A Comparative Study of Quality of Work Life and Self-efficacy among Middle Level Managers of Public and Private Undertakings.

Sadia Khan, Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh-202002 (India). Email : sadiak_me@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

An attempt was made to study the Self-efficacy and Quality of work life on among middle level managers of public and private undertakings. The samples of the study comprised of 200 middle level managers. They were selected by means of random sampling technique from public and private sectors with n=100 from each undertakings. Random sampling technique was used to collect opinions from all managers of different sectors. The Quality of Work Life Scale developed by Shawkat and Ansari (2000) at AMU Aligarh and Self-efficacy Scale developed by Singh and Kumari (1990) was used for data collection. Analyses of the data were done by applying Mean, SD and t-test. Results revealed that middle level managers of public and private undertakings significantly differ with respect to Quality of Work Life and some of its dimensions; (i.e. Work Itself, Organizational Climate, Inter Group Relation and Trust) where as there is no significance of difference was found between Self-efficacy of middle level mangers of public and private undertakings. It was also found Quality of work life was found at the higher level in public undertakings as compared to the private undertakings.

Keywords : Quality of work life, self-efficacy, public and private middle level managers.

Introduction:

Quality of Work Life

Right from very beginning the term "Quality of Work Life" has been described differently by different psychologist, researchers and managers in their own respective ways to cover various aspects of Quality of Work Life at large in the following manner such as:

Taylor (1973) and Spink (1975, pp. 220-226) described Quality of Work Life as "the degree of excellence in the work and working conditions which contribute to overall satisfaction of the individual and enhance individual as well as organizational effectiveness". Bennium (1974) viewed Quality of Work Life as the quality of the relationship between man and his task. Bandura (1994, p. 71), Ketzell and Yankelovich (1975, pp.23-46) defined Quality of Work Life as "an individual's evaluation of the outcomes of the work relationship". They observed and witnessed that a worker can enjoy a good quality of life when- firstly, job incumbents have positive feelings towards his/her jobs and its future prospects. Secondly, employees are motivated to stay on the job and perform well. Thirdly, when he/she experiences and feels working life quite benefitting with his/her private life. Walton (1975) on the other hand stated that Quality of Work Life is the degree to which members of work organization perceive that they are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in organization. Lippit (1977, pp. 4-11) thought Quality of Work Life as, "the degree to which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal need to survive with some security, to interact with others, to have a sense of personal usefulness, to be recognized for achievements and to have an opportunity to improve one's skills and knowledge". Here, Lippit covered the whole gamut of work life which may increase organizational effectiveness.

Menton (1979) described Quality of Work Life as relatively new term for a bundle of old issues that have been an interest to philosophers, theologists, social scientists, workers and employers since a long time. The concept of quality of work life is very broad that can includes all aspects of work ethic and work condition, workers expression of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, managerial concern about efficiency of output and broaden consideration of social cohesion and stability. Recently, the term Quality of Work Life has been described as 'better job and more balanced ways of combining work life with personal life'. Eurofound (2006) emphasized that 'as a concept Quality of Work Life is multi-dimensional and universal. However, key concept tends to include job security, reward systems, pay and opportunity for growth among other factors'(Rossi, Perrewee, and Sauter, 2006).

Self-Efficacy

Among the mechanisms of human agency, none is more central or pervasive than beliefs of personal efficacy. This core belief is the foundation of human motivation, well-being, and accomplishments. Unless people believe they can produce desired effects by their actions, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors serve as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to

effect changes by one's actions. General self-efficacy can be defined as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (Bandura, 1994,p. 71). Self-efficacy determines how people feel, think, motivate them, and behave (Bandura,1994). "Belief in one's efficacy is a key personal resource in self-development, successful adaptation, and change". Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in his/her capabilities to exert control over different aspects of their lives. The concept of self-efficacy has been studied in two perspectives : (i) Specific self-efficacy & (ii) General self-efficacy (Bandura, 1971, Sherer et al., 1982). Bandura (1971) posits that self-efficacy refers to the confidence in one's abilities to behave in such a way as to produce a desirable outcome. He conceived self-efficacy as situation specific, not a global concept generalizing between domains (Bandura, 1977). It operates through its impact on "cognitive", "motivational", "affective", and "decisional processes". Efficacy beliefs affect whether individuals think optimistically or pessimistically, in self enhancing or self-debilitating ways. Such beliefs affect people's goals and aspirations, how well they motivate themselves, and their perseverance in the face of difficulties and adversity. Efficacy beliefs also shape people's outcome expectations—whether they expect their efforts to produce favorable outcomes or adverse ones. In addition, efficacy beliefs determine how environmental opportunities and impediments are viewed. People of low efficacy are easily convinced of the futility of effort in the face of difficulties. They quickly give up trying. Those of high efficacy view impediments as surmountable by self-development and perseverant effort. They stay the course in the face of difficulties and remain resilient to adversity. Efficacy beliefs also affect the quality of emotional life. Information used to appraise self-efficacy is acquired from four primary sources: actual performances, vicarious experiences, forms of persuasion, and physiological reactions.

According to Baranowski, Perry and Parcel (2002, pp.165-184), self-efficacy is defined as "the confidence one feels about performing a particular activity, including confidence in overcoming the barriers to performing that behaviour". Thus, high self-efficacy leads to people work hard and persist in the face of setbacks, obstacles and barriers in performing a particular activity. For instance, many of the great innovators, entrepreneurs and politicians have had sufficient self-efficacy to press on in spite of repeated obstacles, considerable ridicule and little encouragement. Thomas Edison tested at least three thousand different theories before eventually developing the first incandescent light bulb. A milkshake salesman named Ray Kroc persisted despite being ridiculed for believing that his McDonald's Corporation could become a successful franchise. Ormord (2006) defined self-efficacy as "the belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner to attain certain goals."

Literature Review

Quality of Work Life

Payne and Pheysey (1971) in the light of an interesting study conducted on organizational climate came to conclusion that job satisfaction is an indicative of positive Quality of Work Life. This was to highlight qualities of employee's work life. Job satisfaction is an indicative of positive quality of working life. Hence, whatever studies will be put forth on job satisfaction would be determining relationship of some variable as its important determinants.

Costello and Sang (1974) reported that majority of job incumbents of publicly owned utility firms were satisfied with security and social needs but, were different in the fulfillment of increase order needs self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization. Study conducted by Rhinehard and Dewolf (1969) on managers, compared managers working in government agencies with those from business and industries. They found that perceived deficiency in need fulfillment likely to increase successively at lower level which was almost similar to the findings of Jhonson and Marcrum (1968). Their study also revealed that increased dissatisfaction was found among managers of government agencies as compared to managers of business and industries.

Hackman, Pearce and Wolf (1978) propounded that the job can be re-designed to have the attributes desired by the people and organization, and also to have the environment desired by the people. This approach seeks to improve the quality of working life. Rajappa (1978) found in his study that organizations with achievement oriented climate were highly productive.

Robert (1997) presented a summary of determined tests of the assumption that success rates are so low in Organizational Commitment that doubt or cynicism constitutes the appropriate mind-sets. This opinion continues to appear in the literature, both scientific and popular, despite the existence of several large data sets that could either reinforce the doubt or cynicism, or require variously nuanced caveats about them. 16 major data sets are

reviewed in effect to sketch some confidence intervals concerning reasonable estimates of success rates in varieties of planned change commonly labeled as Quality of Work Life, organizational development and Organizational Commitment.

Donaldson et al. (1999) studied a major incentive for work-site. Health promotion activities promised increase of company's profitability. Although employee sleep patterns predicted health care utilization and psychological well-being, for most of the employee-health behaviours were not strong predictors of proximal organizational effectiveness factors. However, Quality of Work Life factors significantly predicted Organizational Commitment, absenteeism, and tardiness frequency. Findings suggested the value of improving the system of work in which employee are embedded as part of comprehensive work-site health promotion efforts.

Chan, Raymond and Joseph, Stephen (2000) compared the experiences of work stress, work satisfaction and mental health on 2,589 managers and workers from six different professions and para-professions, namely general practitioners, lawyers, engineers, teachers, nurses, and life insurance personals. Results showed that performance pressures and work family conflicts were perceived to be the most stressful aspects of work. Two of the stressors contributed to the overall work stress. Further, stress arising due to work, family conflicts, performance pressure and poor job prospect was negatively associated with level of work satisfaction. These findings were discussed in contexts of increasing professionalization, and de professionalization and growing emphasis on productivity and efficiency in a quickly developing economy.

Dargahi and Seragi (2007) conducted a study to provide the processes used to investigate and implement a pathway for improving of Quality of Work Life as an approach model. The results from the survey showed that the perceived strongest areas among 12 categories developed by Quality of Work Life Strategic Planning Committee that employees agreed to improve on their Quality of Work Life were Organizational Commitment, trust, support, monetary compensation, non-monetary compensation, leadership, attendance management, communication between managers and employees, communication between managers and managers, overall communication, respect and recognition. This committee evaluated the outcomes of Quality of Work Life of managers and employee teams to improve the employees' Quality of Work Life. The Quality of Work Life Strategic Planning Committee also recommend a new approach to suggest the ways which may be impressive on the employees' improving Quality of Work Life.

Gunaand Maimnah (2008) in a study entitled "Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals", concluded that IT industries in many developing countries are experiencing tremendous challenges in meeting the employment market demand. A good human resource practice would encourage IT professionals to be more productive while enjoying their work. Therefore, Quality of Work Life is becoming an important human resource issue in IT organizations. Effective strategic human resource policies and procedures are essential to govern and provide excellent Quality of Work Life among IT professionals. Conversely, poor human resource strategic measures that are unable to address these issues can effectively distort the Quality of Work Life, which will eventually fail the organizations' vision of becoming competitive globally.

Pugalendhi, Umaselvi and Nakkeeran (2011) in a study of Quality of Work Life: Perception of college teachers, revealed a significant relationship between total Quality of Work Life and Quality of Life in teaching environment . They also found that quality of life of college teachers is low in its working level and stated that Quality of Work Life is an essential concept of favourable situation in a working environment.

Reena and Jayan (2012) investigated the influence of QWL in relation to the job attitude and personal effectiveness of engineering college teachers in Kerala state. The numerous results came out by applying appropriate statistics regarding the objectives of the research. The major findings of the study were: (i) the higher levels of perceived quality of work life teachers obtained significantly more scores on the different dimensions of personal effectiveness such as personal focus, personal growth, team effectiveness, relationships, and personal adaptability than those teachers who have moderate and lower level of perceived QWL; (ii) there was significant difference in the personal growth of teachers towards their perceived levels of total QWL; (iii) relations with colleagues and HODs directs to high competent, motivated and dynamic staff in institutional effectiveness; (iv) the higher levels of perceived QWL college teachers indicated significantly more scores on the job attitude dimensions such as job commitment and job satisfaction as compared to the moderate and lower level of perceived QWL of teachers; and (v) significant difference was not reported on job involvement dimension of job attitude. It was concluded that high QWL in educational environment play very important role in accomplishment on teachers' needs for humor, and balance.

Nia and Maleki (2013) conducted a study to explore the relationship between QWL and organizational commitment of faculty members. Results revealed the positive relationship between the QWL and organizational commitment of faculty members. It means organizational commitment of faculty members will be enhanced along the good QWL at work setting in the universities.

Khan (2015) made an attempt to find out the relationship between QWL and organizational commitment among clerical-staff. The findings of the study revealed the positive and significant relationship between QWL and organizational commitment of clerical-staff. Further, QWL was emerged as significant predictor for organizational commitment of clerical-staff. This study may have its own practical significance at the organizational set up to optimizing QWL of clerical- staff at large to enhance their commitment and reduced their deviation from work.

Khan (2016) made an attempt to study the effect of multiple dimensions of perceived work environment on need satisfaction in Asia's largest transport public sector organization the Indian Railways. The results revealed the significant zero-order correlation of perceived work environment with need satisfaction. Further, Robustness check to use ordinary least square (OLS) Multiple Regression Analysis was carried out and satisfied. Multiple regression analysis showed that six dimensions of perceived work environment such as; effectiveness of supervision/management, working conditions, confidence in management, monetary gain, opportunity for growth and development, and citizenship behaviour and recognition at work emerged as critical predictors of need satisfaction and explained significant amount of variance. Magnitude of effect size for each predictor was calculated and found to be real and very large.

Self-Efficacy

In a field study, O'Neill and Mone (1998) investigated the effect of equity-sensitivity and self-efficacy on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intent to leave. The sample was comprised of 242 employees from a health care firm. The findings revealed that the employees working in a health care firm support the moderating role of equity sensitivity and relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction and between self-efficacy and intent to leave. But they did not find relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment.

In another study Jex and Bliese (1999) found a strong positive relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. At the same time, they also found a strong positive relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. Their results indicated that employees react negatively when they perceive that they are not capable of high levels of performance.

Luthans and Peterson (2002) examined the impact of manager's self-efficacy on the relationship between their employee's engagement and manager's effectiveness. They reported that the manager's self-efficacy was a partial mediator of the relationship between his or her employees' engagement and the manager's rated effectiveness. Overall, on the basis of their study they suggested that both employees" engagement and manager self-efficacy are important antecedents that together may more positively influence manager's effectiveness than either predictor.

Sinha, Talwar and Rajpal (2002) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. The sample was comprised of 167 managers. The findings revealed that organizational commitment was positively related with self-efficacy.

Droussiotis (2004) in a study attempts to derive and identify from primary data the characteristics of the most productive Cypriot employees, as seen by their managers. The findings showed that highly performing employees were satisfied with their jobs and were highly motivated to work. The findings obtained by Droussiotis clearly indicated that highly performing employees were found to be having high level of self-efficacy, good communication skills, group cohesiveness, internal locus of control and low organizational commitment.

Karatepe, Arasliand Khan (2007) in a study investigated the effect of self-efficacy on job performance, job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment on employees in three, four and five-star hotels in Northern Cyprus as its setting. The results demonstrated that self-efficacy is a significant determinant of job performance. This study, however, failed to find a significant positive association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The results of the present study revealed that job performance mediates the impact of self-efficacy on job satisfaction. In addition, the results of the path analysis showed that self-efficacy is among the significant predictors of affective organizational commitment. The model test results provided empirical support for the rest of the hypothesized relationships. Specifically, the path-analytic findings indicated that job satisfaction exerts a significant positive influence on affective organizational commitment. The model test results also demonstrated that job satisfaction

and affective organizational commitment are negatively associated with intention to leave.

In their study Vuuren, Jong and Seydel (2008) investigated the main and combined effects of self-efficacy and organisational efficacy on three dimensions of organizational commitment. The survey was conducted on employees of a chemical plant. The findings revealed that both organisational efficacy and to a lesser extent, self-efficacy both contribute to affective, normative and continuance commitment.

Hurter (2008) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between self-efficacy and employee commitment. For this purpose the sample was comprised of 113 category four and higher employees from a South African sugar manufacturing company. The results of the study indicated the positive correlation between self-efficacy and employee commitment. Uncommitted employees showed a lower level of self-efficacy.

Ballout (2009) investigated the moderating role of self-efficacy on the relationship between career commitment and career success. The survey was conducted on managers and non-manager employees in Lebanon regarding their career commitment, self-efficacy and career success. The results showed that career commitment predicted both objective (i.e. salary level) and subjective (i.e. career satisfaction) career success only for employees with average to high self-efficacy but not for those with low self-efficacy.

Fang (2009) analyzed the relationship between self-efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in manufacturing industry. The employees of manufacturing industry in Tainan county and Tainan city were chosen as the main study subjects. The sample was comprised of 405 employees. The results were as follow: (1) there was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among the employees in manufacturing industry, (2) there was a significant correlation between self-efficacy and organizational commitment among the employees in manufacturing industry and (3) there was a significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the employees in manufacturing industry.

Schmidt and DeShon (2010) investigated the moderating effects of performance ambiguity on the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. The results revealed that self-efficacy was negatively related to subsequent performance under conditions of high ambiguity but was positively related to performance when performance ambiguity was low.

Vaezi and Fallah (2011) made an attempt to explore the relationship between self-efficacy and stress of Iranian EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers. The respondents were selected from six different language institutes in Tehran. The findings revealed significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and stress. Furthermore, multiple regression analysis showed that the two dimensions of self-efficacy such as classroom efficacy and organizational efficacy explained 22 percent variance in stress. Self-efficacy was emerged as significant predictor of stress among EFL teachers.

Syamakinia, Tabrizi and Zoghi (2013) conducted the correlation study to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy of university instructors. The results revealed significant positive correlation between instructors' emotional intelligence and their self-efficacy beliefs.

Agarwal and Mishra (2016) considered the self-efficacy as significant predictor of organizational commitment among revenue personnel. They hypothesized that the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment will be positive and it will be significantly predicting the organizational commitment. Results revealed significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment ($r=0.36$, $p<0.01$). Further, self-efficacy was found significantly and positively related with each dimensions of organizational commitment viz.; affective commitment ($r=0.37$, $p<0.01$), continuance commitment ($r=0.34$, $p<0.01$) and normative commitment ($r=0.32$, $p<0.01$). The regression analysis indicated that self-efficacy explained 12.7% variance in organizational commitment of revenue personnel.

Ansari (2017) conducted a study to investigate the self-efficacy and spiritual values as predictors of life satisfaction among school teachers. Pearson product moment correlation indicated that,self-efficacy; spiritual values and life satisfaction were positively and significantly correlated with each other. Further, stepwise multiple linear regression analysis showed that, self-efficacy and spiritual values emerged as significant predictors of life satisfaction of school teachers.

Objective

To evaluate significance of the difference between the middle level managers of public and private undertakings with respect to Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Self-Efficacy.

Hypothesis

There will be a significant difference between the middle level managers of public and private undertakings with respect to Quality of Work Life and Self-Efficacy.

Sample

The sample of the present study was drawn from managers of public and private sectors. The sample comprising of 200-middle level managers (100-working in public and 100-in private sectors) were selected by applying random sampling technique from Delhi NCR, New Delhi.

Tools used

In the present investigation quality of work life and organizational commitment scale was used for data collection. The brief description of the scale is as follows:

1) Quality of Working Life Scale

Quality of Working Life, as observed earlier is a multidimensional concept. Its measurement requires truly valid and reliable devices. The review of tests revealed that Shawkat and Ansari (2000) developed a scale to measure Quality of Working Life at AMU Aligarh. The scale was developed hardly half-a- decade back. Hence, it is the most accurate scale, touching all old as-well-as new aspects of Quality of Working Life.

Numerous dimensions which are studied are work itself; employee's participation; physical working conditions; union management relations; organizational climate; inter-group relations; employees relations; autonomy at work; organizational commitment; supervisory relations; trust; clarity in organization; recognition; economic benefits; self-respect; employee's health and promotion. In all, seventeen dimensions make up the scale.

There are forty-eight items in the scale. Two items have been negatively phrased; hence their scoring was done by reversing the scores. It is a five-point scale. The total scores of the scale ranges from 48 to 240.The higher the scores, the stronger the perception of quality of working life of employees working in the organization and vice-versa.

2) Personal Efficacy Scale

The Personal Efficacy scale was developed by Singh and Kumari (1990). This scale is used to assess the personal efficacy of the individual. There are 28 items, each item has to be on 5 point scale on the continuum of strongly disagree to strongly agree. So, the total range of score is 28 to 140. Nine of the items are negatively phrased and their scoring was done by reversing the scores. The higher the scores obtained by the subjects, indicates high level of self-efficacy of the subjects and vice-versa. Split- half reliability was determined by Spearman-Brown formula and was found to be 0.72. The coefficient of correlation between scores of Social Reaction Inventory and personal efficacy was found to be 0.72. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Questionnaire and personal efficacy was to be 0.81.

Procedure of data collection

In order to collect the data, good rapport was established with each manager before requesting to fill up the questionnaire and then instructions were invariably explained to the managers. After that questionnaires were distributed individually. Subjects were assured of confidentiality of their responses and were requested to extend their co-operation. Finally questionnaires were collected from all the managers, scoring done and analysis was carried on.

Statistical analyses

The data obtained from the middle level managers of public and private sectors was analyzed by the means of Mean, SD, and t-test. The t-test was also administered to analyze the level of significance difference between two groups and comparisons of two groups of middle level managers on various factors of dimensions of all two variables.

Results and interpretation

Table 1

Significance of difference between middle level managers of public & private undertakings with respect to Quality of Work Life and its dimensions.

Variables	Organizational sectors	N	Mean	SD	Sig.	t-value
WI	Public	100	14.90	2.047	2.728	.007
	Private	100	14.08	2.200		
EP	Public	100	6.81	1.152	1.240	.216
	Private	100	6.59	1.349		
PWC	Public	100	6.94	1.246	1.572	.118
	Private	100	6.64	1.446		
UMR	Public	100	6.60	1.393	1.190	.235
	Private	100	6.35	1.572		
OLCL	Public	100	10.87	1.581	2.224	.027
	Private	100	10.33	1.843		
IGR	Public	100	7.11	1.325	2.181	.030
	Private	100	6.69	1.398		
ER	Public	100	14.16	2.053	.415	.679
	Private	100	14.04	2.040		
AW	Public	100	13.68	1.999	.563	.574
	Private	100	13.52	2.017		
OC	Public	100	10.90	1.784	1.027.	.305
	Private	100	10.64	1.795		
SR	Public	100	14.07	2.297	.125	.900
	Private	100	14.11	2.211		
Trust	Public	100	10.76	2.075	2.908	.004
	Private	100	9.89	2.155		
CIO	Public	100	10.46	2.057	1.573	.117
	Private	100	9.96	2.424		
Recog	Public	100	7.13	1.502	1.170	.243
	Private	100	6.87	1.637		
EB	Public	100	12.62	1.847	.705	.482
	Private	100	12.43	1.966		
SER	Public	100	11.27	1.476	.778	.438
	Private	100	11.10	1.611		
EH	Public	100	3.57	.844	.498	.619
	Private	100	3.51	.859		
Promo	Public	100	6.92	1.383	.928	.355
	Private	100	6.73	1.510		
QWL	Public	100	168.77	13.185	2.467	.015
	Private	100	163.48	16.910		

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Table 1 shows the Mean, SD and t-values of Quality of Work Life score of middle level managers of public and private undertakings. Dimension wise Mean, SD and t- values are also shown in the table. The dimensions of Quality of Work Life are: Work Itself, Employee Participation, Physical Working Condition, Union Management Relations, Organizational Climate, Inter Group Relation, Employee Relation, Autonomy at Work, Organizational Commitment, Supervisory Relations, Trust, Clarity in Organization, Recognition, Economic Benefits, Self Respect, Employee Health and Promotion.

For the first dimension of Quality of Work Life that is Work Itself, the mean value (M = 14.90) for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 14.08) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.728 which is not significant. For Employee Participation, the mean value (M = 6.81)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 6.59) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.240 which is not significant.

For Physical Working Condition, the mean value (M = 6.94)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 6.64) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.572 which is not significant. For Union Management Relations, the mean value (M = 6.60)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 6.35)for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.190 which is not significant.

For Organizational Climate, the mean value (M = 10.87)for the managers of public undertakings while the mean value (M = 10.33) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 2.224 which is significant at .05 level of significance. For Inter Group Relation, the mean value (M = 7.11)for the managers of public undertakings while the mean value (M = 6.69) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 2.181 which is significant at .05 level of significance.

For Employee Relation, the mean value (M = 14.16)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 14.04) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .415which is not significant. For Autonomy at Work, the mean value (M = 13.68) for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 13.52) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .562which is not significant.

For Organizational Commitment, the mean value (M = 10.90)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 10.64) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.027 which is not significant. For Supervisory Relations, the mean value (M = 14.07)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 14.11) for the middle level managers of private undertakings.The t-value between these two means was found to be -.125 which is not significant.

For Trust, the mean value (M = 10.76)for the managers of public undertakings and (M = 9.89) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 2.908 which is significant. For Clarity in Organization, the mean value (M = 10.46) for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 9.96) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.573 which is not significant. For Recognition, the mean value (M = 7.13)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 6.87) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 1.170 which is not significant. For Economic Benefits, the mean value (M = 12.62)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M =12.43) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .705 which is not significant.

For Self Respect, the mean value (M = 11.27)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 11.10) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .778 which is not significant. For employee Health, the mean value (M = 3.57) for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 3.51) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .498 which is not significant. For Promotion, the mean value (M = 6.92)for the managers of public undertakings was found to be more or less similar (M = 6.73) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .928 which is not significant. For Quality of Work Life, the mean value (M = 168.77) for the managers of public undertakings and mean value (M = 163.48) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be 2.467 which is found to be significant at .01 level. The above table revealed that managers of public and private undertakings was significantly differs with respect to Quality of Work Life and some of its dimensions i.e. (WI, OLCL, IGR, Trust).

Table: 2

Significance of difference between middle level managers of public and private undertakings with respect to Self-Efficacy.

Variables	Organizational sectors	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
SE	Public	100	101.92	9.339	.414	.679
	Private	100	101.35	10.122		

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Table 2 shows the Mean, SD and t-values of third predictor variable Self-Efficacy, the mean value (M = 101.92)for the middle level managers of public undertakings is more or less similar (M = 101.35) for the middle level managers of private undertakings. The t-value between these two means was found to be .414 which is not significant. The above table revealed that there is no significant difference between middle level managers of public and private undertakings with respect to Self-Efficacy.

The objective of present research work was to determine the significance of difference between middle level managers of public and private undertakings with respect to Quality of Work Life and Self-Efficacy. The t-test revealed that middle level managers of public and private undertakings significantly differ with respect to Quality of Work Life and some of its dimensions; (i.e. Work Itself, Organizational Climate, Inter Group Relation and Trust). The overall Quality of Work Life was found at the higher level in public undertakings as compared to the private undertakings. Dimension wise analyses revealed that the Organizational Climate, Inter Group Relation and Trust are at the higher side in the public undertakings as compared to the private undertakings. No other dimension of Quality of Work Life reached to the .05 level of significance with respect to the difference in the public and private undertakings. The findings suggest that the perception of Quality of Work Life is better in the public undertakings as compared to the private undertakings. This may be due to the fact that the public sector organizations are strictly controlled by well established rules and regulations which are by and large in the favor of employees. Promotion and career advancement of the employees does not depend upon the profitability of the organization rather these are govern by the rules and regulations laid down by the government from time to time. One the employee enters in the public undertakings his job is more secure and he feel more satisfied with their job as compared to the private undertakings. For these reasons the employees of public undertakings may perceive better Quality of Work Life as compared to the employees of private undertakings.

Significant of difference was not found with respect to Self-Efficacy. Since our sample was comprised of middle level managers who are responsible to get things done through their subordinates and to control them at the same time they are responsible for their superiors. They have tomake a balance between their superiors and subordinates. This situation is more or less similar in public and private undertakings. That is why significant difference was not found with respect to Self-Efficacy.

Conclusion

Finally, it is concluded that the middle level managers of public undertakings experienced good quality of work life as compared to private undertakings. There may be several reasons behind this result. Managers of public undertakings have high job security as compared to private undertakings. So they may feel more comfortable in public sector as compared to private sector. Whereas with respect to Self-efficacy, there is no significance of difference is found. This might be due to following reasons : that the middle level of management is different from the higher and lower level of management, and it has more difficult duties and responsibilities as compared to the other two levels of management. At the higher level of management subordination is lesser and authorities are much more, while at the lower level of management authorities are much lesser and duties and responsibilities are more. The middle level management has to make a balance between these two. The findings of the present study are in the line of these assumptions.

References

Agarwal, S., & Mishra, P. C. (2016). Self-efficacy as predictor of organizational commitment among revenue personnel. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4), 44-52.

Ansari, M. (2017). Self-efficacy and spiritual values as predictors of life satisfaction among school teachers. Paper presented at National Conference on Professionalizing Psychology in Meeting Contemporary Needs and Challenges, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University. Aligarh, UP.

Ballout, H.I. (2009). Career commitment and career success: Moderating role of self-efficacy. *Career Development International*, 14 (7), 655-670.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, Vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, 71-81.

Baranowski, T., Perry, C. L., & Parcel, G. S. (2002). How individuals, environments, and health behavior interact. In K. Glanz, R. K. Rimer, & F. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health Behavior and Health Education* 3rd Ed.,165–184. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennium, V. (1974). On the strategic importance of quality wages life: A paper presented at the Fifth International Conference, Canada, Montreal, November.

Chan, Raymond and Joseph, Stephen (2000). Dimensions of personality, domains of aspirations and subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(2), 347-354.

Costello, J.M. & Sang, I.M. (1974). Need fulfillment and job satisfaction of professionals. *Public Personnel Management*, 3(5), 454-461.

Dargahi, H. & Seragi, J.N. (2007). An approach model for employees' improving quality of work life. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, 36(4), 81-86.

Donaldson, S.I., Sussman, S., Dent, C.W., Sevesson, H.H. & Stoddard, J.L. (1999). Health behavior, quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in the lumber industry. *Health Education Behaviour*, 26(4), 579-591.

Droussiotis, A. (2004). The profile of high performing employees in Cyprus. *The Journal of Business in Developing Nations*, 8, 39-64.

Eurofound. (2006). European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions,http://www.eurofound.eu.int/areas/industrialrelations / dictionary/definitions / Quality of Work. Accessed on 17/09/2017.

Fang, T. T. (2009). The relationship between self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Retrieved from http://etd.lib.stut.edu.tw/ETD-db/ETD- search/view_etd?URN=etd-1215110-100000-16 on April 1, 2011. Accessed on 17/09/2017.

Guna, S.R. & Maimnah, I. (2008). Construct of quality of work life: A perspective of information and technology professionals. *European Journal of Social Science*, 7(1), 58-70.

Hackman, J.R., Pearce, J. & Wolf, J.C. (1978). Effects of changes in job characteristics on work attitude and behavior. A naturally occurring quasi-experiment.*Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 21(3), 289-304.

Hurter, N. (2008). The role of self-efficacy in employee commitment (Unpublished master's thesis). University of South Africa.

Jex, S. M. & Bliese, P. D. (1999). Efficacy beliefs as a moderator of the impact of work-related stressors: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 349-361.

Johnson, P.& Marcrum, R.H. (1968). Perceived deficiencies in individual need fulfillment career army officers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 52, 457-461.

Karatepe, O. M., Arasli, H. & Khan, A. (2007). The impact of self-efficacy on job outcomes of hotel employees: Evidence from northern Cyprus. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 8(4), 23-46.

Ketzell, R.A. & Yankelovich, D. (1975). Work productivity and job satisfaction. New York, The Psychological Corporation.

Khan, M. A. (2015). Influence of quality of work life on organizational commitment among clerical-staff. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(25), 106-113.

Khan, S. M. (2016). Role of work environment on need satisfaction in Asia's largest transport public sector organization the Indian Railways. *Journal of Organization and Human Behavior*, 5(4), 44-50.

Lippitt, G.L. (1977). Quality of work life: organizational renewal in action. *Training and Development Journal*, 32(7), 4-11.

Luthans, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2002). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 21(5), 376-387.

Menton (1979). A look at factors affecting the quality of working life. *Monthly Labour Review*, 100(101), 64.

Nia, K. R., & Maleki, M. (2013). A study on the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment. *International Journals of Research in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*, 1(4), 83-94.

O'Neill, B. S., & Mone, M. A. (1998). Investigating equity sensitivity as a moderator of relations between self-efficacy and workplace attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 805-816.

Ormrod, J. E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Developing learners (5th ed.), N.J., Merrill: Upper Saddle River.

Payne, R.L. & Pheyse, D.C. (1971). G.G. Sterta's organizational climate Index: A re-conceptualization and application to business organization. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 6, 77-98.

Pugalendhi, S.B., Umaselvi M. & Nakkeeran, S.K. (2011): Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers. *Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*, 2(1), 47-65.

Rajappa, P. (1978). Motivation Management. *National Labour Institute Bulletin*.

Reena, & Jayan (2012). Role of quality of work life on the job attitude and personal effectiveness of engineering college teachers. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(6), 121-134.

Rhinehard, B. & Dewolf (1969). Comparative study of need satisfaction in government and business hierarchies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53, 530-535.

Robert, K.T. (1997). Job involvement and organisational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4) 539-545.

Rossi, A.M., Perrewee, P.L.& Sauter, S.L. (2006) Stress and Quality of Working Life, Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 663-671.

Schmidt, A. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2010). The moderating effects of performance ambiguity on the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 95(3), 572-581.

Sinha, S. P., Talwar, T., & Rajpal, R. (2002). Correlational study of organizational commitment, self-efficacy and psychological barriers to technological change. *Psychologia*, 45, 176-183.

Spink, P. (1975). Some comments on quality of work life – development of an inventory. *Journal of Social Work*, 41(3), 220-226.

Syamakinia, N., Tabrizi, M., & Zoghi, A. (2013). On the relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers and instructors. *Journal of ELT Voices*, 3(6), 90-99.

Taylor, J.C. (1973). Concepts and problems in the quality of working life. Working paper Quality of Work Life Program. U.C.L.A.

Vaezi, S. & Fallah, N. (2011). The Relationship between self-efficacy and stress among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1168-1174.

Vuuren, M. V., Jong, M. D. T. D., & Seydel, E. R. (2008). Contributions of self and organisational efficacy expectations to commitment: A fourfold typology. *Employee Relations*, 30(2), 142-155.

Walton, R.E. (1975). Criteria for quality of working life. In Davis, L.E. and Cherns, A.B. (eds.) *The Quality of Working Life* : Problems, Prospects and the State of the Art (Vol. 1), New York: The Free Press.