508 Df=3 .037<0.05 Significant
High	26	72.2%	28	66.7%	6	33.3%	2	50.0%	
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>									
Low	12	33.3%	20	47.6%	8	44.4%	2	50.0%	X <sup>2</sup> =.1.804 Df=3 .614>0.05 Not
High	24	66.7%	22	52.4%	10	55.6%	2	50.0%	

									Significant
<b>Freedom of work</b>									
Low	27	75.0%	24	57.1%	12	66.7%	2	50.0%	$X^2=3.140$
High	9	25.0%	18	42.9%	6	33.3%	2	50.0%	Df=3 .371>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>									
Low	26	72.2%	22	52.4%	16	88.9%	2	50.0%	$X^2=8.751$
High	10	27.8%	20	47.6%	2	11.1%	2	50.0%	Df=3 .033<0.05 Significant

The above table shows that there is a significant association between age of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p<0.05$ ).

### Research hypothesis

There is a significant association between age of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Null hypothesis

There is no significant association between age of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Statistical test

Chi-square test was used the above table

### Findings

The above table shows that there is a significant association between age of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p<0.05$ ). So the research hypothesis accepted and the null hypothesis rejected.

Table 4 – T-Test

Difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

Marital status	Mean	S.D	Statistical inference
<b>Work environment</b>			
Married (n=90)	7.53	1.083	T=-1.356
Unmarried (n=10)	8.00	.000	.178>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Organizational culture and climate</b>			
Married (n=90)	25.18	5.254	T=.321
Unmarried (n=10)	24.60	6.620	.749>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Training and development</b>			
Married (n=90)	11.40	1.714	T=1.059
Unmarried (n=10)	10.80	1.549	.292>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>			
Married (n=90)	7.59	2.119	T=.812
Unmarried (n=10)	7.00	2.667	.419>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>			
Married (n=90)	10.01	2.387	T=1.498
Unmarried (n=10)	8.80	2.781	.137>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Freedom of work</b>			
Married (n=90)	74.91	9.592	T=1.715
Unmarried (n=10)	69.40	10.080	.089>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>			
Married (n=90)	136.62	16.107	T=1.552
Unmarried (n=10)	128.60	7.382	.124>0.05 Not Significant

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value ( $p>0.05$ ).

### Research hypothesis

There is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Statistical test

Oneway ANOVA 'f' test was used the above table

### Findings

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value ( $p>0.05$ ). So the research hypothesis rejected and the null hypothesis accepted.

**Table 5 – T-Test**

**Difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life**

Type of family	Mean	S.D	Statistical inference
<b>Work environment</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	8.00	.803	T=2.880
Joint (n=68)	7.38	1.079	.005<0.05 Significant
<b>Organizational culture and climate</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	25.75	5.809	T=.803
Joint (n=68)	24.82	5.169	.424>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Training and development</b>			

Nuclear (n=32)	11.63	1.897	T=1.151
Joint (n=68)	11.21	1.598	.252>0.05 Not Significant
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	8.69	1.469	T=3.911
Joint (n=68)	6.99	2.243	.000<0.05 Significant
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	11.25	1.984	T=4.119
Joint (n=68)	9.25	2.384	.000<0.05 Significant
<b>Freedom of work</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	78.50	12.786	T=3.037
Joint (n=68)	72.41	7.230	.003<0.05 Significant
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>			
Nuclear (n=32)	143.81	20.257	T=3.732
Joint (n=68)	132.06	11.218	.000<0.05 Significant

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### **Research hypothesis**

There is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

#### **Null hypothesis**

There is no significant difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

#### **Statistical test**

Student 't' test was used the above table

### Findings

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between type of family of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p < 0.05$ ). So the research hypothesis accepted and the null hypothesis rejected.

**Table 6 – Oneway ANOVA difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life**

Educational qualification	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical inference
<b>Work environment</b>						
Between Groups			17.960	4	4.490	F=4.825 .001<0.05 Significant
UG (n=44)	7.64	.990				
PG (n=10)	8.60	.516				
ITI (n=22)	7.09	1.065				
Diploma (n=18)	7.33	1.085				
Others (n=6)	8.00	.000				
Within Groups			88.400	95	.931	
<b>Organizational culture and climate</b>						
Between Groups			231.827	4	57.957	F=2.099 .087>0.05 Not Significant
UG (n=44)	23.77	5.953				
PG (n=10)	27.60	4.088				
ITI (n=22)	24.82	5.270				
Diploma (n=18)	26.33	4.256				
Others (n=6)	28.33	3.386				
Within Groups			2622.733	95	27.608	
<b>Training and development</b>						
Between Groups			33.686	4	8.422	F=3.165 .017<0.05 Significant
UG (n=44)	11.41	1.661				
PG (n=10)	12.60	1.265				
ITI (n=22)	11.18	1.943				
Diploma (n=18)	10.44	1.199				
Others (n=6)	12.00	1.789				
Within Groups						

Within Groups			252.754	95	2.661	
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>						
Between Groups			109.414	4	27.354	
UG (n=44)	8.27	1.835				F=7.269 .000<0.05 Significant
PG (n=10)	8.60	1.578				
ITI (n=22)	7.14	2.696				
Diploma (n=18)	5.56	1.294				
Others (n=6)	7.67	1.366				
Within Groups			357.496	95	3.763	
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>						
Between Groups			219.193	4	54.798	
UG (n=44)	10.50	1.772				F=14.047 .000<0.05 Significant
PG (n=10)	11.60	1.838				
ITI (n=22)	9.23	2.137				
Diploma (n=18)	7.33	2.425				
Others (n=6)	12.67	1.366				
Within Groups			370.597	95	3.901	
<b>Freedom of work</b>						
Between Groups			1529.923	4	382.481	
UG (n=44)	73.86	9.111				F=4.630 .002<0.05 Significant
PG (n=10)	81.60	9.834				
ITI (n=22)	73.36	9.317				
Diploma (n=18)	69.56	6.289				
Others (n=6)	84.00	13.506				
Within Groups			7847.117	95	82.601	
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>						
Between Groups			5636.400	4	1409.100	
UG (n=44)	135.45	14.288				F=7.227 .000<0.05 Significant
PG (n=10)	150.60	16.229				
ITI (n=22)	132.82	13.358				
Diploma (n=18)	126.56	9.332				

Others (n=6)	152.67	20.714				
Within Groups			18522.360	95	194.972	

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p < 0.05$ ).

### Research hypothesis

There is a significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Statistical test

Oneway ANOVA 'f' test was used the above table

### Findings

The above table shows that there is a significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value ( $p < 0.05$ ). So the research hypothesis accepted and the null hypothesis rejected.

**Table 7 – Oneway ANOVA difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life**

Income	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical inference
<b>Work environment</b>						
Between Groups			5.243	3	1.748	F=1.659 .181 > 0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	8.00	.000				
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	7.76	1.128				
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	7.61	.954				
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	7.00	1.206				
Within Groups			101.117	96	1.053	
<b>Organizational culture and</b>						



<b>climate</b>						
Between Groups			153.544	3	51.181	F=1.819 .149>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	24.00	.000				
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	26.60	5.099				
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	24.18	5.599				
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	27.00	4.221				
Within Groups			2701.016	96	28.136	
<b>Training and development</b>						
Between Groups			14.017	3	4.672	F=1.646 .184>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	10.00	.000				
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	11.76	2.166				
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	11.11	1.330				
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	11.83	2.209				
Within Groups			272.423	96	2.838	
<b>Compensation and rewards</b>						
Between Groups			12.513	3	4.171	F=.881 .454>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	6.00	.000				
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	7.96	2.091				
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	7.34	2.081				
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	7.83	2.855				
Within Groups			454.397	96	4.733	
<b>Job satisfaction and job security</b>						
Between Groups			58.676	3	19.559	F=3.535 .018<0.05 Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	11.00	.000				
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	11.16	2.304				
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	9.41	2.532				
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	9.50	1.314				
Within Groups			531.114	96	5.532	
<b>Freedom of work</b>						
Between Groups			161.122	3	53.707	F=.559

Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	68.00	.000				.643>0.05
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	75.60	12.961				Not
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	74.43	9.075				Significant
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	72.50	4.700				
Within Groups			9215.918	96	95.999	
<b>Overall quality of work life</b>						
Between Groups			970.143	3	323.381	
Below Rs.5000 (n=2)	127.00	.000				F=1.339
Rs.5000 to 10000 (n=25)	140.84	21.254				.266>0.05
Rs.10000 to 15000 (n=61)	134.08	14.117				Not
Above Rs.15000 (n=12)	135.67	5.959				Significant
Within Groups			23188.617	96	241.548	

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value ( $p>0.05$ ).

### Research hypothesis

There is a significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life

### Statistical test

Oneway ANOVA 'F' test was used the above table

### Findings

The above table shows that there is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value greater than table value ( $p>0.05$ ). So the research hypothesis rejected and the null hypothesis accepted.

## FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

### FINDINGS

- 42 percentages of the respondents were in 30-40 years of age group.
- 100 percentages of the respondents are male.

- 90 percentages of the respondents are married.
- 68 percentage of the respondent's joint family.
- 44 percentage of the respondents educational qualification are UG.
- 16 percentage of the respondents are fitter.
- 61 percentage of the respondents receive a monthly salary of Rs.10000 to 15000
- 32 percentage of the respondents are working in departments of manufacturing.
- 50 percentage of the respondents are having between 5-10 years of experience.
- 61 percentage of the respondents are motivating by working environment.
- 65 percentage of the respondents agree with the statement 'satisfied with working conditions provided by industries.
- 67 percentage of the respondents Agree with the opinion-Cordial relationship with management.
- 29 percentage of the respondents strongly agree with the opinion-Cordial relationship with the department.
- 33 percentage of the respondents Neutral with the opinion-Cordial relationship with other department.
- 38 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Cordial relationship with subordinate.
- 49 percentage of the respondents Agree with the opinion-Cordial relationship with employer-employee.
- 51 percentage of the respondents Agree with the opinion-cordial relationship with co-workers.
- 66 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Cordial relationship with immediate superior.
- 69 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Training programmed helps the employee to achieve the required skill for performing the job efficiently.
- 57 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Training programme helps in improving relationship among employees.
- 47 percentage of the respondents useful opinion-Rate the programmers overall.
- 34 percentage of the respondents agree to the opinion-Given adequate and fair salary.

- 34 percentage of the respondents are strongly agree with the opinion-organization will pay salary by considering responsibilities at work.
- 44 percentage of the respondents strongly agree with the opinion-Feel comfortable and satisfied with your job.
- 56 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-Feel secured about your job.
- 56 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-‘Satisfied with yearly increment’.
- 58 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-‘Freedom to use the skills’.
- 56 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-Level of involvement in the decision making is good.
- percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Level of job satisfaction in good.
- percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Satisfied with the team work.
- 68 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Gives recognition for good result achieved.
- 56 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-Satisfied with your atmosphere.
- 61 percentage of the respondents are agree with the opinion-suggestion scheme implemented by the organization.
- 53 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-management communicates every new change that take place.
- 36 percentage of the respondents agree, strongly agree with the opinion-convenient of working hours.
- 40 percentage of the respondents strongly agree, agree with the opinion-Satisfied with casual leave provided by the management.
- percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-medical leave provided by the management.
- 37 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-earn leave provided by the management.
- 41 percentage of the respondents are neutral with the opinion-promotional policy is satisfactory.
- 51 percentage of the respondents neutral with the opinion-overall facilities provided by the organization is good.

- 46 percentage of the respondents are neutral with the opinion- Recognized by the management for additional responsibility taken by the management.
- percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion- Satisfied with care Development programmed provided by the management.
- 61 percentage of the respondents agree with the opinion-employees assistance programmed offered is good.
- 61 percentages of the respondents are agreed with the opinion-satisfied with employee's pension plan.
- 58 percentages of the respondents are agreed with the opinion-satisfied with insurance plan.
- 54 percentages of the respondents are agreed with the opinion –Training and development programmers offered are good.

### **Suggestions**

- Kothari Sugars and Chemical Limited can still motivate the work environment of the employee.
- Working conditions to be improved.
- By improving the transportation facility for the employees a bit more will facilitate reaping additional employee's satisfaction.
- The company shall focus on training and development of the employees.
- Employee's promotion policy's can be modified.
- Salary can be increased.
- Management provide earned leave.
- Insurance coverage can be provided to working employees.
- Adequate training programme can be enhanced.
- Yearly increment can be further be raised adequate freedom can be given by the management to use the employee skill.
- Job security should be increased.
- Participate decision- making can be welcome by the management.
- Overall quality of work life can further be improved.

### **CONCLUSION**

The study concludes that the overall satisfaction of quality of work life is neutral and factors which affect quality of work life are motivation, cordial relationship within the department and

---

the other department, superiors, subordinates, employer-employees, employee training programme, decision making, job security, employee recognition etc., benefits provided are only neutral.

## REFERENCE

1. Kothari.C.R. “Research methodology”, New Delhi, Vikram publishing House PVT Ltd.
2. Gupta.S.P. “statistical methodology”, New Delhi, Sultan Chand & Sons Publishers, 2002.
3. Rao.T.V.(1991), Readings in Human Resources Development, Mohan primlani for Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., PVT LTD, New Delhi.
4. Shankrgouda C patil and VM Chavan, March 2010 “Quality of Work Life In Small Scale industries of Dharwar, District, HRM Review, Vol-X Issue-III.P41-48.
5. Anonymous (2005). Quality of Work Life Task Force looks to integrate home and work. Vanderbilt University Medical Center, House Organ. Available from <http://www.Quality20%of/20%work/20% life. htm>.
6. Anbarasan, V & Mehta, N. (2009), "An Exploratory Study on Perceived Quality of Working Life among Sales Professionals Employed in Pharmaceuticals, Banking, Finance and Insurance Companies in Mumbai", *Abhigyan*, 27(1): 70-81.
7. Ebrahim (2010) “The relation between QWL and job satisfaction”, *Middle –East Journal of scientific Research* 6(4), 317-323-2010.
8. Feuer, D., Quality of work life: a cure for all ills? *Training: The Magazine of Human Resources Development*, 26: 65-66, 1989.
9. 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.
10. Raduan,C. R., Loosee .B., Jegak,U & Khairuddin, I. (2006), "Quality of Work Life: Implications of Career Dimensions", *Journal of Social Sciences*. 2 (2): 61-67.
11. Sandrick k (2003). Putting the emphasis on employees as an award. *Winning employer, Baptist health care has distant memories of the workforce shortage*, *Trustee*. pp. 6-Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher, 1984. *QWL: New working relationships in the communication industry. Labor Studies J.*, Vol. 9: 261-274.
12. Walton, R. (1973), — *Quality of Work life Indicators- Prospects and Problems- A Portigal Measuring the Quality of working life*, pp-57-70, Ottawa.
13. Rita Goyal (2011) – *Quality of work life in insurance sector*, Vol 1 Issue 5 *International Journal of Research in IT, Management and Engineering*.