

A Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL) in Small Scale Unionized and Non Unionized Organization

Sarang S. Bhola*

Jyoti J. Nigade**

Key Words:

1. QWL
2. Unionized Organization
3. Non Unionized Organization
4. Trade Union

Abstract:

Beginning in the seventies and during the next two decades a constellation of principles and methods for developing working conditions had evolved into a movement called Quality of Work Life (QWL). Present research investigates the impact of trade union on level of Quality of Working Life specially of small scaled organizations in Satara industrial estate during 2010-11. The research was designed to throw light on awareness and satisfaction of employees about eight broad criteria and eighty eight micro-parameters of QWL in the presence and absence of trade union. It is comparative study of QWL between small scaled unionized and non-unionized organizations. Responses of total 100 samples are collected on Likert Scale. Data is analyzed using mean, rank and standard deviation and hypothesis is tested using independent sample't' test.

The comparative study find out that QWL in unionized organization is better than non-unionized organization. It also concludes that union plays crucial role in the improvement of QWL in organization.

Introduction:

The term QWL may be conceptualized as a sub-set of quality of life since these two terms are closely related to each other i.e. life at work is an integral part of total life space. It can be said that QWL is the quality of the content of relationship between human beings and their work. QWL involved economic benefits, physical working conditions, mental state, career orientations, advancement, job stress, effect on personal life, union management relations, self respect, etc. QWL is a shared responsibility of management and workers which represents significant dimension in industrial relations. To be meaningful, workplace reform must take place within a context of changing power relations between union and managements. Otherwise it may be overwhelmed by events occurring in external environment. Labour unions, therefore, need to participate in QWL initiatives while simultaneously making new types of demands during bargaining. (Gordon DiGiacomo.1987)

Concept of QWL and Trade Union:

In 1972 Louis Davis has coined this term first. The concept gained attention of researchers in the recent past. There are various definitions existed on QWL.

The American Center for the Quality of Working Life (1977) define QWL, 'Quality of work life improvements are defined as any activity which takes place at every level of an organization which

*The author is Associate Professor at Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Satara and can be reached at sarangbhola@gmail.com

**The author is a Research Scholar at Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Satara and can be reached at jyotinigade@gmail.com

seeks greater organizational effectiveness through the enhancement of human dignity and growtha 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'.

Many scholars defined the term in their own perspectives, few to mention :-

Balch, David E., et.al. (1989), defines QWL as it is 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.

Much broader concept of QWL stated by Richard E. Walton (1985) encompassing eight categories in it 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.

According to Jenkins (1981) The quality of work life is a broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories, and management styles through which organizations and jobs are designed so as to grant workers more autonomy, responsibility, and authority than is usually done. To simplify somewhat, the general objective is to arrange organizations, management procedures, and jobs for maximum utilization of

individual talents and skills, in order to create more challenging and satisfying work and improve organization effectiveness.

From these definitions one finds broad as well as narrow approach towards QWL. Any specific improvement in and around workplace is often included under the term of QWL.

The researchers made an attempt to assess QWL in unionized and non-unionized organization in present study.

Literature Review:

QWL is step forward to a classical job design. Leaders considered human element in organization as a human capital and not merely a factor of production. Driving and restraining forces has to play role in organization which many times lead to an allegation. The allegation is between employer and employees generally found that are, employers feeling that employees are more conscious about their rights and not the responsibilities. This allegation profoundly find at the time of collective bargaining. Employees feel that employer is only concern with the yield and profits and not the benefit of employees.

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

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

Franklin Roosevelt supported the Wagner Act in 1935 which encourages workers to join union. The act recognized unions as the authorized representatives of workers, able to bargain collectively with employers. Then onwards employees formed unions and management need to find new ways to handle union issues.

The movement of unions earns importance for human as a factor of production. Cognizance was given to the culture, ethical aspects, values, organizational development and behavioral aspects of employees. Due to setting up of corporate culture and policies many issues of unions are already be taken into consideration. The ethical and moral values established in the organization matters to the QWL of organization (Singh A.P. 1995). Existence of better working environment in an organization encourages creativity, reduces anxiety, build a positive attitude and increase job satisfaction which contributes significantly towards improved performance and efficiency of human resource Prasad et.al (2008).

Plethora of opinions found on the relationship between union and QWL. An anonymous (1979) expressed the fear that, 'If unions and companies do not meet their needs, they will have to cope with alienated workers.'

New reform into organization bicker suspicion into the mind of employees and the suspicion also prevails with management as to acceptance of reforms by workers. The reforms through which

management intends to attain efficiency. Employees and unions are expected to march hand-in-hand. Cohen et.al (1979) argued that, 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 further stated 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.

The success of management reforms is depending on mutual faith and collective work. QWL should be treated as a joint venture of management and unions via the collective bargaining process Lewin, David (1981). 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. 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 (Beck, Al (1988). Both union and management have equal credit for the success of QWL in the organization (Thacker et.al 1987). Labor-management relations are improved through joint union-management QWL projects (Bushe, Gervase R 1988). Decisions on implementations taken in joint union-management committee should diffuse down to lower levels of the organization but union leadership may send mixed messages to the rank-and-file about the extent of union support for QWL (Gilbert, Beth 1989).

QWL programs in unionized organization leads to several expectations as:

1. The two goals of an effective QWL program should be improved working conditions and greater organizational effectiveness. The changing aspirations and needs of today's employees require unions to adapt and adjust or face the prospect of extinction (Hian et.al 1990).
2. 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 influences reactions, but the perceived success of the endeavor does do so, Fields, Mitchell W.et.al. (1992).
3. 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 (Fields et.al 1992).

4. Cooperation between labour and management in the workplace is favourable to implement the QWL programs effectively and have been successful in meeting their varied goals of better working conditions, job security, employee satisfaction, employee participation in decision-making which reveal a pattern of steady improvement in productivity, profitability etc. QWL is a vehicle for gaining managerial, employee, and union commitment that would result in long-term benefits for both the Company and its employees (Peterson et.al 1992).

The expectations are fetching benefits to both management and unions and the diffusion of experience of QWL program may create an environment in the industry to adopt QWL programs.

Eaton, Adrienne and et.al (1992) argued that, unions have viewed the increasing use of QWL programs in unionized workplaces with a great deal of caution and concern because reduced member identification, commitment, and activity stemming from QWL might make it more difficult for the union to conduct a work stoppage and therefore reduce its bargaining power. Finally, to the extent that union commitment and bargaining power are weakened by participative programs, the very existence of the union may be threatened. Both union and company commitment increased after employee's involvement in a joint QWL process.

Several researches focused attention towards benefits of QWL program in unionized organizations.

1. Porter, Nelson D (1984) in their article, 'Union Endorses Quality of Working Life' states that, the QWL program has led to create mutual trust between labor and management and also strengthened union members' attitudes toward the union. Workers become more self-confident, committed, and freer from job-related stresses. 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 (Gene Bocioletti 1987).
2. One anonymous (1981) focused on benefits like smoother and less adversarial collective bargaining for entire company as well as all participants in a QWL program.

Unlike advantages of any management reforms QWL programs is not free from disadvantages. QWL programs have to introduce work changes that would decrease dissatisfaction in the work area (Rubinstein, Saul 1984), and need to increase workers participation in problem solving with QWL program. One

anonymous (1981) expressed the fear of some unions about exploitation of the rank and file membership, after management has won union cooperation in a QWL program.

Martin D Hanlon, David A Nadler (1986) noted that, organized labour cannot be benefited from union participation in QWL programmes until such programmes have spread rapidly.

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 since it involves finding out the reasons behind status of QWL in both organization where unions are existed and the second organization where non existence of union is found.

The study of QWL and trade union is undertaken to test following hypothesis.

H⁰ – A QWL in unionized organization does not differ than QWL in Non-unionized organization.

Primary data is collected with the help of structured schedule. Structure includes eighty eight variables depicting QWL in engineering units. These variables were organized in 8 broad criteria 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. Twenty 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. Workers and executives were the samples. Responses were taken on Likert Scale. Classification and analysis is done thereon. Data is collected using five point scale. Using this scale satisfaction for each variable from every sample is assessed. These comments then converted to mean and ranks are given to the mean score. Higher the mean first is the rank and so on. The higher mean denotes more satisfaction of samples about that variable. The ranks are calculated for the responses from unionized and un-unionized samples. Consistency in the opinions of samples is measured by using standard deviation. Further hypothesis is tested by independent sample 't' test.

Data Analysis:

This section of paper discusses data analysis.

Exhibit 1 depicts mean, ranks and standard deviation for seven variables of adequate and fair compensation

The greater mean of sample workers in unionized organization than of non-unionized organization shows more satisfaction among samples of unionized organization about adequate and fair compensation. Both types of organizations follow statutory compliances firmly since workers in unionized as well as non-unionized organization are strongly satisfied with provision of P.F., E.S.I., and Bonus etc. But on another hand both types of organizations are lagging to provide productivity based incentives.

There is more consistency in the opinion of non-unionized workers

Exhibit 1 : Adequate and Fair Compensation:

| Sr No. | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|--------|---|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Organization pays workers according to Minimum Wages Act. | 3.12 | 4 | 0.72 | 2.74 | 4 | 0.66 |
| 2 | Payment of Bonus as per Bonus Act. | 3.30 | 3 | 0.76 | 2.80 | 3 | 0.61 |
| 3 | Overtime pay at double rate | 2.32 | 6 | 1.15 | 1.40 | 6 | 0.81 |
| 4 | Productivity based incentive | 2.24 | 7 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 7 | 0.00 |
| 5 | Provision of provident fund | 3.52 | 1 | 0.50 | 3.06 | 2 | 0.24 |
| 6 | Provision of Medical Fund or E.S.I. | 3.36 | 2 | 0.48 | 3.12 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 7 | Other employees welfare schemes | 2.42 | 5 | 1.01 | 1.66 | 5 | 0.85 |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.964 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.000 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Exhibit 2 : Immediate Opportunity to Use And Develop Human Capacity:

| Sr No. | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|--------|---|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Workers participation in decision making | 2.90 | 6 | 0.54 | 2.12 | 5 | 0.87 |
| 2 | Workers require multiple skill to do the job | 3.60 | 1 | 0.49 | 2.64 | 2 | 0.53 |
| 3 | Workers perform complete job | 3.44 | 2 | 0.58 | 2.56 | 3 | 0.58 |
| 4 | Regular feedback about work to employees | 3.36 | 4 | 0.66 | 2.70 | 1 | 0.61 |
| 5 | Workers enjoys autonomy at work | 3.38 | 3 | 0.53 | 2.20 | 4 | 0.76 |
| 6 | Moderate delegation of authority to workers | 3.32 | 5 | 0.65 | 1.44 | 6 | 0.79 |
| 7 | Management practiced redesigning | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | Management evaluated effects of redesigning | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | Management diagnose job before redesigning | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | Management consult workers before redesigning | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.600 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.208 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

about adequate and fair compensation as compared to unionized workers since standard deviation in opinions of unionized workers is more than of non-unionized workers.

Rank correlation is 0.964 which is significant at 99% confidence level.

Exhibit 3 contain information regarding satisfaction of samples towards different safe and healthy working conditions of the organization

Exhibit 3 : Safe And Healthy Working Conditions:

| Sr.No. | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|--------|---|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Floor cleanness | 3.44 | 9 | 0.76 | 2.80 | 9 | 0.57 |
| 2 | Sanitary and drainage cleanness | 3.36 | 14 | 0.66 | 2.82 | 7 | 0.48 |
| 3 | Disposal of wastes and effluents | 3.54 | 7 | 0.68 | 2.50 | 18 | 0.51 |
| 4 | Adequate light arrangement | 3.94 | 1 | 0.65 | 3.16 | 1 | 0.55 |
| 5 | Ventilation and temperature | 3.18 | 16 | 0.60 | 2.40 | 21 | 0.73 |
| 6 | Dust and Fumes | 2.66 | 23 | 0.48 | 2.46 | 20 | 0.61 |
| 7 | Overcrowding | 1.74 | 29 | 0.83 | 2.26 | 22 | 0.56 |
| 8 | Latrines and urinals | 3.42 | 12 | 0.50 | 2.88 | 4 | 0.52 |
| 9 | Fencing of machinery | 3.76 | 2 | 0.59 | 2.62 | 15 | 0.75 |
| 10 | Work on or near machinery in motion | 3.08 | 20 | 0.44 | 2.16 | 23 | 0.62 |
| 11 | Striking Gears and devices for cutting off power | 3.44 | 9 | 0.50 | 2.88 | 4 | 0.52 |
| 12 | Casing of new machinery | 3.60 | 5 | 0.49 | 2.76 | 11 | 0.48 |
| 13 | Hoists and lifts | 2.44 | 24 | 1.07 | 1.90 | 25 | 0.81 |
| 14 | Lifting machines, chains, ropes and lifting tackles | 2.40 | 25 | 1.03 | 1.78 | 26 | 0.76 |
| 15 | Revolving machinery | 3.10 | 18 | 0.51 | 2.48 | 19 | 0.54 |
| 16 | Pits, sumps, openings in floor | 3.62 | 3 | 0.49 | 2.66 | 13 | 0.63 |
| 17 | Excessive weights | 1.86 | 28 | 0.93 | 2.10 | 24 | 0.79 |
| 18 | Explosive/inflammable dust & gases | 2.02 | 27 | 1.12 | 1.68 | 28 | 0.79 |
| 19 | Safety Limit Marking | 3.58 | 6 | 0.50 | 2.90 | 3 | 0.51 |
| 20 | Safety space between machine | 3.40 | 13 | 0.57 | 2.58 | 17 | 0.73 |
| 21 | Safety goggles and shoes etc. | 3.62 | 3 | 0.49 | 2.66 | 13 | 0.87 |
| 22 | Site Development | 3.46 | 8 | 0.50 | 2.60 | 16 | 0.53 |
| 23 | Dinning and Rest room | 2.80 | 22 | 0.76 | 1.60 | 29 | 0.81 |
| 24 | Drinking Water | 3.44 | 9 | 0.50 | 2.96 | 2 | 0.53 |
| 25 | First Aid Box | 2.98 | 21 | 0.59 | 2.82 | 7 | 0.44 |
| 26 | Industrial Uniform | 3.14 | 17 | 0.50 | 2.78 | 10 | 0.62 |
| 27 | Canteen Facilities | 2.26 | 26 | 1.14 | 1.70 | 27 | 0.95 |
| 28 | Formal Safety Training | 3.34 | 15 | 0.72 | 2.70 | 12 | 0.51 |
| 29 | Fire Fighting Equipment's | 3.10 | 18 | 0.51 | 2.88 | 4 | 0.44 |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.660 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.00 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Unionized workers are more satisfied than non-unionized workers about safe and healthy working conditions as their mean is greater than of non-unionized workers for most of the parameters. Workers in sample organizations are suffering from explosive/inflammable dust and gases, excessive weights as well as they are not happy with canteen facilities.

Rank correlation is 0.660 which is significant at 99% confidence level.

Exhibit 2 shows opinions of samples towards availability of immediate opportunities to use and develop human capacities.

Opinions of unionized workers 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-unionized organization.

Both organizations are lagging to implement the job redesigning

Exhibit 4: Opportunity for Continued Career Growth and Security:

| Sr No. | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Challenging job opportunities | 3.48 | 2 | 0.58 | 2.72 | 3 | 0.50 |
| 2 | Internal Training | 3.42 | 3 | 0.61 | 2.56 | 5 | 0.61 |
| 3 | Promotion or upward move | 2.84 | 7 | 0.58 | 1.94 | 7 | 0.79 |
| 4 | Employed job rotation system | 2.88 | 6 | 0.52 | 2.12 | 6 | 0.87 |
| 5 | Arrangement for employment security | 3.50 | 1 | 0.51 | 2.64 | 4 | 0.56 |
| 6 | Chance for expanding knowledge | 3.38 | 4 | 0.60 | 3.12 | 1 | 0.44 |
| 7 | Personality development | 3.36 | 5 | 0.60 | 2.90 | 2 | 0.36 |
| 8 | Suggestion Scheme | 2.00 | 8 | 1.07 | 1.82 | 8 | 0.90 |
| 9 | Career planning system / policy | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 10 | Career counseling | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 11 | Career development workshops | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 12 | Mentoring programs | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13 | Assessment centers | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 14 | External Training | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.619 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.10 | | | | | |

Exhibit 5: Social Integration in the Work Organization:

| Sr No | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|-------|--|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Existence of natural work units. | 3.64 | 1 | 0.53 | 2.50 | 5 | 0.86 |
| 2 | Workers Meeting | 3.10 | 7 | 0.61 | 1.84 | 8 | 0.91 |
| 3 | Top executives involved in socio cultural activities | 3.04 | 9 | 0.57 | 2.36 | 7 | 0.72 |
| 4 | Celebration of different festivals | 3.26 | 4 | 0.56 | 2.62 | 2 | 0.70 |
| 5 | Sense of community | 3.48 | 3 | 0.58 | 2.56 | 4 | 0.67 |
| 6 | Inter personnel openness | 3.26 | 4 | 0.53 | 2.50 | 5 | 0.61 |
| 7 | Workers receive humanized treatment | 3.58 | 2 | 0.50 | 2.62 | 2 | 0.49 |
| 8 | Freedom from prejudice | 3.06 | 8 | 0.62 | 2.76 | 1 | 0.62 |
| 9 | Workers meeting with top officials | 3.24 | 6 | 0.56 | 1.82 | 9 | 0.92 |
| 10 | Workers meetings with owners / Directors | 2.18 | 10 | 1.27 | 1.14 | 10 | 0.45 |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.453 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.18 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

policy which is a major hurdle in their human resource development.

Rank correlation is 0.600 which is not significant.

Exhibit 4 shows views of all samples towards career development in the organization. In unionized organization opportunities for

continued career growth and security are available in plenty as compared to non-unionized organization as there is more satisfaction in the opinions of unionized workers.

Workers in unionized organization enjoy more job security and develop themselves by using various opportunities and training. Both types of organizations does not give importance to career building of their employees, since they do not have career

planning system, career counseling, career development workshops, mentoring programs and availability of training and development program from external sources.

Rank correlation is 0.619 which is not significant.

Exhibit 5 shows mean with ranks for different variables of social integration in the work organization.

Above table denotes more satisfaction among unionized workers than non-unionized towards social integration in the work organization as their mean score are greater as compared to non-unionized organizations. There is more consistency in opinions of unionized workers excluding workers meetings with owners / directors.

Rank correlation is 0.453 which is not significant.

Exhibit 6 shows views of respondents towards constitutional

Exhibit 6: Constitution in the Work Organization:

| Sr | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|----|-------------------------------|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | privacy | 3.20 | 2 | 0.61 | 2.56 | 1 | 0.61 |
| 2 | Scope for free speech | 3.52 | 1 | 0.58 | 2.52 | 2 | 0.58 |
| 3 | Recruitment procedure | 3.14 | 3 | 0.61 | 2.52 | 2 | 0.74 |
| 4 | Promotion policy | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Disciplinary Procedure | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | Grievance Procedure | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7 | Training & Development Policy | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | Performance Appraisal Policy | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.00 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 1.00 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Exhibit 7: Balanced Role of Work in the Total Life Space:

| Sr No | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionised Org. | | |
|----------|---|----------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Overtime work | 2.56 | 6 | 0.67 | 2.52 | 6 | 0.54 |
| 2 | Work during inconvenient hours | 1.92 | 8 | 0.85 | 1.80 | 8 | 0.78 |
| 3 | Overload of work | 2.24 | 7 | 0.77 | 2.08 | 7 | 0.70 |
| 4 | Employees enjoy weekly off. | 3.48 | 1 | 0.58 | 2.98 | 1 | 0.38 |
| 5 | Employees avail Government declared Holidays | 3.26 | 4 | 0.63 | 2.74 | 2 | 0.63 |
| 6 | Employees enjoy pay leaves | 3.46 | 2 | 0.54 | 2.56 | 4 | 0.64 |
| 7 | Equality In Work | 3.30 | 3 | 0.61 | 2.70 | 3 | 0.46 |
| 8 | Worker spare time for family balancing his work | 3.00 | 5 | 0.61 | 2.54 | 5 | 0.68 |
| 9 | Transfers | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Spearman's rho | 0.905 | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.002 | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

protection in the organization.

Exhibit 6 depicts that unionized workers are more satisfied with constitution in the organization than non-unionized organization as the mean values of unionized organizations are greater than of non-unionized organizations. But according to the standard deviation consistency in opinions of both types of workers is nearly same.

Sample workers in both organizations are quite familiar with recruitment policy but they are unknown about the other policies and procedures.

Rank correlation is 0.00 which is not significant.

Exhibit 7 shows satisfaction of all samples towards balanced role of work in the total life space.

Exhibit 8: Social Relevance of Work

| Sr No | Parameters | Unionized Org. | | | Non-Unionized Org. | | |
|-------|--------------------------|----------------|------|----|--------------------|------|----|
| | | Mean | Rank | SD | Mean | Rank | SD |
| 1 | Social relevance of work | 3.10 | - | - | 2.94 | - | - |
| | Spearman's rho | - | | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | - | | | | | |

Source: (Compiled by researcher)

Exhibit 9: Hypothesis Testing Using Sample T Test

| Sr. No | Parameters | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|--------|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|
| | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| 1 | Adequate and fair compensation | Equal variances assumed | 4.447 | .059 | 1.434 | 11 | .179 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.480 | 10.518 | .168 |
| 2 | Safe and healthy working conditions | Equal variances assumed | 2.474 | .121 | 4.255 | 55 | .000 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.231 | 49.052 | .000 |
| 3 | Opportunity to develop human capacities | Equal variances assumed | 5.015 | .052 | 5.237 | 9 | .001 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 5.731 | 5.633 | .002 |
| 4 | Career growth and development | Equal variances assumed | .033 | .859 | 2.228 | 13 | .044 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.207 | 12.076 | .047 |
| 5 | Social integration in work place | Equal variances assumed | 1.226 | .284 | 4.054 | 17 | .001 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.108 | 16.726 | .001 |
| 6 | Constitutionalism in work place | Equal variances assumed | 900.937 | .000 | 5.584 | 3 | .011 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.183 | 1.010 | .148 |
| 7 | Balance role in life space | Equal variances assumed | 2.448 | .142 | 1.763 | 13 | .101 |
| | | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.705 | 9.631 | .120 |

Source: (Compiled 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 organizations enjoy the weekly off, holidays etc. but suffer a lot due to work during inconvenient hours and overload of work.

Rank correlation is 0.905 which is significant at 95% confidence level.

Exhibit 8 shows satisfaction of all samples towards Social relevance of work.

Table reveals that the satisfaction towards social relevance of work is more with unionized organization as compare to non unionized organization.

Hypothesis Testing:

The hypothesis set to test for this study is, A QWL in unionized organization does not differ than QWL in Non-unionized organization. Hypothesis is tested using independent sample 't' test.

From exhibit 9 it reveals that the test is not significant with two parameters one is Adequate and fair compensation and another is Balance role in life space.

The test is significant with the parameters viz. Safe and healthy working conditions, Opportunity to develop human capacities, Career growth and development, Social integration in work place, Constitutionalism in work place.

Compensation is generally found at par in all the units since it is aspect of prime consideration otherwise people would run after greener pasture. Apart from compensation almost in the entire variable set the difference lies. It may not be appropriate to quote that due to only unions the significant difference lies into these variables of QWL but it is a matter of fact that, in unionized organization the status of quality of quality of work life is excel as compare to non unionized organization.

Conclusion:

Present research is comparative study of prevailing QWL between unionized and non-unionized organization which focus on significant role of union in developing and maintaining high degree of QWL in organization. Unions try to avoid exploitation of workers and facilitates them which results into high degree of satisfaction, productivity and greater organizational effectiveness. While in case of non-unionized organizations workers have no platform to put forward their demands, which affect on their morality and performance. Thus it can be concluded that union impose better QWL in organization.

Reference:

- 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.

Bocialetti Gene (1987), 'Quality of Work Life Some Unintended Effects on the Seniority Tradition of an Industrial Union,' Group & Organization Studies, December, 12(4), 386-411.

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.

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

Dale S. Beach, (1985), 'Personnel Management - The Management of People at Work', Macmillan publishing Company, New York, Collier Macmillan Publishers, London, 5th Edition, page no.325-326.

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.

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.

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.

Hanlon Martin D, Nadler David A (1986), 'Research Notes: Unionists' Attitudes toward Joint Union--Management Quality of Work Life Programmes,' Journal of Occupational Behavior, January, 7(1), 53-60.

Peterson, Richard B, Tracy, Lane (1992), 'Assessing Effectiveness of Joint Committees in a Labor-Management Cooperation Program,' Human Relations, 45(5), 467-489.

Porter, Nelson D (1984), 'Union Endorses Quality of Working Life,' Canadian Business Review, 11(4), 10-13.

Rao Subba P. (2006) Human Resource Management and Industrial Relation, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai.

Rubinstein, Saul (1984), 'QWL, the Union, the Specialist and Employment Security,' Training and Development Journal, March, 38(3), 81-85.

Singh A.P. (1995), 'Values-System and Quality of Work-Life - The IPLC Experience,' Human Values for Managers, Wheeler Publication, 1st edition, 17-25.

Thacker, James W., Fields, Mitchell W (1987), 'Union Involvement in Quality-of-Work life Efforts: A Longitudinal Investigation,' Personnel Psychology, 40(1), 97-112.

<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-189653414.html>

www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1647153&show=html

www.jstor.org/stable/3486655