Social Relevance of Working Life for Women Employees in Small Scale Industries: An Empirical Study

S.C.Patil *
Chetan V. Hiremath **

Key Words:

1 Social Relevance of Working Life
2 Women Employee
3 Small Scale Industry

Abstract:
In developing country like India still the role of women as an employee is limited due lack of education. She is forced to work to meet both the ends meet. Also, she has to do the daily core of work at home. In this context Social Relevance of working life plays an important role.

A primary survey method is adopted to collect the necessary data. Cochran's and Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) used to compare the scores across the genders. The study found that balance between work and social life for women is dependent on cooperation of colleagues.

Introduction :

The concept, Quality of Work Life, appeared in the USA in mid 1970's in Research Journals. The concept was being given potential importance right from early 1950's. With the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the nineteenth century, the industrial worker had to adopt himself to machines that had become increasingly independent of both human energy and human ingenuity for their operation. Towards the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, Taylor and Fayol (1841- 1925) proposed ways to improve the role of the worker .Their views improved the economical performance of the firms but increased human problems, including boredom, under-utilization of intellectual skills, alienation, absenteeism and turn-over.

Many attempts were directed towards the refinement of Scientific Management by applying new insights. But they were not in the interests of workers, but to optimize its manipulative capacity in the interests of higher productivity and profit. This abuse of behavioural science separated the human organisation of industry from its technological organisation and left Scientific Management virtually intact and brought the school into disrepute.

Many approach towards work evolved to address these problems. Maslow proposed hierarchy of needs theory. Mcgregor identified need of power, achievement and affiliation. Herzberg(1966) isolated five motivators of work: (1) the need for achievement, (2) recognition by others (3) the work it self, (4) responsibility, and (5) the opportunity for advancement. Tavistock Institute of London focussed on the integration of technical as well as human and social dimensions of industry (the Socio-Technical System). The socio-technical approach fostered the idea that there appears to be a possible and desirable alternative to the modes of work organisation inherited from Scientific Management for a given technology. There is not only one but several possible and effective ways of organisation work. Some of these offer better socio-technical combinations than others and allow for improvement in the Quality of Work Life (QWL) without sacrificing any of the organisational effectiveness of the enterprise.

* The author is Director at KLE's College of Business Administration, Hubli and can be reached at patilsc2809@gmail.com

* *The author is Assistant Professor at Global Business School, Hubli

Development of The Concept :

The main concept used to explain Quality of Work Life (QWL) is that of the 'socio-technical system'. Using this approach Rice(1958) re-organised the automatic weaving shed in Calico Mills, Ahmedabad. This internal group structure helped for better task accomplishment. His reportis well received by many scholars in the field(Likert 1961, Davis 1962, Mcgregor 1960, Myers 1959 and Katz and Kahn 1969.According to this system the productive system has three key dimensions which are all interdependent-the technological, the social and economic. Yet each of these possesses its own scale of independent values. To pursue one set of these and ignore the others is to invite trouble, if not disaster. More formally, optimising along one dimension does not produce optimal results for the system as a whole. Overall system optimisation usualiy implies sub-optimisation along each dimension Rice (1963).

The above studies contributed towards the evolution of the better concept of Quality of Work Life (QWL). Today ,the term 'Quality of Work Life' (QWL) has become well known not only to social scientists, but to laymen as well. This has been so, particularly, in the first world (Thorsrud 1977, Wilson 1973, Blichfeldt 1976).

In the development process, the term, Quality of Work Life has been defined by several social scientists (Walton 1974, Lippitte and Rumley 1977, Seashore 1978, and Jinkins 1981) and the word

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

has acquired many different definitions that the term has led to confusion(Nadler and Lawler ,1983) .The United States experience is closest to what has been termed as "confusion" (Emery 1974, Bharadwaj 1983).

Definition :

In a way, any conscious effort that is amied at improving working conditions, work content, and its attendent conditions like safety, security, wages and benefits can legitimately quality as Quality of Work Life (QWL) activity, Ultimately, Quality of Work Life (QWL) is a concern not only to improve life at work, but also life outside work. After all, the two cannot be linked. One notices from this the widely divergent views of Quality of Work Life (QWL) varying, from global view of the role of work in one's life to as narrow concern as job content.Despite the abundance of interest and activity, a single, well developed definition of just what constitutes a high-quality work situation seems to be missing.

Factors of Quality Work Life :

Walton (1974) one of the major interpreters of the quality of work life movement has proposed eight major conceptual areas for under-standing. What this, is all about: -adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy environment, development of human capacities, growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism the total life space and social relevance (Walton, 1974). Some of the difference's in definition lie in the different view points of the different interpretors Seashore (1975) for example, has pointed out that much of the research and theorising in the quality of work life areas has been based primarily on the assumption that it is the individual's own personal satisfaction or dissatisfaction that defines the quality of his or her work rather her than any "objective criterian (Seashore, 1975). However, due to individual differences in culture, social class, family rearing, education and personality, a wide range of human preferences exists and any assessment of improvements in the quality of work life would be especially subject to these differences in personal expectations. One man's meat may be another man's poison.

Individuals do not, however, have completely unique standards for evaluating the quality of the work in common, systematic, measurable and predicExhibit patterns, as Walton points out (Walton 1975). Thus, among other things, the nature of different occupations can be responsible for differences in evaluating the quality of the work situation. Other investigators look beyond these differences between individual perspectives and differences in-group membership to the study of those common expectations that determine the quality of work life. Studies show that a relatively few environmental variables explain or account for about one-half of the variability in job satisfaction, broadly defined, as measured across all categories of employees (Seashore, 1975). It can, thus, be concluded that there are in fact systematic and universal characteristics of the work environment, which yield high levels of satisfaction and well being on the part of employees generally. Experience per se is only one element among the many factors involved in the quality of work life.

Rosow (1980) explains the importance of work more in detail and relates it to success and failure of a man in his society. According to him, work is the core of life, considering the deeper meaning of work to be individual and to life's values. Work means being a good provider, it means autonomy, it pays off in success and it establishes self-respect or self-worth. Within this framework, the person who openly confesses active job-dissatisfaction is verily admitting failure as a man, a failure in fulfilling his moral role in society."

Quality of Work Life is very significant in the context of commitment to work motivation and job performance. It is the degree to which members of a work organisation are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organisation. Managerial expectations are strongly linked with the organizational Quality of Work Life and it is a means to facilitate the gratification of human needs and goal achievement. Improvisation and changes in Quality of Work Life is, thus, sought, when the existing Quality of Work Life frustrates human efforts towards self-actualization and advancement.

Guest H Robert (1979) a noted behavioural scientist talks about feelings of an employee about his work while defining Quality of Work Life. He further points out the effect of Quality of Work Life on person's life. According to him, "Quality of Work Life is a generic phrase that covers a person's feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards and benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and interpersonal relations and its intrinsic meaning in person's life". It is a process by which an organisation attempts to unlock the creative potential of its people by involving them in decisions, affecting their work lives.

Methodology :

The entire plan of the investigation rests upon the propositions that: There are measurable differences among (levels) with respect to perception of Quality of Work Life. Individual has his own set or criteria to evaluate his/her work life, thereby perceive Quality of Work Life accordingly.

The "work life concept" consists of many factors, each of which plays its role in evaluating work life (Walton 1974). The factors in reference to present investigation are Social responsibility of the firm employed, effect of present job on social prestige, Family support, match between work and social life and how well an employee is supported by co workers.

The information from women employees form small scale organisations is collected. Mostly all the respondents are unskilled or semiskilled because of their educational back grounds. The responses were obtained for the measure from various small scale units in and around Hubli-Dharwad .

For the sake of precaution the respondents were assured that the data would be confidential and not available to the management. For collecting the responses on 'Quality of Work Life' measures, respondents were contacted individually to help them to understand the items of measures as some of whom had the barrier of language.

The instrument's validity was cross checked with managers and other workers from the small scale industries. Due to the simplicity of the design, less number of questions and type of data collected,

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

the reliability is doubt full with Cronbach's alpha less than standard value.

The dichotomous responses collected are analyised using Cochran's and Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) statistics. For a 2*2*2 matrix as in our case three test are required. CMH statistic tests whether X and Y are independent given Z .MH test measures average strength of the association. The homogeneity of odds ratio between X and Y for given categories of Z is given by Breslow-Day Test[1].

Findings and Analysis :

Most of the male respondents are shop floor employees and female are support staff. Throughout the study "balance between work and social life" is compared with other factors of relevance keeping gender as a controlled variable. Thus, CMH statistic will test whether "balance between work and social life" and other factor are independent given the gender. Whereas, MH test studies whether the strength of average association is significant and Breslow-Day test finds out whether the odds ratios for "balance between work and social life" and given variable are same for both the genders.

Social Responsibility of The Firm Employed:

The proportion of the employees who felt that their firm is not socially responsible was more than those who believed otherwise. However, it is observed that those who felt that there was no "balance between work and social life" were more negative about their firm being socially responsible (Exhibit 2). More than female members male members felt negatively about their firm. However, there is no significant difference between the views of genders (Exhibit 3 & 4). Also, "balance between work and social life" is independent of "Social Responsibility of the firm employed" controlling for gender (Exhibit 3 & 5).

Exhibit 1 : Socially Responsible Match between Work and Social Life

			match between work and social life		
Gender			no	yes	Total
Female	socially responsible	no	22	15	37
		yes	1	0	1
	Total		23	15	38
Male	socially responsible	no	11	9	20
		yes	1	1	2
	Total		12	10	22
Total	socially responsible	no	33	24	57
		yes	2	1	3
	Total		35	25	60

Source: Primary Data

Exhibit 2 : Risk Estimate

Gender		Value	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Female	For cohort match between work and social life = no	.595	.456	.776
	N of Valid Cases	38		
Male	Odds Ratio for socially responsible (no / yes)	1.222	.067	22.401
	For cohort match between work and socialite = no	1.100	.260	4.650
	For cohort match between work and social life = yes	.900	.207	3.907
	N of Valid Cases	22		
Total	Odds Ratio for socially responsible (no / yes)	.688	.059	8.026
	For cohort match between work and social life = no	.868	.379	1.992
	For cohort match between work and social life = yes	1.263	.248	6.441
	N of Valid Cases	60		

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 3 : Chi-Square Tests

Gender		Value	df	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Female	Pearson Chi-Square	.670[a]	1	.413		
	Continuity Correction	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.022	1	.312		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.605
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.652	1	.419		
	N of Valid Cases	38				
Male	Pearson Chi-Square	.018c	1	.892		
	Continuity Correctionb	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.018	1	.892		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.714
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.895		
	N of Valid Cases	22				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.090d	1	.764		
	Continuity Correctionb	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.092	1	.761		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.626
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.089	1	.766		
	N of Valid Cases	60				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .91.

d. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25.

Exhibit 4 : Tests of Homogeneity of the Odds Ratio

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Breslow-Day	0.633	1	0.426
Tarone's	0.633	1	0.426

Exhibit 5 : Tests of Conditional Independence

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Cochran's	0.135	1	.713
Mantel-Haenszel	0.054	1	.816

Under the conditional independence assumption, Cochran's statistic is asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution, only if the number of strata is fixed, while the Mantel-Haenszel statistic is always asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution. Note that the continuity correction is removed from the Mantel-Haenszel statistic when the sum of the differences between the observed and the expected is 0.

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 7 : Job Affects Social Prestige Match Between Work and Social Life

			match between work and social life		
Gender			No	Yes	Total
Female	job affects social prestige	no	17	12	29
		yes	6	3	9
	Total		23	15	38
Male	job affects social prestige	no	10	9	19
		yes	2	1	3
	Total		12	10	22
Total	job affects social prestige	no	27	21	48
		yes	8	4	12
	Total		35	25	60

Source: Primary Data

Exhibit 7 : Chi-Square Tests

Gender		Value	df (2-sided)	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Exact Sig.
Female	Pearson Chi-Square	.186[a]	1	.666		
	Continuity Correctionb	.002	1	.967		
	Likelihood Ratio	.189	1	.664		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.490
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.181	1	.670		
	N of Valid Cases	38				
Male	Pearson Chi-Square	.206[c]	1	.650		
	Continuity Correctionb	.000	1	1.000		
	Likelihood Ratio	.210	1	.646		
	Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.571
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.196	1	.658		
	N of Valid Cases	22				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	.429[d]	1	.513		
	Continuity Correctionb	.107	1	.743		
	Likelihood Ratio	.437	1	.509		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.745	.376
	Linear-by-Linear Association	.421	1	.516		
	N of Valid Cases	60				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.55.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.36.

d. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.00.

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 8 : Risk Estimate

Gender			95% Confidence Interval	
		Value	Lower	Upper
Female	Odds Ratio for job affects social prestige (no / yes)	.708	.147	3.407
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = no	.879	.505	1.530
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = yes	1.241	.447	3.444
	N of Valid Cases	38		
Male	Odds Ratio for job affects social prestige (no / yes)	.556	.043	7.214
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = no	.789	.319	1.955
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = yes	1.421	.268	7.541
	N of Valid Cases	22		
Total	Odds Ratio for job affects social prestige (no / yes)	.643	.170	2.428
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = no	.844	.527	1.352
	For cohort match between work and sociallife = yes	1.313	.554	3.108
	N of Valid Cases	60		

Exhibit 9 : Tests of Homogeneity of the Odds Ratio

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Breslow-Day	.025	1	.874
Tarone's	.025	1	.874

Exhibit 10 : Tests of Conditional Independence

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Cochran's	.368	1	.544
Mantel-Haenszel	.073	1	.786

Under the conditional independence assumption, Cochran's statistic is asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution, only if the number of strata is fixed, while the Mantel-Haenszel statistic is always asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution. Note that the continuity correction is removed from the Mantel-Haenszel statistic when the sum of the differences between the observed and the expected is 0.

Job Affects Social Prestige:

The proportion of the employees who felt that Job affects social prestige was more than those who believed otherwise. However, it is observed that those who felt that there was a "balance between work and social life" were more negative about Job affecting social prestige (Exhibit 8). However, there is no significant difference between the views of genders (Exhibit 7 & 9). Also, "balance between work and social life" is independent of "Job affects Social Prestige" controlling for gender (Exhibit 7 & 10).

Family Support :

Many statistics were not calculated as there are few observations in some cells. It is observed that the view of male members was divided were as most of the female employees believed that family support was not a matter of concern for them. Balance between work and social life is independent of family support (Exhibit 12 & 14).

Support From Workmates:

The Risk statistic was calculated only for the "cohort yes", i.e the views of only those employees who said there is a balance between work and social life is considered. The views do not vary across the categories (Exhibit 2). Female members felt that co operation of colleagues affected their balance between work and social life than male members. (Exhibit 3 & 4). Also, "balance between work and social life" is not independent of "support from colleagues" controlling for gender (Exhibit 3 & 5).

Conclusion:

The social responsibility of the firm employed, social prestige associated with the job , family support did not really mattered to the workers. However, the views varied depending on gender and whether worker's life was balanced between work and social life.

Source: Primary Data

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 11 : Family support * match between work and social life * Gender Count

			match between work and social life		
Gender			no	yes	Total
Female	Family support	no	23	14	37
		yes	0	1	1
	Total		23	15	38
Male	Family support	no	12	10	22
	Total		12	10	22
Total	Family support	no	35	24	59
		yes	0	1	1
	Total		35	25	60

Source: Primary Data

Exhibit 12 : Chi-Square Tests

Gender		Value	df (2-sided)	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Exact Sig.
Female	Pearson Chi-Square	1.575a	1	.210		
	Continuity Correctionb	.048	1	.827		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.901	1	.168		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.395	.395
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.533	1	.216		
	N of Valid Cases	38				
Male	Pearson Chi-Square	.c				
	N of Valid Cases	22				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	1.424d	1	.233		
	Continuity Correctionb	.029	1	.865		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.775	1	.183		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.417	.417
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.400	1	.237		
	N of Valid Cases	60				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .39.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. No statistics are computed because Family support is a constant.

d. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .42.

Exhibit 13 : Tests of Homogeneity of the Odds Ratio

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Breslow-Day	.	.	.
Tarone's	.	.	.

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 14 : Tests of Conditional Independence

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Cochran's	1.575	1	.210
Mantel-Haenszel	.046	1	.829

Under the conditional independence assumption, Cochran's statistic is asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution, only if the number of strata is fixed, while the Mantel-Haenszel statistic is always asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution. Note that the continuity correction is removed from the Mantel-Haenszel statistic when the sum of the differences between the observed and the expected is 0.

Exhibit 15 : A Memebr of Work Team * Match between Work and Social Life

			match between work and social life		
	Gender	no	yes		Total
Female	memebr of work team	no	23	11	34
		yes	0	4	4
	Total		23	15	38
Male	memebr of work team	no	12	9	21
		yes	0	1	1
	Total		12	10	22
Total	memebr of work team	no	35	20	55
		yes	0	5	5
	Total		35	25	60

Source: Primary Data

Exhibit 16 : Tests of Homogeneity of the Odds Ratio

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Breslow-Day	.	.	.
Tarone's	.	.	.

Exhibit 17 : Tests of Conditional Independence

	Chi-Squared	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Cochran's	8.061	1	.005
Mantel-Haenszel	5.402	1	.020

Under the conditional independence assumption, Cochran's statistic is asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution, only if the number of strata is fixed, while the Mantel-Haenszel statistic is always asymptotically distributed as a 1 df chi-squared distribution. Note that the continuity correction is removed from the Mantel-Haenszel statistic when the sum of the differences between the observed and the expected is 0.

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

Exhibit 18 : Chi-Square Tests

Gender		Value	df (2-sided)	Asymp. Sig (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Exact Sig.
Female	Pearson Chi-Square	6.855a	1	.009		
	Continuity Correctionb	4.316	1	.038		
	Likelihood Ratio	8.176	1	.004		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.018	.018
	Linear-by-Linear Association	6.675	1	.010		
	N of Valid Cases	38				
Male	Pearson Chi-Square	1.257c	1	.262		
	Continuity Correctionb	.009	1	.926		
	Likelihood Ratio	1.634	1	.201		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.455	.455
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1.200	1	.273		
	N of Valid Cases	22				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	7.636d	1	.006		
	Continuity Correctionb	5.243	1	.022		
	Likelihood Ratio	9.400	1	.002		
	Fisher's Exact Test				.010	.010
	Linear-by-Linear Association	7.509	1	.006		
	N of Valid Cases	60				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .45.

d. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.08.

Exhibit 19 : Risk Estimate

Gender		Value	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
Female	For cohort match between work and social life = yes	.324	.199	.526
	N of Valid Cases 38			
Male	For cohort match between work and social life = yes	.429	.262	.702
	N of Valid Cases 22			
Total	For cohort match between work and social life = yes	.364	.256	.516
	N of Valid Cases 60			

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)

The only factor which made significant difference to women employees was how much cooperation they received from their colleagues. These finding should be validated further as reliability of the instrument is doubt full. A further study in this direction will help develop better teams at plant levels and enhance work life balance for women workers.

References :

Bhardwaj. S B L., Quality of Work Life, Perspectives, Dreams and Realities, Paper Presented at National Symposium on QWL, Hyderabad,1983.

Blichfeldt. J F., The Development in an Educational Organisation, Work Research Institute, 1976.

Davis. K., Human Relations at work, McGraw Hill, New York, 1962.

Emery. F E, and Emery. M., Participative Design Work and Community Life, Occasional Papers in Continuing Education, The Australian National University, 1974.

Guest. Robert H, QWL: Learning from Terrytown, Harvard Business Review, 57 (4), 1979.

Herzberg F., Work and the Nature of Man, Cleave land World, 1966. Hyot. K B., Getting to Work, Training and Development Journal, September 1984, vol. 38(9), pp.71-80.

Jinkins. D., QWL - Current Trends and Directions, Occasional Paper No.3, Ontario QWL Centre, Toronto, 1981.

Katz. D and R. L Khan., The Social Psychology of Organisation, Jhon Wiley, New York, 1966.

Likert, Rensis., New Patterns of Management, McGraw Hill, New York, 1961.

Lippitt, G. L. and J. Rumley, Living with Work: The search for QWL, Optimum 8(1), 1977.

Mcgregor, D., The Human Side of the Enterprise, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.

Myers, C. A. Management in India, Ed. F. Harbinson and C. a. Myers, Management in the Industrial World, McGraw Hill, 1959.

Nadler, D. A. and Lawler, E.E., Quality of Work Life: Perspective and Direction, Organisational Dynamics, Win. 1983, Vol. 11(3), pp. 20-30.

Rice A. K. Productivity and Social Organisation. The Ahmedabad Experiment, London, Tavistock Publication (1958).

Rice A. K., The Enterprise and its Environment, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, 1963.

Rosow, J. M., Quality of Work Life Issues for the 1980's in Clark Kerr and Jerome M. Rosow, pp. 157-87.

Seashore, S. E., Defining and Measuring the QWL in Daivs, L. E. and Chern, A. E., QWL, New York, 1975.

Thorsrud, E., Democracy at Work, Norwegian Experiences with Non-Bureaucratic forms of Organisation, Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1977, 13(3), pp. 410-21.

Walton, R. E., QWL Indicators: Prospects and Problems, Studies in Personnel Psychology, 1974, Spr., Vol. 6(1), pp. 7-18.

Wilson, N.A.B., On the Quality of Working Life, London, H.M.S.O., 1973, p. 52.

ISSN : 2229-6514 (Print),2230-8237(Online)