

Monthly Income and Quality of Work Life of Public and Private Sector Employees of Kerala

Ambily A.S

Assistant Professor(S.G), Department of Commerce and Management,
Amrita School of Arts and Sciences, Kochi, under Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham University
E-mail: ambilysanjayan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Quality of work life encompasses various aspects relating to work environment, employee motivation, technology facilities, quality and humanism of managerial care and supervision, management – union relations and so on. The level of economic development considerably determines people's quality of life. Organisations' role is crucial in attracting competent, talented persons, and to retain them. It constantly adds significant value to the organisation. For retaining the employees' of the organisation, monthly income has a significant role. Employees' compensation, gives a sense of recognition and also determines social status. Employees' compensation is a vital issue that needs an immediate solution. Present study focuses on monthly income and Quality of work life of public and private sector employees of Kerala.

Access this article online	
Quick Response Code:	Website: www.innovativepublication.com
	DOI: 10.5958/2394-2770.2015.00002.2

INTRODUCTION

Human resource is animate, active, and living since man alone has the ability to feel, think, conceive and grow, shows satisfaction or dissatisfaction, resentment or pleasure, resistance or acceptance for all types of managerial actions. They are the most complex and unpredictable in its behaviour as a manager is able to acquire the employee's time, his physical presence at a given place and his skilled muscular motions per hour or day, but it is difficult to buy his enthusiasm, initiative, loyalty and his devotionⁱ. Each individual has his own distinct background and psychological framework which cannot be interchanged with others. In employing and supervising people a manager must follow tailor made approach based on his understanding of the actions, attitudes, needs and urges of the employee concerned which is a challenging taskⁱⁱ.

The rise of labour organizations and various laws, such as the Factories Act, Employees' State Insurance Act, and the Workmen's Compensation Act have been passed to ensure certain minimum standards of treatment, also increased the importance of human resource. Fear of opposition by labour unions is another reason for treating human resource with due respect. According to Leon C. Megginson, the term human resources can be thought of as "the total knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talents and aptitudes of an organizational workforce, as well as the value, attitudes and beliefs of the individuals involved".

According to Lawrence Appley, "management is the development of people, not the direction of things". In

the modern era of automation and computerization, machine is useless without competent people to run it. Thus Human Resource Management has become a very significant factor.

Human Resource Management is defined as a set of policies, practices and programmes designed to maximize both personal and organizational goals. It is the process of binding people and organizations together so that the objectives of each are achieved. One of the recent trends in HRM is Quality of Work Life (QWL). Beginning in the seventies and during the next two decades a constellation of principles and methods evolved into a movement called Quality of Work Life (QWL). The quality of work life is a broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories, and management styles through which organization and jobs are designed so as to grant workers more autonomy, responsibility, and authority that are usually done.

Quality of work life encompasses various aspects relating to work environment, employee motivation, technology facilities, quality and humanism of managerial care and supervision, management – union relations and so on. The level of economic development considerably determines people's quality of life.

Organisations' role is crucial in attracting competent, talented persons, and to retain them. It constantly adds significant value to the organisation. For retaining the employees' of the organisation, monthly income has a significant role. Employees' compensation, gives a sense of recognition and also determines social status. Employees' compensation is a vital issue that needs an immediate solution. Present study focuses on monthly income and Quality of work life of public and private sector employees of Kerala.

The study is partly descriptive and partly analytical in nature and is mainly based on primary data. Secondary data are also used for the study. The aim is to study the income and quality of work life of public sector and private sector manufacturing companies in Kerala. The study is conducted in large and medium sized

manufacturing enterprises with not less than 500 employees' and is chosen from northern, central and southern regions of Kerala. Simple random sampling technique is used for selecting 5 private sector and 5 public sector (3 state public sectors and 2 central public sectors) manufacturing companies.

Through systematic random sampling 1000 employees' from both sectors, covering 100 employees' each as of randomly selected companies are considered for the study. From 1000 employees' 200 fit in to managerial employees' and the rest 800 are non managerial employees'.

Disposition of employees' towards quality of work life is being collected through a pre-tested interview schedule with the help of 8 broad variables developed by Richard E Walton. The variables are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capacity,

opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalisation in the work organization, work and the total life space and social relevance of work life. In addition to the above parameters, two more variables which play a greater role for maintaining quality of work life of the organization are also added. They are superior subordinate relationship and welfare facilities. Secondary data were mainly collected through journals, books, thesis, internet and magazines. Chi square test of independence was used to test the hypotheses. In order to study the contribution of each parameter of the quality of work life towards maintaining the QWL in the organisation, Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed. The One-Way ANOVA is also used which produces a one-way analysis of variance for a quantitative dependent variable by a single factor (independent) variable.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Table 1: Monthly Income - wise Employees

Monthly Income(Rs.)	Non managerial employees	
Below 10000	273	34.1%
10000 – 15000	225	28.1%
15000 – 20000	197	24.6%
20000 – 25000	074	09.3%
Above 25000	031	03.9%
Total	800	100%

Source: Survey data

Table no. 1 shows that a majority of the non- managerial employees' receive salary below Rs. 10000 irrespective of their age and experience. The employees' who receive salaries between Rs. 10000 – 20000 are only 52 per cent and those getting Rs. 20000 – 30000 are very few, which is about 12 per cent.

Better compensation and recognition determine the social status of the employees. Here it show a negative indication in the case of the non- managerial employees. About 34.1 per cent of employees' of this category receive salary below Rs. 10000. Thus better remuneration increases the satisfaction level among all employees.

Disposition of Public and Private Sector Non- Managerial Employees–Monthly Income Wise

Table 2 discloses that satisfaction level is more among the income group of above Rs. 25000 in the public sector and between Rs. 20000 – 25000 in the private sector respectively. Higher income groups of non- managerial employees' are more satisfied with working conditions as compared to lower income groups.

Table 2: Non- managerial Employees' – Monthly Income Wise

Parameters	Mean	Sector	Below 10000	10000- 15000	15000- 20000	20000- 25000	Above 25000	Total
Adequate and Fair Compensation	21.62	Public	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		private	24.00	19.46	21.84	20.16	13.84	20.38
Safe and healthy working conditions	23.85	Public	21.84	24.25	26.71	21.00	28.66	22.85
		private	39.00	26.45	23.00	20.32	20.20	23.71
Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity	18.57	Public	24.18	23.60	24.19	14.00	23.83	24.00
		private	13.00	19.42	21.43	20.64	16.92	20.23
			15.61	20.09	15.38	12.00	23.16	16.91

Opportunity for continued Growth and Security	15.06	Public	09.00	17.19	16.19	15.24	09.44	15.73
		private	13.36	16.62	15.57	07.00	16.50	14.39
Social Integration in the Work Organisation	13.36	Public	08.00	11.33	13.97	15.98	11.20	13.26
		private	11.76	16.62	15.92	11.00	23.00	13.46
Social Relevance of Work Life	12.80	Public	12.00	11.43	11.84	16.36	10.24	12.45
		private	13.23	12.56	14.19	18.00	15.66	13.15
Work and the Total Life Space	12.80	Public	09.00	10.99	11.02	13.93	14.08	11.69
		private	13.29	15.04	15.38	05.00	17.50	13.92
Constitutional-isation in the work organisation	10.71	Public	11.00	10.11	09.57	10.75	08.68	09.92
		private	10.71	12.55	15.66	14.00	12.83	11.51
Superior Subordinate Relationship	19.41	Public	19.00	17.30	18.11	20.43	18.48	18.34
		private	19.17	23.66	19.71	18.00	23.50	20.47
Welfare Facilities	27.64	Public	34.00	23.97	22.63	24.71	13.72	23.10
		private	31.87	33.32	30.42	23.00	33.16	32.19

Source : Survey data

Table 2 enlightens that the satisfaction level is more in public sector concerning the parameter adequate and fair compensation, social integration in the work organisation, social relevance of work life, work and the total life space, constitutionalisation in the work organisation, superior subordinate relationship and welfare facilities.

With regard to opportunity to use and develop human capacity, opportunity for continued growth and security, the satisfaction level is more in the private sector than in the public sector. The table also shows that with regards to safe and healthy working conditions both the sectors have equal satisfaction under the same conditions. Table also makes it clear that income variable among non- managerial employees’ has a greater contribution to determining quality of working life in an organisation.

Multiple Comparison of Monthly Income Group and Qwl of Non- Managerial Employees

In order to test whether there is any significant difference within the income group of non- managerial employees’ with respect to various parameters of quality of work life, the post hoc multiple comparison test is employed. The hypothesis developed is as follows:

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to QWL parameters.

Monthly Income VS Adequate And Fair Compensation

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to adequate and fair compensation.

Table 3: Income Group VS Adequate and fair compensation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Adequate and fair compensation	Adequate and fair compensation	1038.70	4	259.68	7.61	<.001
	Error	27145.78	795	34.15		
	Total	28184.48	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs adequate and fair compensation, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison tests are applied.

Table 4: Income Groups Vs Adequate and Fair Compensation (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Adequate and fair compensation	Below 10	25-30	5.209*
		10-15	5.050*
	15-20	20-25	2.184*
		25-30	5.650*
	20-25	15-20	-2.184*
		25-30	3.466*
	25-30	Below10	-5.209*
		10-15	-5.050*
		15-20	-5.650*
		20-25	-3.466*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from table 4 that significant difference exists between following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs.15000-Rs. 20000 (Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000, Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs. 20000-Rs.25000(Rs.15000-Rs. 20000, Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000 (all other income groups) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter adequate and fair compensation.

While comparing monthly income between Rs. 25000 and Rs. 30000 with other monthly income groups of non-managerial employees', it is seen that significant difference exists between all other monthly income groups. Here also the null hypothesis is rejected. It is also clear that difference emerge between high income group and low income group.

Monthly Income VS Safe and Healthy Working Conditions

H₀ : There is no monthly - income wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees' with respect to safe and healthy working conditions.

Table 5: Income Vs Safe and Healthy Working Conditions (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Safe and healthy working conditions	Safe and healthy working conditions	1863.25	4	465.81	11.33	<.001
	Error	32695.93	795	41.13		
	Total	34559.18	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs safe and healthy working conditions, ANOVA test is conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 6: Monthly Income Groups VS Safe and Healthy Working Conditions (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Safe and healthy working conditions	Below 10	20-25	4.434*
		25-30	3.774*
	10-15	15-20	1.952*
		20-25	4.841*
		25-30	4.181*
	15-20	10-15	-1.952*
		20-25	2.888*
	20-25	Below10	-4.434*
		10-15	-4.841*
		15-20	-2.888*
	25-30	Below10	-3.774*
		10-15	-4.181*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from table no. 6 that significant difference exists between the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000, Rs. 25000-Rs. 30000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Rs.15000-Rs.20000, Rs.20000-Rs.25000, Rs.25000-Rs.30000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Rs.10000-Rs.15000, Rs.20000-Rs.25000), Rs.20000-Rs.25000 (Below Rs.10000, Rs.10000-Rs.15000, Rs.15000-Rs.20000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-Rs. 15000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter safe and healthy working conditions. It is also clear that difference exists between high income groups and low income groups.

Monthly Income VS Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to opportunity to use and develop human capacity.

Table 7: Income Vs Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	4096.22	4	1024.05	55.98	<.001
	Error	14543.58	795	18.29		
	Total	18639.80	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs opportunity to use and develop human capacity, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 8: Monthly Income Groups Vs Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income ‘000’	Within	Mean difference
Opportunity to use and develop human capacity	Below 10	10-15	-4.219*
		15-20	-5.259*
		20-25	-4.999*
		25-30	-2.601*
	10-15	Below10	4.219*
	15-20	Below10	5.259*
		25-30	2.657*
	20-25	Below10	4.999*
	25-30	Below10	2.601*
		15-20	-2.657*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 10000-Rs.15000, Rs. 15000 - Rs.20000, Rs.20000 - Rs.25000, Rs.25000-Rs.30000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Below Rs. 10000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 25000- Rs. 30000), Rs.20000-Rs. 25000 (Below Rs. 10000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 15000-Rs. 20000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter opportunity to use and develop human capacity. It is also clear that difference exists between high income group and low income group.

Monthly Income VS Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to opportunity for continued growth and security

Table 9: Income vs opportunity for continued growth and security (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Opportunity for continued growth and security	Opportunity for continued growth and security	2490.57	4	622.64	38.14	<.001
	Error	12977.43	795	16.32		
	Total	15468.00	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs opportunity for continued growth and security, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 10: Monthly Income Groups Vs Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Opportunity for continued growth and security.	Below 10	10-15	-3.700*
		15-20	-2.912*
		20-25	-1.915*
		25-30	2.413*
	10-15	Below10	3.700*
		20-25	1.784*
		25-30	6.113*
	15-20	Below10	2.912*
		25-30	5.325*
	20-25	Below10	1.915*
		25-30	4.328*
	25-30	Below10	-2.413*
10-15		-6.113*	
15-20		-5.325*	
20-25		-4.328*	

Source : Survey data *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from table 10 that significant difference exists among the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 10000 –Rs. 15000, Rs. 15000 – Rs. 20000, Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000, Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000, Rs. 25000-Rs.30000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 25000- Rs. 30000) ,Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 25000- Rs. 30000), Rs. 25000-Rs. 30000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-Rs. 15000, Rs. 15000 – Rs. 20000, Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter opportunity for continued growth and security. It is also clear that difference emerge between high income group and low income group.

Monthly Income VS Social Integration in the Work Organisation

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees' with respect to social integration in the work organisation.

Table 11: Income vs Social Integration in the Work Organisation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Social integration in the work organisation	Social integration in the work organisation	1488.31	4	372.08	14.86	<.001
	Error	19902.29	795	25.03		
	Total	21390.60	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs social integration in the work organisation, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 12: Monthly Income Groups Vs Social Integration in the Work Organisation (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Social integration in the work organisation	Below 10	10-15	-2.238*
		15-20	-2.545*
		20-25	-4.281*
	10-15	Below10	2.238*
		20-25	-2.043*
	15-20	Below10	2.545*
	20-25	Below10	4.281*
		10-15	2.043*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs.10000 –Rs. 15000, Rs. 15000 – Rs. 20000, Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000), Rs.15000-Rs. 20000 (Below Rs. 10000), Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs.10000-Rs.15000), at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter social integration in the work organisation.

Monthly Income VS Social Relevance of Work Life

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to social relevance of work life.

Table 13: Income VS Social Relevance of Work Life (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Social relevance of work life	Social relevance of work life	1318.18	4	329.55	15.46	<.001
	Error	16951.40	795	21.32		
	Total	18269.58	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs social relevance of work life, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 14: Monthly Income Groups Vs Social Relevance of Work Life (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Social relevance of work life	Below 10	10-15	1.22*
		20-25	-3.194*
	10-15	Below10	-1.220*
		20-25	-4.414*
	15-20	20-25	-4.295*
	20-25	Below10	3.194*
		10-15	4.414*
		15-20	4.295*
		25-30	5.101*
	25-30	20-25	-5.101*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from table 14 that significant difference exists between the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 10000 –Rs. 15000, Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Below Rs. 10000,Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000(Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000),Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000(Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-Rs.15000, Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000,Rs.25000-Rs.30000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000(Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000).at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter social relevance of work life. It is also clear that difference emerge between high income group and low income group.

Monthly Income Vs Work and the Total Life Space

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to work and the total life space.

Table 15: Income Vs Work and the Total Life Space (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Work and the total life space	Work and the total life space	570.41	4	142.60	8.54	<.001
	Error	13269.17	795	16.69		
	Total	13839.58	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs work and the total life space, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 16: Monthly Income Groups Vs Work and the Total Life Space (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income ‘000’	With in	Mean difference
Work and the total life space	Below 10	15-20	1.666*
	10-15	15-20	1.450*
	15-20	Below10	-1.666*
		10-15	-1.450*
		20-25	-2.323*
	20-25	15-20	2.323*
	25-30	15-20	3.254*

Source: Survey data

*The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among the following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 15000 –Rs. 20000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-Rs. 15000, Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000, Rs. 25000 – Rs. 30000), Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000 (Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000 (Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter work and the total life space.

Monthly Income vs Constitutionalisation in the Work Organisation

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees’ with respect to constitutionalisation in the work organisation.

Table 17: Income Vs Constitutionalisation in the Work Organisation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	168.09	4	42.02	5.1	<.001
	Error	6518.07	795	8.20		
	Total	6686.16	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing null hypothesis concerning income Vs constitutionalisation in the work organisation, ANOVA tests were conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison tests are applied.

Table 18: Monthly Income Groups Vs Constitutionalisation in the Work Organisation (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	With in	Mean difference
Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	10-15	15-20 25-30	1.061* 1.800*
	15-20	10-15	-1.061*
	25-30	10-15	-1.800*

Source: Survey data, *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists between the following income groups Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Rs. 10000-Rs. 15000), Rs.25000-Rs. 30000 (Rs. 10000- Rs. 15000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter constitutionalisation in the work organisation.

Monthly Income Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees' with respect to superior subordinate relationship.

Table 19: Income Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Superior Subordinate relationship	Superior Subordinate relationship	539.76	4	134.94	6.39	<.001
	Error	16802.11	795	21.14		
	Total	17341.88	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs superior subordinate relationship, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table 20: Monthly Income Groups Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	With in	Mean difference
Superior subordinate relationship	Below 10	10-15	-1.191*
	10-15	Below10	1.191*
	15-20	10-15 20-25	-2.070* -2.116*
	20-25	15-20	2.116*

Source: Survey data, *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists between following income groups below Rs.10000 (Rs. 10000 –Rs. 15000), Rs.10000-Rs.15000 (Below Rs. 10000), Rs.15000-Rs.20000 (Rs. 10000-Rs. 15000,Rs. 20000- Rs. 25000), Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000 (Rs. 15000- Rs. 20000) at 0.05 level of significance with respect to the parameter superior subordinate relationship.

Monthly Income Vs Welfare Facilities

H₀ : There is no monthly income - wise significant difference in the disposition of non- managerial employees' with respect to welfare facilities.

Table 21: Income Vs Welfare Facilities (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Welfare facilities	Welfare facilities	12501.12	4	3125.28	58.64	<.001
	Error	42367.77	795	53.29		
	Total	54868.89	799			

Source: Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs welfare facilities, ANOVA test were conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison tests is applied.

Table 22: Monthly Income Vs Welfare Facilities (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Monthly income '000'	Within	Mean difference
Welfare facilities	Below 10	10-15	03.486*
		15-20	08.486*
		20-25	07.259*
		25-30	14.464*
	10-15	Below10	-03.486*
		15-20	05.000*
		20-25	03.773*
		25-30	10.978*
	15-20	Below10	-08.486*
		10-15	-05.000*
		25-30	05.978*
	20-25	Below10	-07.259*
		10-15	-03.773*
		25-30	07.205*
	25-30	Below10	-14.464*
		10-15	-10.978*
		15-20	-05.978*
		20-25	-07.205*

Source: Survey data, *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test on QWL parameter welfare facilities, it is found that significant difference exists between all monthly income groups of non- managerial employees' at 0.05 level of significance, except between Rs. 15000 – Rs. 20000 and Rs. 20000-Rs. 25000. The null hypothesis is rejected with respect to the concerned parameter. After comparing all the QWL parameter of non- managerial employees' with the variable monthly income, it can be seen that the null hypothesis is rejected with respect to all income groups at five per cent significance level.

Monthly Income Group Vs Quality of Work Life Index of Non- Managerial Employees

Table 23: Monthly Income Group * Quality Of Work Life Index

			QWL INDEX			TOTAL	
			High	Medium	Low		
I N C O M E	Below Rs.10000	No. of employees	032	135	058	225	
		Per cent within age	14.2	60.0	25.8	100	
	Rs. 10000-15000	No. of employees	12	47	15	74	
		Per cent within age	16.2	63.5	20.3	100	
	Rs. 15000-20000	No. of employees	048	106	043	197	
		Per cent within age	24.4	53.8	21.8	100	
	Rs. 20000-25000	No. of employees	10	16	05	31	
		Per cent within age	32.3	51.6	16.1	100	
	Above Rs.25000	No. of employees	024	236	013	273	
		Per cent within age	08.8	86.4	04.8	100	
	Total		No. of employees	126	540	134	800
			Per cent within age	15.8	67.5	16.8	100

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig (2 sided)	Conclusion
Pearson Chi-Square	84.543	8	<.001	Significant

Quality of work life index of non- managerial employees' was prepared to know the disposition of employees' income - wise towards quality of work life. Table no.4 - 11 conveys that monthly income group above Rs. 25000 of non- managerial employees' is more satisfied than other groups of similar situation. It point outs that non- managerial employees' with higher income are more satisfied with their working environment. The least satisfied are found in below Rs. 10000 income group which is established by Chi Square Tests (V = 84.543, P < 0.001).

Hence the null hypothesis, 'There is no monthly income wise significant difference in the disposition of employees' with respect to quality of worklife' is rejected.

The majority of employees' are not satisfied with the working environment because they fall under the category receiving salary below Rs. 10000. Thus higher income receiving non- managerial employees' are more satisfied with the working conditions.

CONCLUSION

Concerning the disposition of non - managerial employees' to monthly income and quality of work life it is found that satisfaction level is more among the income group of above Rs 25000 in the public sector and between Rs 20000 – 25000 in the private sector respectively. It highlights that higher income non - managerial employees' are more satisfied with their working conditions than those in the lower income groups. The number of employees' receiving salary below Rs 10000 comes to around 34 per cent of the total non - managerial employees' and it is also established that the least satisfied non - managerial employees' are also found under the same category. It is clear that the majority of employees' are not satisfied with the working environment.

The incomes acquired by non - managerial employees' of both the sectors are far from adequate for the subsistence in the present economic circumstances. An average contentment is asserted by non - managerial employees' of both the sectors with regard to the compensation they receive and they are of the view that the remuneration does not endow them with any sort of recognition and social status. But the company's name gives them recognition and social status.

Public and private sector non - managerial employees' are well informed as regards the wage policies of the organisation concerned. Non - managerial employees' of both the sectors are of the outlook that the compensation received is paltry and cannot satisfy their demands in the market. Public sector compensation is not linked to any responsibility, skill and performance but is rule - bound. Reviews and revisions of salaries are only proper in the private sector, vis-a-vis the public sector. In the private sector it is found that employees' with more than 15 years of experience are receiving Rs 7500 as salary which is not enough to survive in present day economy. Non - managerial employees' of both the sectors are forced to live their life in accordance with their compensation. They themselves have tuned their life styles based on the salary they are receiving.

Private sector non - managerial employee's salary is purely based on performance rather than responsibility, skill experience, etc. In the private sector, increments are provided every year. In addition to that, special incentives are also given based on better performance and special skills. Private sector employees' are more bothered about output rather than anything. Even if no much difference exists between both sectors concerning the parameter, adequate and fair compensation etc. it can be demarcated that public sector non - managerial

employees' are more satisfied than private sector non - managerial employees'. It is mainly because public sector employees' are complacent with their compensation.

While considering non - managerial employees' of both the sectors, it can be concluded that for maintaining better quality of work life in the organisation, the contribution of parameter like adequate and fair compensation is incalculably essential.

REFERENCES:

1. Kapoor, S.D., "The Prepotency of Specific Motive among Indian Industrial Workers," *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 1967, 4(2), 29-33.
2. Sirota, D., "Production of Service Personnel and Job Enrichment," *Work study*, 22(1), Jan. 1973, 9-15
3. Cherrington.J. and Cherrington.J.O. 1974, "Improving productivity and the QWL," Praeger special studies, Newyork.
4. Walton, R.E., "Improving the QWL." *Harvard Business Review*, June 1974, pp.12ff.
5. Biennium, Van,(1974), "On the Strategic Importance of the Quality of Working Life". A paper presented at the 5th International Personnel Conference, Canada, Montreal November, 1974.
6. Allenspach.H. (1975), *Flexible Working Hours*, International Labour Office, Geneva, 64.
7. Johnston, R., "Pay and Job Satisfaction; a survey of some Research Findings," *International Labour Review*, 111(5), May, 1975, 441-49.

ⁱGregerson, H.B., Morrison, A.J., and Mendenhall, M.E.(2000). Guest editors' introduction. *Human Resource Management*, 39(2 and 3), 115-116.

ⁱⁱAdams, P.G. and Slocum, J.W.(1971), "Work Groups and Employees Satisfaction," *Personnel administration*,34(2):37-43.