



# ANVESHAN

IMR'S

## MANAGEMENT RESEARCH JOURNAL

<b>"Sustainable Competitive advantage through Strategic Human Resource Development"</b> Prof. Arpita Singh .....	05
<b>"Co – Integration of Global Commodity Markets"</b> Ms. Manjul Jain Dr. Suresh Patidar Dr. Manminder Singh .....	09
<b>"QWL in Unionized Organization: A Macro Approach"</b> Dr. Sarang S. Bhola Jyoti J. Nigade .....	16
<b>"A Study on Performance of Selected Stocks in Indian Stock Market"</b> Prof. Shrinivas R. Patil .....	31
<b>"A STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT IN urban local bodies of mumbai and PUNE: an comparative approach"</b> Prof. Vaibhav R. Suryawanshi .....	37
<b>"A study of Socio-Economic Impact of Voluntary Retirement Scheme with Special Reference To Pune City."</b> Dr. Sunil Panditrao Ujagare .....	47
<b>"To study the need for restructuring of housing co-operative sector with special reference to Pandharpur"</b> Prof. Mrs. Savita D. Uppalli. Miss. Smita L. Padamwar. Dr. Mrs. Anita S. Mane .....	56
<b>Promotion and distribution of corporate securites : An empirical study</b> Prof. R .S. Marigoudar Dr. Umesh. H Arahunashi Prof. F. B. Ani .....	63
<b>"The Impact of Cross-Border mergers and acquisitions in India"</b> Dr. Dr. Purandhar D. Nare Prof. Salim G Sonnekhan .....	69

## Contents

Sr. No.	Article Name	Name of Author	Page No.
1	"Sustainable Competitive advantage through Strategic Human Resource Development"	Prof. Arpita Singh	5
2	"Co – Integration of Global Commodity Markets"	Ms. Manjul Jain Dr. Suresh Patidar Dr. Manminder Singh	9
3	"QWL in Unionized Organization: A Macro Approach"	Dr. Sarang S. Bhola Jyoti J. Nigade	16
4	"A Study on Performance of Selected Stocks in Indian Stock Market"	Prof. Shrinivas R. Patil	31
5	"A STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT IN urban local bodies of mumbai and PUNE: an comparative approach"	Prof. Vaibhav R. Suryawanshi	37
6	"A study of Socio-Economic Impact of Voluntary Retirement Scheme with Special Reference To Pune City."	Dr. Sunil Panditrao Ujagare	47
7	"To study the need for restructuring of housing co-operative sector with special refference to Pandharpur"	Prof. Mrs. Savita D.Uppalli. Miss. Smita L. Padamwar. Dr. Mrs. Anita S.Mane	56
8	Promotion and distribution of corporate securites : an empirical study	Prof. R .S.Marigoudar Dr.Umesh.H Arahunashi Prof. F. B. Ani	63
9	"The Impact of Cross-Border mergers and acquisitions in India"	Dr. Dr.Purandhar D.Nare Prof. Salim G Sonnekhan	69

## "QWL in Unionized Organization: A Macro Approach"

\* Dr. Sarang S. Bhola

\*\* Jyoti J. Nigade

### ABSTRACT

*QWL is a tool to integrate human resources of organization which focuses on attaining organizational goals with satisfaction of human needs and maintaining good industrial relations. Present research is a comparative study of prevailing QWL between, sample unionized and non-unionized organizations in engineering industry. The study find out favourableness about important criteria of QWL among employees and concludes that union plays very crucial role in the improvement of QWL. Study find out that unionized organizations has better QWL as compare to non-unionized organizations.*

**Keywords:** QWL, Unionized Organization, Non-Unionized Organization, Trade Union.

### INTRODUCTION

QWL is a multidimensional construct usually referring to overall satisfaction with working life and with work life balance, a sense of belonging to a working group, a sense of becoming oneself, and a sense of being worthy and respectable. QWL refers to a concern about the impact of work on people as well as on organizational effectiveness and the idea of participation in organizational problem solving and decision making. In the terms of management perspective, it relates to a variety of efforts to improve productivity through improvements in the human, rather than the capital or technological inputs of production. Any specific improvement in and around workplace is often included under the term of QWL.

The implementation of QWL programmes leads to improvement in labour-management communication, more effective and sound management, smoother contract negotiations, improved pay and benefits and most important stronger union organizations since QWL is a process of labour-management collaboration. It is believed that implementation of the QWL project has built an attitude of mutual trust in company.

Overall QWL is related to Job satisfaction, humanizing work and Organizational development programmes.

### Concept of QWL and Trade Union

The term QWL was introduced by Louis Davis which is emerged in much broader perspective in 1972. The term 'Quality of Work Life' has become catchall phrase encompassing whatever improvement in general organizational climate the researcher has observed.

The term has defined by American Center for the Quality of Working Life (1977) as, "Quality of work life improvements are defined as any activity which takes place at every level of an organization which seeks greater organizational effectiveness through the enhancement of human dignity and growth ....a process through which the stakeholders in the organization management, unions and employees – learn how to work together better ...to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve the twin and simultaneous goals of an improved quality of life at work for all members of the organization and greater effectiveness for both the company and the unions."

\* Associate Professor, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Satara

\*\* Research Scholar, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Satara

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

Richard E. Walton stated much broader concept of QWL encompassing it in eight categories viz. Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security, Social Integration in Work Place, Constitutionalism in the Work Organization, Balanced Role of Work in Total Life Space, Social Relevance of Work etc.

J. Richard and J. Loy define, QWL as it is the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personnel needs through their experience in the organization.

The gamut of definitions on QWL narrates broad as well as narrow approach towards QWL.

Present paper craving to evaluate broad parameters of QWL in unionized and non-unionized organizations. The study is an attempt to compare QWL prevailing in organizations having union and organizations which does not have unions.

Indian Trade Union Act, 1926 defined a trade union as, "any combination whether temporary or permanent formed primarily for the purpose of regulating the relations between workman and employers or between workmen and workmen, between employers and employers or for imposing restrictive conditions on the conduct of any trade or business and include any federation of two or more trade unions."

Trade unions and employer organizations are set up to protect the rights, safeguard the interest and promote the growth and welfare of their members i.e. working class and employers / enterprises respectively. While both these organizations set up independently they have to deal with each other.

Due to quality of work life improvements management, unions, employees learn how to work together better to attain organizational goals effectively.

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

QWL is step forward to classical job design. The leadership gives dues consideration to human as an asset than merely a factor of production.

The allegation strongly found between employer and employees that, employer state workers are more conscious about their rights and not responsibilities and vice versa.

Such allegation grows suspicious and bickering in the work environment. This suspicious environment not only found in unionize organizations but in non-unionize organization also.

The intensity of suspicion differs organization to organization and situation to situation, also depends on the previous experiences of union management relations and the implementation of terms of agreement signed on. All these aspects develop the attitude of management and union to look at each other in hostile way, which leads to complexity in the work environment.

Researchers have attempted contextual review and presented in ascending order on the basis of year of publication.

According to Cohen, Deborah Shaw (1979), "QWL is a process of joint decision making, collaboration, and building mutual respect between management and employees, which seems to cause a change in how people feel about their work and each other. It is this

change in the human climate that QWL advocates maintain increases satisfaction and facilitates better solutions to management and production problems." He also mentioned in his article, 'The Quality of Work Life Movement: Does Working Together Work Better?' that "managers and supervisors are sometimes threatened by a loss of control, union members are often suspicious that QWL is just a work speed-up in disguise or a threat to their adversary solidarity. For these reasons, and others, all QWL efforts involve extensive education and training. Having a higher degree of QWL indicates that more effective and democratic ways of using people in work."

An anonymous (1979) in his article 'Hot UAW Issue: "Quality of Work Life"' expressed the fear that, "If unions and companies do not meet their needs, they will have to cope with alienated workers."

Lewin, David (1981) in their study 'Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work Life' opined that, "QWL should be treated as a joint venture of management and unions via the collective bargaining process. So that both the representatives can manifest adversarial as well as integrative attitudes when dealing with QWL issues which contributes more integration among experts of organizational behavior and industrial relations."

One anonymous (1981) in his article 'Quality of Work Life: Catching On' mentioned the fear of some unions about exploitation of the rank and file membership, after management have won union cooperation in a QWL program. At the same time he also focused on benefits like smoother and less adversarial collective bargaining for entire company as well as all participants in a QWL program.

Donahue, Thomas R (1982) in his article titled, 'Labor Looks at Quality of Work Life Programs' opines that, "If QWL movements provide an avenue for the pursuit of the better life for the workers, trade unions must be ready to explore that avenue. The QWL concept poses a problem to the labor movement

because of the potential for management to penetrate and influence small, informal work groups. The problem is not insuperable for unions that can insist on an equal and active voice in how the program works, but unions with more limited bargaining leverage may be antagonistic.

Lissy, William E. (1982) in their article, 'Quality of Work Life Programs and Unions' states that, "Union willingness to participate in QWL programs is basic to their success and effectiveness but they are no substitute or alternative for the collective-bargaining process."

Rubinstein, Saul (1984) states that the goal of quality of work life (QWL) programs has been to introduce work changes that would decrease dissatisfaction in the work area. They also mention the need of increased worker participation in problem solving with QWL programs in their article titled, 'QWL, the Union, the Specialist and Employment Security'

Martin D Hanlon, David A Nadler (1986) in his Research note titled, 'Unionists' attitudes toward joint union—management quality of work life programmes' noted that, "organized labour can not be benefited from union participation in QWL programmes until such programmes have spread rapidly."

The article 'Quality of Work Life: Some Unintended Effects on the Seniority Tradition of an Industrial Union' of Gene Bocioletti (1987) revealed that, "workers of relatively low seniority benefited more than, and sometimes at the expense of workers with relatively high seniority. Senior workers suffered negative effects (i.e., lost ground), whereas junior workers remained unchanged"

Thacker, James W., Fields, Mitchell W. (1987) in their study 'Union Involvement in Quality-of-Work life Efforts: A Longitudinal Investigation' found that, "Both union and management have equal credit for the success of QWL in the organization."

According to the article 'QWL and Unions in the 1990s' of Beck, Al (1988), "The organization must accept the unions involvement in its operation, and management and unions must work together to assure that new programs are undertaken with good planning to improve the QWL of it."

Bushe, Gervase R (1988) in their case study, 'Developing Cooperative Labor-Management Relations in Unionized Factories: A Multiple Case Study of Quality Circles and Parallel Organizations Within Joint Quality of Work Life Projects' proved that, "labor-management relations are improved through joint union-management QWL projects."

Gilbert, Beth (1989) seems the inability of the union leadership to push QWL programs down to lower levels of the organization and to improve outcomes. Evidence of their study of 'The Impact of Union Involvement on the Design and Introduction of Quality of Working Life' suggests that the union leadership may send mixed messages to the rank-and-file about the extent of union support for QWL.

Fields, Mitchell W., Thacker, James W. (1992) in their article, 'Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment' conclude that, "in unionized organizations, QWL refers to a cooperative effort on the part of union and management representatives to involve employees in the day-to-day decision-making process at work which can affect both the company-and union-related attitudes of participants. In a company context, it is participation in work decisions, but in a union context, members interaction with union officers and the latter's responsiveness to member demands are key."

QWL involvement in and of itself should improve employee's job satisfaction, their reactions to the employer i.e. company commitment and also union commitment because it fulfills a need of the membership. The specific behaviors of union officials associated with participation in a QWL intervention result in improved attitudes. Members react positively

when union officials show an active interest in work-related issues. Participation in a QWL process does not in and of itself influence reactions, but the perceived success of the endeavor does do so."

According to Robert H. Waterman, Jr., Judith A. Waterman, and Betsy A. Collard (1994), "All employees should have the right to demand the training and challenging work experiences they need to update their skills and by helping workers become more employable, companies can build a more flexible workforce and recreate a sense of community." They also added that, "it is employee's responsibility to manage his own career, while company's responsibility is to provide tools, open environment and opportunity for assessing and developing the skills to employees. It results into group of self-reliant workers or a career – resilient workforce; means group of employees who are dedicated to idea of continuous learning, ready to reinvent themselves to keep pace with change, take responsibility for their own career management and committed to company success. It helps to increase QWL of organization."

New adult-adult relationship must be established between the organization and its employees instead of the traditional parent-child relationship. In other words, both employers and employees should be partners in continuous process of benchmarking and updating skills by creating win-win relationship between them."

A.P.Singh (1995) expressed his views like "The ethical and moral values established in the organization matters to the QWL of organization".

Gnapathis R., Malar S. (2008) with prime objective, to identify the most important and least important determinants of job satisfaction expressed their views that, "working conditions that enhance an employee's physical comfort plays a very important role in their job satisfaction. A satisfied worker is an asset to organization. So, measures to be undertaken to

increase QWL of employees in order to motivate them to perform better”.

Buddhapriya Sanghamitra (2009) many studies have shown that the employees nowadays seem to value the QWL more than amount of salary they get.

Many scholars focused their attention to the micro relationship between management and union on the magnitude of QWL. The focus seem shifted from narrow to broad categories of working conditions and environment. There is paucity of research on QWL addressing to the relationship between management and unions in Indian scenario. Hence, researchers have addressed this issue with the help of present research. Researchers have attempted to gauge the relationship of management and union on the broad parameters of QWL.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Present research is diagnostic inferential in nature.

The study of QWL and trade union is undertaken to test hypothesis, that is, A QWL in unionized organizations does not differ than QWL in Non-unionized organizations.

Primary data is collected with the help of structured schedule. Twenty Eight medium and small scale engineering units situated in MIDC Satara, State of Maharashtra, India were selected for research. Purposive sampling technique is used to select sample units. Five samples are selected from each organization using random sampling lottery method. Out of that three were workers and two were executives. Data is collected by using likert scale. 77 variables spread over 8 categories viz. Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunity to Develop Human Capability, Continued Growth and Security, Social Integration, Constitution at Workplace, Balanced Role of Work and Social Relevance of Work were bring in use to asses QWL.

Data is classified, tabulated and analysed. Weighted Average, rank and spearman correlation and hypothesis is tested using,

**DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

Data collected using likert scale is converted into weighted average and ranks are given. The results are based on weighted average and ranks as follows.

Table details the descriptive statistics of parameters in twenty eight unionized and non-unionized organizations.

**Table 1**

Adequate and Fair Compensation

Following table depicts comparison of unionized and non-unionised organizations on the basis of various variables of Adequate and Fair Compensation

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized		Non-Union
		Org. Wtd.Avg	Rank	Org. Wtd. Avg
1	Wages	14.93	4	12.3
2	Bonus	15.80	2	13.2
3	Overtime pay	11.13	6	6.7
4	Incentive	10.93	7	4.7
5	Provident Fund	16.60	1	14.3
6	E.S.I.	15.53	3	14.5
7	Welfare Schemes	11.33	5	7.9
	Mean	13.75		10.5
	S.D.	2.5		4.0

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Regarding adequate and fair compensation there is more consistency in the opinion of unionized workers as compared to non-unionized workers since standard deviation is 2.5 and 4.0 respectively. The mean of weighted average of unionized organization is 13.75 as compared to 10.5 in non-unionized organization, which shows more satisfaction among samples of unionized organization about adequate and fair compensation.

**Table 2**

**Safe and Healthy Working Conditions**

Following table contain information regarding responses of all samples about safe and healthy working conditions in both unionized and non-unionised organizations.

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Unionized samples are more satisfied than non-unionised samples about safe and healthy working conditions as their mean is greater than of non-unionised samples but at the same time consistency in their opinions is less than of non-unionised workers as the standard deviations of unionized and non-unionised organization is 2.73 and 2.01 respectively.

Overcrowding, Excessive Weights, Explosive/Inflammable Dust & Gases are

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg	Rank	Wtd.Avg.	Rank
1	Floor cleanness	16.3	8	12.8	9
2	Drainage Cleanness	15.9	12	12.3	14
3	Disposal of Wastes	16.8	5	11.7	18
4	Lights	18.4	1	14.9	1
5	Ventilation and Temp	14.8	16	11.3	21
6	Dust and Fumes	12.4	23	11.4	20
7	Over crowding	7.6	29	10.6	22
8	Latrines	16.0	11	13.6	3
9	Fencing of Machinery	17.7	2	12.3	15
10	Work on Machinery in Motion	14.3	20	9.9	24
11	Devices For Cutting Off Power	15.9	13	13.4	5
12	Casing of New Machinery	16.8	5	12.9	8
13	Hoists and lifts	12.3	24	9.2	25
14	Lifting Machines	11.8	25	8.7	26
15	Revolving Machinery	14.5	18	11.5	19
16	Pits, Sumps, Openings in Floor	17.0	4	12.1	16
17	Excessive Weights	8.2	28	10.1	23
18	Explosive/Inflammable Dust & Gases	10.2	27	7.7	27
19	Safety Limit Marking	16.6	7	13.5	4
20	Safety Space between Machine	15.7	14	12.5	12
21	Safety Goggles and Shoes etc.	17.1	3	12.4	13
22	Site Development	16.2	9	11.9	17
23	Dinning and Rest Room	13.3	22	7.6	28
24	Drinking Water	16.1	10	13.7	2
25	First Aid Box	14.0	21	13.2	7
26	Industrial Uniform	14.7	17	12.8	9
27	Canteen Facilities	10.9	26	7.0	29
28	Formal Safety Training	15.7	14	12.6	11
29	Fire Fighting Equipment's	14.5	18	13.4	5
	Mean	15		12	
	S.D.	2.73		2.01	

few parameters to consider while thinking of Safe and Healthy Working Conditions.

Opinions of unionized samples are more consistent and they are more satisfied than non-unionized workers about immediate opportunities available in organization to use and develop human capacity as the mean value of unionized organization is greater and standard deviation is lesser than of non-unionised organization. Researcher had used ten variables to asses opportunity to develop human

**Table 3**

**Opportunity to Develop Human Capacity**

Following table shows views of respondents towards scope for development of human capacities.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg	Rank	Wtd.Avg.	Rank
1	Participation in Decision Making	13.7	6	9.5	5
2	Multiple Skill	17.0	1	12.3	2
3	Complete Job	16.1	2	11.9	3
4	Feedback	15.6	4	12.8	1
5	Autonomy	15.8	3	10.1	4
6	Delegation of Authority	15.6	4	6.7	6
7	Management Practiced Redesigning	0.00		0.00	
8	Management Evaluated Redesigning	0.00		0.00	
9	Diagnose Job Before Redesigning	0.00		0.00	
10	Consult Workers Before Redesigning	0.00		0.00	
	Mean	15.6		10.5	
	S.D.	1.10		2.30	

capacities. Out of these ten variables four variables viz. Management Practiced Redesigning, Management Evaluated Redesigning, Diagnose Job before Redesigning and Consult Workers before Redesigning carries no response from samples of unionized and non-unionised organizations. Redesigning of jobs is not at all consider in both unionized and non-unionised sample organizations.

Participation in Decision Making carries low score in unionized organization which needs to be addressed. Delegation of Authority and Participation in Decision Making are concerned very low in non-unionised organization.

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

**Table 4**

**Continued Career Growth and Security**

Following table depicts the weighted average and ranks for variables of career development opportunities in organizations.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg.	Rank	Wtd. Avg.	Rank
1	Challenging job	16.4	1	12.9	3
2	Internal Training	15.9	3	11.8	5
3	Promotion	13.3	7	8.7	7
4	Job Rotation	13.5	6	10.7	6
5	Employment Security	16.2	2	12.1	4
6	Expanding Knowledge	15.9	4	14.5	1
7	Personality Development	15.8	5	13.5	2
8	Suggestion Scheme	9.9	8	8.6	8
9	Career Planning System / Policy	0.00		0.00	
10	Career Counseling	0.00		0.00	
11	Career Development Workshops	0.00		0.00	
12	Mentoring Programs	0.00		0.00	
13	Assessment Centers	0.00		0.00	
14	External Training	0.00		0.00	
	Mean	14.6		11.6	
	S.D.	2.25		2.15	

Source: (Complied by researcher)

Samples in unionized organization are more satisfied about availability of opportunities for continued career growth and security in organization since its mean is 14.6 and 11.6 of non-unionized organization. But their opinions are less consistent than the opinions of non-unionized samples as its

standard deviation is greater i.e. 2.25 than 2.15 of non-unionized samples. In this category out of fourteen variables six variables have not received any response from samples. These variables are Career Planning System, Career Counseling, Career Development Workshops, Mentoring Programs, Assessment Centers and External Training. The aspects related to career are neglected in both kinds of organizations. Suggestion scheme is the most neglected variable in both types of organizations.

**Table 5**

**Social Integration**

Following table depicts the satisfaction of respondents towards social integration in workforce.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg.	Rank	Wtd. Avg.	Rank
1	Natural Work Units.	16.9	1	12.13	3
2	Workers Meeting	14.6	7	7.93	9
3	Top Executives Involved in Socio Cultural Activities	14.1	9	10.87	7
4	Festivals	15.0	6	12.47	2
5	Sense of Community	16.0	3	11.80	6
6	Inter Personnel Openness	15.3	4	11.87	5
7	Humanized Treatment	16.7	2	12.13	3
8	Freedom from Prejudice	14.5	8	12.53	1
9	Workers Meeting with Top Officials	15.1	5	9.73	8
10	Workers Meetings With Owners/Directors	10.9	10	5.60	10
	Mean	14.9		10.71	
	S.D.	1.68		2.30	

Source: (Complied by researcher)

There is more satisfaction among unionized workers than non-unionized towards social integration in the work organization as there is vast difference between their mean values as well as more consistency in their opinions as standard deviation is 1.68 and 2.30 respectively.

The frequency of meetings of workers among themselves, with top management and with owners is less in non-unionized organization than unionized organization.

**Table 6**

**Constitution at Workplace**

Following table shows satisfaction of samples towards constitution in the work organization.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg.	Rank	Wtd. Avg.	Rank
1	Privacy	14.7	2	11.7	1
2	Scope for Free Speech	16.3	1	11.3	3
3	Recruitment procedure	14.3	3	11.5	2
4	Promotion policy	0.00		0.00	
5	Disciplinary Procedure	0.00		0.00	
6	Grievance Procedure	0.00		0.00	
7	Training & Development Policy	0.00		0.00	
8	Performance Appraisal Policy	0.00		0.00	
	Mean	15.1		11.5	
	S. D.	1.06		0.20	

Source: (Complied by researcher)

Unionized workers are more satisfied with constitution in the organization than non-unionized organization as the mean values are 15.1 and 11.5 respectively but according to the standard deviation, i.e. 1.06 and 0.20 their opinions are less consistent than non-unionized samples. Samples in both organizations are quite familiar with recruitment policy but they are completely unknown about the other company policies viz. Promotion policy, Disciplinary Procedure, Grievance Procedure, Training & Development Policy, Performance Appraisal Policy.

**Table 7**

**Balanced Role of Work**

Following table gives information regarding perception of samples in both unionized and non-unionised organizations about variables of work life balance.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg.	Rank	Wtd. Avg.	Rank
1	Overtime Work	11.5	6	11.9	5
2	Work during Inconvenient Hours	8.7	8	8.8	8
3	Overload of Work	9.9	7	10.1	7
4	Weekly Off.	16.5	1	14.0	1
5	Government Holidays	15.2	3	13.3	2
6	Pay Leaves	16.1	2	12.3	3
7	Equality in Work	12.3	5	12.1	4
8	Spare Time for Family	14.0	4	11.6	6
9	Transfers	11.5	6	11.9	5
	Mean	13.0		11.8	
	S. D.	2.89		1.66	

Source: (Complied by researcher)

There is more satisfaction but less consistency in the opinions of sample workers in unionized organization about balanced role of their work in the total life space as compared to non-unionized workers as their mean and standard deviation value is greater than of non-unionized workers.

Sample workers in both organization enjoy the weekly off, holidays etc. but are suffers a lot due to work during inconvenient hours and overload of work

consequent tabulations hypothesis is tested for every variable and presented category-wise.

**Table 9**

QWL in sample Unionized and Non-unionized Organization.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Adequate and fair compensation	11.70	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Safe and Healthy Working Conditions	23.20	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Opportunity for Career Growth	17.18	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Continued Growth and Security	11.73	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Social Integration	15.8	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Constitution	10.81	1.96	Ho rejected
7.	Balanced Role of Work	8.44	1.96	Ho rejected
8.	Social Relevance of Work	4.23	1.96	Ho rejected

**Table 8**

Social Relevance of Work

Following table shows satisfaction of samples towards social relevance of work.

Sr.	Parameters	Unionized Org.		Non-Unionized Org.	
		Wtd.Avg.	Rank	Wtd. Avg.	Rank
1	Social Relevance of Work	14.6		13.8	

Source: (Complied by researcher)

Samples in both types of organizations found their work has social relevance since the mean score is good and there is hardly difference into a mean score between unionized and non-unionized organizations.

**HYPOTHESIS TESTING**

The hypothesis is sought to test in this paper is, 'A QWL in unionized organization does not differ than QWL in Non-unionized organization'. Hypothesis is tested using Z test. Researcher had used 77 variables spread over 8 categories of QWL. In the first table consolidated hypothesis testing is shown. In the

Table reveals that QWL in unionized organization differ than QWL in Non-unionized organization. For all eight categories of QWL null hypothesis is rejected.

Researchers probe in depth of every category of QWL and peep into parameters to see the scenario in unionized and non-unionized organizations. These parameters from every category are also tested using Z test as follows.

**Table 10**

**Adequate and Fair Compensation:**

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on adequate and fair compensation.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1	Wages	5.06	1.96	Ho rejected
2	Bonus	5.45	1.96	Ho rejected
3	Overtime Pay	5.93	1.96	Ho rejected
4	Incentive	7.46	1.96	Ho rejected
5	P.F.	8.00	1.96	Ho rejected
6	E.S.I.	5.66	1.96	Ho rejected
7	Welfare Schemes	4.71	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>11.70</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

Table reveals that scenario of adequate and fair compensation in unionized organization differs than non-unionized organization. Null hypothesis is rejected for all parameters of adequate and fair compensation. Overtime pay is paid as per legal directives to employees in both sample units.

**Table 11**

**Safe and Healthy Working Conditions:**

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on safe and healthy working conditions.

Table reveals scenario of safe and healthy working conditions where null hypothesis is rejected in case of all these variables. This depicts that QWL in unionized organizations differ than in non-unionized organizations.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Floor Cleanliness	7.97	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Drainage Cleanliness	7.70	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Disposal of Wastes	10.86	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Lights	9.16	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Ventilation and Temp.	7.69	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Dust and Fumes	2.33	1.96	Ho rejected
7.	Overcrowding	5.58	1.96	Ho rejected
8.	Latrines	6.84	1.96	Ho rejected
9.	Fencing	10.81	1.96	Ho rejected
10.	Work in Motion	10.51	1.96	Ho rejected
11.	Devices For Cutting Off Power	7.70	1.96	Ho rejected
12.	Casing	10.00	1.96	Ho rejected
13.	Hoists	4.24	1.96	Ho rejected
14.	Lifting Machines	4.67	1.96	Ho rejected
15.	Revolving Machinery	7.56	1.96	Ho rejected
16.	Floors	11.88	1.96	Ho rejected
17.	Excessive Weights	2.93	1.96	Ho rejected
18.	Explosive Gases	-3.22	1.96	Ho rejected
19.	Safety Limit Marking	9.23	1.96	Ho rejected
20.	Safety Space Between Machine	6.4	1.96	Ho rejected
21.	Safety Goggles and Shoes	8.58	1.96	Ho rejected
22.	Site Development	11.26	1.96	Ho rejected
23.	Dinning and Rest Room	9.87	1.96	Ho rejected
24.	Drinking Water	7.93	1.96	Ho rejected
25.	First Aid Box	2.28	1.96	Ho rejected
26.	Industrial Uniform	4.31	1.96	Ho rejected
27.	Canteen Facilities	4.96	1.96	Ho rejected
28.	Formal Safety Training	6.41	1.96	Ho rejected
29.	Fire Fighting Equipments	3.71	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>23.20</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

**Table 10**

**Adequate and Fair Compensation:**

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on adequate and fair compensation.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1	Wages	5.06	1.96	Ho rejected
2	Bonus	5.45	1.96	Ho rejected
3	Overtime Pay	5.93	1.96	Ho rejected
4	Incentive	7.46	1.96	Ho rejected
5	P.F.	8.00	1.96	Ho rejected
6	E.S.I.	5.66	1.96	Ho rejected
7	Welfare Schemes	4.71	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>11.70</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

Table reveals that scenario of adequate and fair compensation in unionized organization differs than non-unionized organization. Null hypothesis is rejected for all parameters of adequate and fair compensation. Overtime pay is paid as per legal directives to employees in both sample units.

**Table 11**

**Safe and Healthy Working Conditions:**

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on safe and healthy working conditions.

Table reveals scenario of safe and healthy working conditions where null hypothesis is rejected in case of all these variables. This depicts that QWL in unionized organizations differ than in non-unionized organizations.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Floor Cleanliness	7.97	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Drainage Cleanliness	7.70	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Disposal of Wastes	10.86	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Lights	9.16	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Ventilation and Temp.	7.69	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Dust and Fumes	2.33	1.96	Ho rejected
7.	Overcrowding	5.58	1.96	Ho rejected
8.	Latrines	6.84	1.96	Ho rejected
9.	Fencing	10.81	1.96	Ho rejected
10.	Work in Motion	10.51	1.96	Ho rejected
11.	Devices For Cutting Off Power	7.70	1.96	Ho rejected
12.	Casing	10.00	1.96	Ho rejected
13.	Hoists	4.24	1.96	Ho rejected
14.	Lifting Machines	4.67	1.96	Ho rejected
15.	Revolving Machinery	7.56	1.96	Ho rejected
16.	Floors	11.88	1.96	Ho rejected
17.	Excessive Weights	2.93	1.96	Ho rejected
18.	Explosive Gases	-3.22	1.96	Ho rejected
19.	Safety Limit Marking	9.23	1.96	Ho rejected
20.	Safety Space Between Machine	6.4	1.96	Ho rejected
21.	Safety Goggles and Shoes	8.58	1.96	Ho rejected
22.	Site Development	11.26	1.96	Ho rejected
23.	Dinning and Rest Room	9.87	1.96	Ho rejected
24.	Drinking Water	7.93	1.96	Ho rejected
25.	First Aid Box	2.28	1.96	Ho rejected
26.	Industrial Uniform	4.31	1.96	Ho rejected
27.	Canteen Facilities	4.96	1.96	Ho rejected
28.	Formal Safety Training	6.41	1.96	Ho rejected
29.	Fire Fighting Equipments	3.71	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>23.20</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

**Table 12**

Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity:

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacity.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Participation In Decision Making	8.47	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Multiple Skills	12.43	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Complete Job	10.05	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Feedback	7.30	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Autonomy	11.80	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Delegation of Authority	18.07	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>17.18</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

Table reveals that workers in unionized organization get an opportunity to use and develop their capacities as compare to non unionized organization that are good in delegation of authority. Hypothesis is rejected with respect to all variables, depicts that QWL in unionized organization is differ than non-unionized organization.

**Table 13**

Opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security:

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security.

Opportunity for continued career growth and security differs in unionized and non-unionised organization, since the hypothesis is rejected.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Challenging Job	9.81	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Internal Training	9.44	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Promotion	9.69	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Job Rotation	7.44	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Employment Security	9.58	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Expanding Knowledge	6.19	1.96	Ho rejected
7.	Personality Development	7.21	1.96	Ho rejected
8.	Suggestion Scheme	2.79	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>11.73</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

**Table 14**

Social Integration in the Work Organization:

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on social integration in the work organization.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated z	tabulated z	Ho
1.	Natural Work Units	11.11	1.96	Ho rejected
2.	Workers Meeting	12.14	1.96	Ho rejected
3.	Top executives involved in socio cultural activities	7.59	1.96	Ho rejected
4.	Festivals	7.57	1.96	Ho rejected
5.	Sense Of Community	9.31	1.96	Ho rejected
6.	Interpersonal Openness	9.34	1.96	Ho rejected
7.	Humanized Treatment	11.47	1.96	Ho rejected
8.	Freedom From Prejudice	5.74	1.96	Ho rejected
9.	Workers Meeting With Top Officials	11.20	1.96	Ho rejected
10.	Workers Meeting With Owners	7.88	1.96	Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>15.8</b>	1.96	Ho rejected

Unionized organization has better social integration in work organization as compare to non-unionised organization. Ten variables were executed to test the difference in social integration in the work organization. Hypothesis is rejected with all variables signifies difference in QWL of unionized and non-unionised organizations.

**Table 15**

Constitution in the Work Organization:

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on constitution in the work organization.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated	z tabulated	z	Ho
1.	Privacy	7.59	1.96		Ho rejected
2.	Scope for Free Speech	11.06	1.96		Ho rejected
3.	Recruitment Procedure	6.55	1.96		Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>10.81</b>	1.96		Ho rejected

Eight variables were executed to test constitution in the work organization. Samples have not responded to promotion policy, Disciplinary Procedure, Grievance, Training and Development and Performance Appraisal. Unionized organization has better privacy, scope for free speech and recruitment procedure.

In case of these three variables hypothesis is rejected which signifies difference in the QWL in unionized and non-unionised organizations.

**Table 16**

Balanced Role of Work in the Total Life Space:

Following table shows opinion of sample workers on balanced role of work in the total life space.

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated	z tabulated	z	Ho
1.	O.T. Work	-1.58	1.96		Ho rejected
2.	Work During Inconvenient Hrs	-0.61	1.96		Ho rejected
3.	Overload of Work	-1.51	1.96		Ho rejected
4.	Weekly Off	7.81	1.96		Ho rejected
5.	Govt Holidays	6.38	1.96		Ho rejected
6.	Pay Leaves	9.63	1.96		Ho rejected
7.	Equality	1.79	1.96		Ho rejected
8.	Spare Time for Family	6.41	1.96		Ho rejected
	<b>Sum</b>	<b>8.44</b>	1.96		Ho rejected

Both Unionized and non-unionized organizations are not providing balanced role of work in total life space. Overtime work is reported by samples in both the organizations. Samples in both unionized and non-unionised organizations suffered from work during inconvenient hours and has overload of work. In case of overtime work, work during inconvenient hours and overload of work null hypothesis is accepted. The hypothesis is rejected in case of weekly off, govt holidays, pay leaves and spare time for family.

**Table 17**

Social Relevance of Work:

Sr.	QWL categories	calculated	z tabulated	z	Ho
80	Social Relevance of Work	4.23	1.96		Ho rejected

Following table shows opinion of sample worker on social relevance of work.

Workers in both sample units found their work has social relevance.

### **FINDINGS**

1. Employees in unionized organization enjoy adequate and fair compensation.
2. Unionized and non unionized organizations provides safe and healthy working environment.
3. Employees in Unionized organization enjoy reasonable opportunities to develop their capabilities.
4. Both unionized and non unionized organizations are lagging in development of human capacity.
5. Employees in unionized organization enjoy continued growth and finds job security.
6. The scenario of social integration in the work place is better in unionized organization as compare to non unionized organization.
7. Employees in both organizations are dissatisfied towards constitutional provisions at workplace.
8. Both organizations provide balanced role of work to their employees.
9. Scenario of social relevance of work is satisfactory in both organizations.
10. Employees in unionized organizations are more suffered from O.T. Work, Work During Inconvenient hours, Overload of Work and equality than in non-unionized organizations.
11. Both unionized and non-unionized sample organizations found to have good constitutional provisions in work organization.
12. Samples find social relevance in work.

### **CONCLUSION**

Unions are drive towards attainment of better quality of working life while looking betterment of employees and executives bargaining power. When it comes to execution of bargaining power management expects output. These favourable circumstances from union and management leads to discussions and thinking for the betterment of employees as well as organization. In most of the instances the discussions leads to positive output. Non-unionised organizations are dealt only by management and no concern is given to employees which may leads to poor quality of work life may lead to poor organizational output. Hence, it can be said that unions pave better quality of work life.

### **REFERENCES**

- Anonymous (1979). "Hot UAW Issue: "Quality of Work Life"," *Business Week*, September. 17, Iss. 2603
- Anonymous (1981). "Quality of Work Life: Catching On," *Business Week*, Industrial New York:Sep 21,. Iss. 2706, 72-75.
- Balaji Prasad M. and Vijaykumar R. (2008). "Environmental Impacts: A Study on the Effects of Working Environment on the Performance of Executives," *The Journal of Indian Management and Strategy*, January-march, 13(1), 28-33.
- Balch, David E., Blanck, Robert (1989). "Measuring the Quality of Work Life," *Quality Progress*, November, 22(11), 44-49.
- Beck, Al (1988). "QWL and Unions in the 1990s," *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 11(4), 20-25.
- Socialetti Gene (1987). "Quality Of Work Life Some Unintended Effects On The Seniority Tradition Of An Industrial Union," *Group & Organization Studies (1986-1998)*, December, 12(4), 386-411.
- Buddhapriya Sanghamitra (2009). "Work-Family Challenges and Their Impact on Career

Decisions: A Study of Indian Women Professionals," *Vikalpa*, January-March, 34(1), 31-45.

- Bushe, Gervase R (1988). "Developing Cooperative Labor-Management Relations in Unionized Factories: A Multiple Case Study of Quality Circles and Parallel Organizations Within Joint Quality of Work Life Projects," *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24(2), 129-151.

- Cherns, Albert (1986). "The Political Dimensions of QWL," *International Journal of Manpower*, 7(4), 18-23.

- Cohen, Deborah Shaw (1979). "The Quality of Work Life Movement: Does Working Together Work Better?," *Training*, January, 16(1).

- DiGiacomo, Gordon (1987). "Trade Unions and the Reform of the Quality of Work Life: Ergonomic and Other QWL Reforms Have Limited Goals and Are Held No Substitute for Labor Involvement", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, October, 46(4), 399-405.

- Donahue, Thomas R (1982). "Labor Looks at Quality of Work Life Programs,"

*Journal of Contemporary Business*, 11(2), 115-123.

- Eaton, Adrienne E, Gordon, Michael E, Keefe, Jeffrey H (1992). "The Impact of Quality of Work Life Programs and Grievance System Effectiveness on Union Commitment,"

*Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 45(3), 591-605.

- Fields, Mitchell W., Thacker, James W. (1992). "Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment," *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(2), 439-451.

- Gnpathis R., Malar S. (2008). "Job Satisfaction of Women Lecturers in Self Financing Colleges With Reference To Coimbatore," *Rai Management Journal*, October, 6(2), 23-39.

- Gilbert, Beth (1989). "The Impact of Union Involvement on the Design and Introduction of Quality of Working Life," *Human Relations*, December, 42(12), 1057-1079.

- Gilbert Patrick (2008). "Human Resources What's Working," *Indian Management*, February, 47(2), 12.

- Hian, Chan Choon, Einstein, Walter O (1990). "Quality of Work Life (QWL): What Can Unions Do?" *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 55(2), 17-23.

- Lewin, David (1981). "Collective Bargaining and the Quality of Work Life," *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(2), 37-54.

- Lissy, William E. (1982). "Quality of Work Life Programs and Unions," *SuperVision*, 44(9), 18-20.