EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES OF KERALA

Dr. Ambily A.S

Assistant Professor (S.G), Department of commerce and management, Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham, Amrita School of Arts and Sciences, Kochi

ABSTRACT

Quality of work life is a broad expression covering a vast variety of programmes, techniques, theories, and management styles through which organization and jobs are designed so as to grant workers more autonomy, responsibility, and authority that are usually done.The level of economic development considerably determines people's quality of life. Organisations' role is crucial in attracting competent, talented persons, and to retain them. It constantly adds significant value to the organisation. For retaining the employees' of the organisation, monthly income has a significant role. Employees' compensation, gives a sense of recognition and also determines social status. Employees' compensation is a vital issue that needs an immediate solution. Present study focuses on monthly income and Quality of work life of public and private sector managerial employees of Kerala.

Key Terms: Quality of work life, Employees' compensation, managerial employees.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

According to Lawrence Appley, "management is the development of people, not the direction of things". In the modern era of automation and computerization, machine is useless without competent people to run it. Thus Human Resource Management has become a very significant factor.

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

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

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

The study is partly descriptive and partly analytical in nature and is mainly based on primary data. Secondary data are also used for the study. The aim is to study the income and quality of work life of public sector and private sector manufacturing companies in Kerala. The study is conducted in large and medium sized manufacturing enterprises with not less than 500 employees' and is chosen from northern, central and southern regions of Kerala. Simple random sampling technique is used for selecting 5 private sector and 5 public sector (3 state public sectors and 2 central public sectors) manufacturing companies.Through systematic random sampling 200 employees' from both sectors, are considered for the study.

Disposition of employees' towards quality of work life is being collected through a pre - tested interview schedule with the help of 8 broad variables developed by Richard E Walton. The variables are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capacity, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalisation in the work organization, work and the total life space and social relevance of work life. In addition to the above parameters, two more variables which play a greater role for maintaining quality of work life of the organization are also added. They are superior subordinate relationship and welfare facilities. Secondary data were mainly collected through journals, books, thesis, internet and magazines. Chi square test of independence was used to test the hypotheses. The One-Way ANOVA is also used which produces a one-way analysis of variance for a quantitative dependent variable by a single factor (independent) variable.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Table No.1

Monthly Income - wise Employees

Monthly Income(Rs.)	Top level		Middle level		Lower level	
Below 10000	00	00.0%	00	00.0%	28	21.5%
10000 – 15000	02	06.7%	12	30.0%	30	23.1%

15000 – 20000	07	23.3%	11	27.5%	34	26.2%
20000 – 25000	18	60.0%	13	32.5%	37	28.5%
Above 25000	03	10.0%	04	10.0%	01	00.8%
Total	**30**	**100%**	**40**	**100%**	**130**	**100%**

Source: Survey data

While considering the managerial level, there are about 77 per cent top level managers' and 33 per cent middle level managers' receiving salary between Rs. 25000 – 30000. But in the case of lower level managers', the situation is different because only .8 per cent fall in the group of Rs. 25000 – 30000. The per cent is more between Rs. 15000 – 25000, .i.e. about 52 per cent. Here too the number of employees' who receive salary below Rs. 10000 is not very low, which is about 22 per cent. It shows that salary administration is more favourable to the top and the middle level managers'. Since the executive compensation depends upon job complexity, education, experience, performance, economic environment and legislation, their pay scale will be more as compared to other catagories.

Better compensation add recognition and determine the social status of the employees. A majority of the managrial employees' receive salaries between Rs. 20000- 25000 which comes to around 60 per cent among top level managers', 32.5 per cent among middle level managers' and 28.5 per cent in the case of lower level managers'. Thus better remuneration increases the satisfaction level among all employees'.

Disposition Of Public And Private Sector Managers' – Monthly Income - Wise
Table No. 2

Top Level Managers' – Income Wise

Parameters	Mean	Sector	10000-15000	20000-25000	Above 25000	Total
Adequate & fair	31.56		**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**

Compensation		Public	00.00	00.00	30.73	30.73
		Private	37.00	36.00	15.00	32.40
Safe & healthy workingconditions	18.20	Public	00.00	00.00	17.40	17.40
		private	24.00	16.00	18.62	19.00
Opportunity to use & Develop Human Capacity	34.10	Public	00.00	00.00	32.00	32.00
		private	35.07	33.05	41.00	36.20
Opportunity for Continued Growth&Security	27.26	Public	00.00	00.00	26.02	26.02
		private	28.12	27.00	30.00	28.33
Social Integration in the Work Organisation	38.46	Public	00.00	00.00	37.00	37.00
		private	38.07	38.05	43.00	39.53
Social Relevance of Work Life	40.10	Public	00.00	00.00	40.00	40.00
		private	42.75	43.50	29.00	40.20
work & the Total Life Space	16.83	Public	00.00	00.00	15.60	15.60
		private	18.25	15.50	21.00	18.06
Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	30.63	Public	00.00	00.00	29.20	29.20
		private	31.00	32.00	35.00	32.06
Superior Subordinate Relationship	30.43	Public	00.00	00.00	29.60	29.60
		private	31.62	30.00	32.00	31.26

| Welfare Facilities | 36.76 | Public | 00.00 | 00.00 | 39.40 | 39.40 |
| | | private | 33.87 | 35.50 | 33.00 | 34.13 |

Source: Survey Data

After verification of Table no. 2 it can be interpreted that the satisfaction level of top level managers' is more in the group having income above Rs. 25000 of both the public and the private sectors. Thus the variable monthly income has a greater role in determining quality of work life of an organisation.

Table No. 3

Middle Level Managers' – Income wise

Parameters	Mean	Sector	10000-20000	20000-30000	30000-Above	Total
Adequate and Fair Compensation	20.60		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Public	21.38	19.60	24.00	21.20
		private	24.00	23.00	12.66	20.50
Safe and healthy workingconditions	11.32	Public	10.00	09.80	10.00	9.95
		private	18.00	09.16	18.00	12.7
Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity	12.67	Public	14.15	10.20	16.00	13.35
		private	16.00	12.83	09.00	12.00
Opportunity for continued Growth and Security	16.80	Public	17.69	12.60	21.00	16.75
		private	18.00	18.41	13.33	16.85

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 9, December 2015

Social Integration in the Work Organisation	11.85	Public	13.23	11.00	18.00	13.15
		private	13.00	11.41	08.00	10.55
Social Relevance of Work Life	16.72	Public	17.00	13.04	23.00	16.70
		private	22.00	14.75	19.00	16.75
Work and the Total Life Space	15.35	Public	16.30	12.60	11.00	14.85
		private	24.00	12.41	20.00	15.85
Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	06.55	Public	06.15	05.00	12.00	06.45
		private	14.00	05.25	07.00	06.65
Superior Subordinate Relationship	17.27	Public	18.23	15.40	22.00	17.90
		private	19.00	17.58	14.00	16.65
Welfare Facilities	21.85	Public	15.92	16.40	14.00	15.85
		private	31.00	26.91	28.66	27.85

Source : Survey data

After examining table no. 3, it can be seen that the satisfaction level is paramount in the income group of Rs. 20000-30000 in the public sector and above Rs. 30000 in the private sector respectively. It is clear from the table that high income groups are more satisfied with their working environment than the low income groups. The table also relates that income variable among middle level managers's has a greater role in determining the quality of working life in an organisation.

Table No. 4

Lower Level Managers' – Monthly Income Wise

Parameters	Mean	Sector	Below 10000	10000-20000	20000-30000	30000-Above	Total
			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Adequate and Fair Compensation	18.23	public	18.00	17.75	0.00	20.00	18.69
		private	00.00	13.00	18.75	17.69	17.76
Safe and healthy working conditions	13.21	public	10.00	12.35	00.00	11.44	11.93
		private	00.00	18.00	17.50	10.86	14.49
Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacity	16.00	public	20.00	14.72	00.00	14.44	14.69
		private	00.00	14.00	21.50	14.20	17.32
Opportunity for continued Growth and Security	16.68	public	18.00	13.40	00.00	16.88	14.92
		private	00.00	11.00	22.25	16.63	18.44
Social Integration in the Work Organisation	15.51	public	18.00	14.43	00.00	12.14	13.53
		private	00.00	10.00	21.28	15.70	17.49
Social Relevance of	17.80	public	25.00	17.97	00.00	15.66	17.12

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 9, December 2015

Work Life		private	00.00	10.00	19.25	19.76	18.49
Work and the Total Life Space	17.84	public	19.00	17.70	00.00	16.66	17.29
		private	00.00	11.00	13.75	24.46	18.40
Constitutionalisation in the work organisation	11.03	public	12.00	11.05	00.00	09.66	10.49
		private	00.00	10.00	14.50	09.23	11.58
Superior Subordinate Relationship	18.93	public	25.00	19.37	00.00	23.33	21.10
		private	00.00	10.00	23.25	12.30	16.76
Welfare Facilities	22.32	public	19.00	18.37	00.00	18.33	18.36
		private	00.00	16.00	30.50	24.73	26.27

Source : Survey data

After probing the Table no. 4, it can be communicated that the satisfaction level is more in the monthly income group of above Rs. 30000 in the public sector and Rs. 10000-20000 in the private sector respectively. The table also shows that a wide deviation of mean value is noted among various parameters like superior subordinate relationship and welfare facilities.

4.2 Multiple Comparison Of Monthly Income And QWL Of Managerial Employees

In order to test whether there is any significant difference within the income group of managerial employees' with respect to various parameters of quality of work life, multiple comparison test is employed. The following hypothesis is set for the study:

H_0 : There is no income - wise significant difference in the disposition of managerial employees' with respect to parameters of quality of work life.

4.2.1 Income Vs Adequate And Fair Compensation Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4 .2.1A

Income Vs Adequate and Fair Compensation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Adequate and fair compensation	Adequate and fair compensation	2845.413	4	711.353	22.643	.000
	Error	6126.182	195	31.416		
	Total	**8971.595**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2..1B

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

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Adequate and fair compensation	Below 10000	25000-30000	-09.736*
	10000-15000	25000-30000	-09.375*
	15000-20000	25000-30000	-10.597*
	20000-25000	25000-30000	-08.553*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	09.736*
		10000-15000	09.375*

| | | 15000-20000 | -10.597* |
| | | 20000-25000 | -08.553* |

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists in the following income groups like Rs. 25000-30000 (Below Rs. 10000, Rs. 10000-15000, Rs. 15000-20000, Rs. 20000-25000) at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.2 Income Vs Safe And Healthy Working Conditions   Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.2A

Income Vs Safe and Healthy Working Conditions (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Safe and healthy working conditions	Safe and healthy working conditions	761.497	4	190.374	14.305	.000
	Error	2595.058	195	13.308		
	Total	**3356.555**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2.2B

Income Groups Vs Safe and Healthy Working Conditions (Post HocTest)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 9, December 2015

Safe and healthy working conditions	Below 10000	10000-15000	6.211*
		15000-20000	4.344*
		20000-25000	4.677*
		25000-30000	2.635*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	-6.211*
		25000-30000	-3.575*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	-4.344*
	20000-25000	Below 10000	-4.677*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	-2.635*
		10000-15000	3.575*

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among the following income groups like below Rs. 10000(Rs. 10000-15000, Rs. 15000-20000, Rs. 20000-25000, Rs. 25000-30000) at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.3 Income Vs Opportunity To Use And Develop Human Capacity Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.3A

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

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Opportunity	Opportunity	4240.725	4	580.312	25.274	.000

to use and develop human capacity	to use and develop human capacity					
	Error	8179.670	195	20.956		
	Total	**12420.395**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2.3B

Income GroupsVs Opportunity To Use And Develop Human Capacity

(Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Opportunity To Use And Develop Human Capacity	Below 10000	10000-15000	05.877*
		15000-20000	08.322*
		20000-25000	04.988*
		25000-30000	-04.716*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	-05.877*
		25000-30000	10.593*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	-08.322*
		25000-30000	-13.038*

	20000-25000	Below 10000	-04.988*
		25000-30000	-09.705*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	04.716*
		10000-15000	10.593*
		15000-20000	13.038*
		20000-25000	09.705*

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from the Table no. 4 - 30.3B that significant difference among income groups like below Rs. 10000(Rs. 10000-15000, Rs. 15000-20000, Rs. 20000-25000, Rs. 25000-30000), Rs. 25000-30000 (Below 10000 Rs., Rs. 10000-15000, Rs. 15000-20000, Rs. 20000-25000) at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.4 Income Vs Opportunity For Continued Growth And Security Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.4A

Income Vs Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Opportunity for continued growth and security	Opportunity for continued growth and security	2321.248	4	580.312	27.692	.000
	Error	4086.347	195	20.956		
	Total	**6407.595**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs opportunity for continued growth and security, ANOVA test is conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result null hypothesis is rejected.

Table No.4.2.4B

Income GroupsVs Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security

(Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Opportunity for continued growth and security	Below 10000	10000-15000	4.250*
		15000-20000	7.227*
		20000-25000	7.050*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	-4.250*
		15000-20000	2.977*
		20000-25000	2.800*
		25000-30000	-5.405*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	-7.227*
		10000-15000	-2.977*
		25000-30000	-8.383*
	20000-25000	Below 10000	-7.050*
		10000-15000	-2.800*
		25000-30000	-8.205*

	25000-30000	10000-15000	5.405*
		15000-20000	8.383*
		20000-25000	8.205*

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

To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied. By applying post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among all income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.5 Income Vs Social   Integration In The Work Organisation Of Managerial Employees

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs social   integration in the work organisation, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that there is significant difference at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table No.4.2.5A

Income Vs Social Integration in the Work Organisation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Social integration in the work organisation	Social integration in the work organisation	6829.275	4	1707.319	27.861	.000
	Error	11949.600	195	61.280		
	Total	**18778.875**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table No.4.2.5B

Income Groups Vs Social Integration in the Work Organisation (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within income	Mean difference
Social integration in the work organisation	Below 10000	15000-20000	10.152*
		25000-30000	-07.389*
	10000-15000	15000-20000	05.244*
		25000-30000	-12.297*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	-10.152*
		10000-15000	-05.244*
		20000-25000	-05.533*
		25000-30000	-17.542*
	20000-25000	15000-20000	05.533*
		25000-30000	-12.009*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	07.389*
		10000-15000	12.297*
		15000-20000	17.542*
		20000-25000	12.009*

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found from the Table that significant difference exists among the income groupslike below10000(15000-20000,25000-30000),10000-15000 (15000-20000,25000-30000), 15000-20000(Below 10000,10000-15000,20000-25000,25000-30000), 20000-25000(15000-20000,25000-30000), 25000-30000(Below10000,10000,15000,15000,20000,20000-25000) at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.6 Income Vs Social Relevance Of Work Life Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.6A

Income Vs Social Relevance of Work Life (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Social relevance of work life	Social relevance of work life	6460.137	4	1615.034	31.243	.000
	Error	10080.018	195	51.692		
	Total	**16540.155**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs social relevance of work life, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists at one per cent significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table No.4.2.6B

Income Groups Vs Social Relevance of Work Life (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Social relevance of work life	Below 10000	25000-30000	-12.858*
	10000-15000	25000-30000	-13.063*
	15000-20000	20000-25000	-05.666*
		25000-30000	-17.130*
	20000-25000	15000-20000	05.666*
		25000-30000	-11.463*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	12.858*

		10000-15000	13.063*
		15000-20000	17.130*
		20000-25000	11.463*

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

To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied. By applying post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among various income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.7 Income Vs Work And Total Life Space Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.7A

Income Vs Work and the Total Life Space (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Work and total life space	Work and total life space	1102.902	4	275.725	20.073	.000
	Error	2678.493	195	13.736		
	Total	**3781.395**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2.7B

Income Groups Vs Work and the Total Life Space (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Work and total life space	Below 10000	10000-15000	-7.272*
		20000-25000	-3.738*
		25000-30000	-2.763*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	7.272*
		15000-20000	5.244*
		20000-25000	3.533*
		25000-30000	4.508*
	15000-20000	10000-15000	-5.244*
	20000-25000	Below 10000	3.738*
		10000-15000	-3.533*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	2.763*
		10000-15000	-4.508*

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

By applying post hoc multiple comparison test it is found that significant different exists among all income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.8 Income Vs Constitutionalisation In The Work Organisation Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.8A

Income Vs Constitutionalisation in the Work Organisation (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig

		squares		square		
Constitution alisation in the work organisation	Constitutiona-lisation in the work organisation	3658.747	4	914.687	19.158	.000
	Error	9309.973	195	47.743		
	Total	**12968.720**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2.8B

Income Groups Vs Constitutionalisation in the Work Organisation

(Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean differene
Constitutionali sation in the work organisation	Below 10000	10000-15000	04.611*
		15000-20000	05.655*
		25000-30000	-06.527*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	-04.611*
		25000-30000	-11.138*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	-05.655*
		20000-25000	-04.244*

		25000-30000	-12.182*
	20000-25000	15000-20000	04.244*
		25000-30000	-07.938*
	25000-30000	Below 10000	06.527*
		10000-15000	11.138*
		15000-20000	12.182*
		20000-25000	07.938*

Source: Survey Data

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among all the income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.9 Income Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship Of Managerial Employees

Table No.4.2.9A

Income Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Superior subordinate relationship	Superior subordinate relationship	2727.058	4	681.764	16.163	.000
	Error	8225.162	195	42.180		
	Total	**10952.220**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

For testing the null hypothesis concerning income vs superior subordinate relationship, ANOVA test was conducted. It is found that significant difference exists   at one per cent

significant level. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. To find what all groups show these differences, multiple comparison test is applied.

Table No.4.2.9B

Income Groups Vs Superior Subordinate Relationship (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within income	Mean difference
Superior subordinate relationship	Below 10000	10000-15000	08.227*
	10000-15000	Below 10000	-08.227*
		15000-20000	-04.111*
		20000-25000	-05.400*
		25000-30000	-10.896*
	15000-20000	10000-15000	04.111*
		25000-30000	-06.785*
	20000-25000	10000-15000	05.400*
		25000-30000	-05.496*
	25000-30000	10000-15000	10.896*
		15000-20000	06.785*
		20000-25000	05.496*

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that significant difference exists among income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.10 Income Vs Welfare Facilities Of Managerial Employees

72

International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
Volume 2, Issue 9, December 2015

Table No.4.2.10A

Income Vs Welfare Facilities (ANOVA)

Parameters	Due to factors	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Welfare facilities	Welfare facilities	4082.676	4	1020.669	18.655	.000
	Error	10669.119	195	54.713		
	Total	**14751.795**	**199**			

Source : Survey data

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

Table No.4.2.10B

Income Groups Vs Welfare Facilities (Post Hoc Test)

Parameter	Income	Within Income	Mean difference
Welfare facilities	Below 10000	15000-20000	11.366*
		20000-25000	10.233*
	10000-15000	15000-20000	06.733*
		20000-25000	05.600*
	15000-20000	Below 10000	11.366*
		10000-15000	-06.733*
		25000-30000	10.272*
	20000-25000	Below 10000	10.233*

		10000-15000	-05.600*
		25000-30000	-09.138*
	25000-30000	15000-20000	10.272*
		20000-25000	09.138*

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

By applying the post hoc multiple comparison test, it is found that there is significant difference among the income groups at 0.05 significance level.

4.2.11 Monthly Income Vs Quality Of Work Life Index Of Managerial Level

Table No. 4.2.11

Monthly Income Vs Quality of Work Life Index of Managerial Level

			Quality of Work life Index			Total
			High	**Medium**	**Low**	
I N C O M	Below Rs. 10000	No. of employees	00	21	07	28
		Per cent within income	00.0	75.0	25.0	100
	Rs.10000-15000	No. of employees	02	40	03	45
		Per cent within income	04.4	88.9	06.7	100
	Rs.15000-	No. of employees	10	35	00	45

E	20000	Per cent within income	22.2	77.8	00.0	100
	Rs.20000-25000	No. of employees	12	29	04	45
		Per cent within income	26.7	64.4	08.9	100
	Above Rs. 25000	No. of employees	03	11	23	37
		Per cent within income	08.1	29.7	62.2	100
	Total	**No. of employees**	**027**	**136**	**037**	**200**
		Per cent within income	**13.5**	**68.0**	**18.5**	**100**

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	**df**	**Asymp.Sig.(2-sided)**	**Conclusion**
Pearson Chi - Square	36.797	4	<.001	Significant

Table indicates that managers' who have Rs. 25000 and above as monthly income are more satisfied than those in the other income groups. The least satisfied are found among Rs. 15000 – Rs. 25000 of both the sectors, which is established by Chi Square Test (V = 36.797, P <.001). It also suggests that the null hypothesis is rejected.

CONCLUSION

After analysing the socio economic background and quality of work life of managerial employees', it can be inferred that socio economic background has a greater impact on the quality of work life. The study conducted by Ghosh and Kalra (1982) found that QWL is influenced by socio economic factors like age, income, qualification, experience, etc.

The QWL index of managerial employees' reflects that the higher income group is more satisfied than lower income groups. Hence the null hypothesis, 'There is no monthly income wise significant difference in the disposition of employees' with respect to quality of work life' is rejected.

Adequate and fair compensation is a vital constituent for better quality of work life in the organisation. The basic element which determines the total quality of work life is the adequacy and fairness in compensation. Adequacy implies that the income derived from work is sufficient for subsistence. Fairness in income means equal pay for equal work, pay linked to responsibility, skill, performance, etc. Remuneration is one of the promoting factors of human beings.

The pay should be competitive with external labour markets and responsive to prevailing practices and changing economic conditions. A sound wage and salary structure is one of the prerequisites of good employer employee relations. In order to develop such a structure, it is essential that pay is related to the nature and worth of the job. It is also essential to maintain proper differentials in the value of different jobs.

The study reveals that employees', irrespective of level, are least satisfied with the compensation. When employees' are under paid, it leads to a silent and cold war between the management and the employees'. As the stress and strains of employees' are going on one side stagnant compensation on the other face leads them to be discontent in their work both physically and psychologically.

The standard and cost of living is rising high at a fast pace day by day. The employees' find it difficult to make both ends meet. Thus they opt for a fair return based on their work. An organisation is not an island; it needs the support and rapport of the employees. So without affecting the organisational profit, the management should take necessary action to redress the grievances relating to low remuneration.

REFERENCES

- Sayeed, O.B. and Sinha, P. (1981), "QWL in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Performance in Two Organisation," Managerial Psychology 2, 15-30.

- Ghosh, S. and Kalra, S.K. (1982), "Perceptual Differences in QWL Factors," Indian Journal of Training and Development, 12(3&4), 10-12.
- Bharadwaj, S B L (1983) QWL: Perspectives, dreams and realities. Hyderabad: National Symposium on Quality of Working Life, July 25-26, Mimeographed.
- Singhal, Sushila (1983) QWL: A reexamination of assumptions. Hyderabad, National Symposium on QWL, July 25-26, Mimeographed.
- Rahman, A. (1984), QWL as Perceived by the Industrial Shift Workers, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Osmania University, Hyderabad India.
- Haque, A.B.M.Z. (1992), "Perceived Quality of Working Life and Job Satisfaction of Industrial Workers in Relation to Certain Demographic Variables," Bangladesh Journal of Psychology, 13, 45-55.
- Austin, R.L. and H.H. Dodge (1992), "Despair, Distrust and Dissatisfaction among Blacks and Women, 1973-1987," Sociological Quarterly 33:579 – 598.
- M.E. Hoque and A.Rahman (1999), QWL and Job Behaviour of Workers in Bangladesh : a comparative study of Private and Public sectors, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 35,3, Oct 1999.

---

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

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