



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume 2; Issue 2; 2024; Page No. 14-18

Received: 02-01-2024

Accepted: 10-02-2024

A study on comparison of manufacturing sector quality of work life (Qwl) dimensions with service sector

¹Hareesh M and ²Dr. Menuka Rani

¹Research Scholar, Department of Management, Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University, Uttarakhand, India

²Professor, Department of Management, Maharaja Agrasen Himalayan Garhwal University, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author: Hareesh M

Abstract

Businesses are under increasing pressure to adopt various work-life balance practices that support female employees in fulfilling their personal and professional obligations. There is a wide array of alternatives available to organisations when it comes to supporting employees' work-life balance. Work-sharing, telecommuting, self-rostering, and flexible scheduling are a few crucial strategies that companies can use to support women's employees' work-life balance. Workplace strategies that could address the issue of work-life balance include things like offering paid leave or opportunities for fewer hours worked, organisation supports such as personal time off, childcare services and financial support for those services, and other family-friendly programmes. Effective organisational culture initiatives, such as work-life balance policies, aim to reduce work-life imbalance and increase employees' productivity in their careers and other duties. An important ongoing paradigm shift is transitioning from regarding work-life balance policies solely as a means to accommodate female employees with caregiving responsibilities to acknowledging their significance in fostering employee engagement. Women employees' work-life imbalance has a detrimental impact on both their individual roles and the organisations as a whole. The most significant effects of work-life imbalance on female employees in any industry include decreased productivity at work, increased inconsistencies, non-attendance, high attrition rates, low confidence, and increased stress.

Keywords: Manufacturing sector, dimensions, service sector. quality of work life

Introduction

The advancement of technology has made human labour easier than it was a few decades ago. In addition to making life easier and simpler, contemporary technology also creates a work-life imbalance by enabling people to work continuously from home. Yet, from the perspective of the socio-technical system, human needs have always been determined to take precedence above technological advancements.

India's post-independence development has been accelerated by shifts in the government's philosophies and policies. Thanks to these measures, India's manufacturing sector has flourished and it is today a proud nation capable of producing the majority of its own goods. There are a number of difficulties related to human capital that have come with liberalisation. The company is finding it difficult to keep up with the changes, which has an impact on the employees' working conditions, hours, job security, and

other factors.

The development of a robust, high-quality work life within the organisation is a prerequisite for any improvement in performance. Once the priorities have been established, active action is required for a true work-life balance. Not everyone can benefit from a single formula all the time. Setting healthy and appropriate limits and being clear about your objectives in life are the first steps towards achieving.

From the standpoint of the manufacturing industry, Buchanan (1979) ^[14] noted that group work can lead to a higher quality of life, particularly when employees participate in organisational design and employee change.

Working in an autonomous group improves life quality without compromising the efficiency of the organisation. According to Kanagalakshmi and Devi's 2003 study of textile industry workers, there is a strong correlation between QWL and characteristics connected to the workplace.

On the other hand, not much research has been done on the several aspects that genuinely impact of the quality of the work life (QWL). Furthermore, the industrial and service industries each have different QWL components that call for an answer. Consequently, the goal of this study is to determine the QWL index for the industrial and service sectors. Additionally, an effort has been made to determine whether the manufacturing and service sectors differ in any way with regard to the QWL index.

Assess the work life quality

The quality of one's work life is a complex concept. This all-encompassing phrase captures an employee's sentiments regarding every aspect of his work, including job security, working conditions, equitable pay, health and safety, job design, stress, social importance of work, potential for advancement.

Materials and Methods

Sampling procedure: Employees of prestigious companies in Kerala region and Telangana region who worked in the manufacturing, service sectors were contacted in order to get information on QWL. Valuable and accurate data from these individuals was gathered using a questionnaire. The sampling plan employed proved to be sufficient in producing. The samples size was adequate to encompass a cross-section of Kerala region and Telangana region manufacturing and service industries. This study only included people who were willing to fill out the forms. The subjects were not subjected to undue pressure or gently persuaded to fill out the questionnaire.

Sample population

Businesses in the manufacturing and service sectors constantly deal with difficulties in their day-to-day work lives. In order to stay ahead of the competition and stay up to date with technical advancements in their respective industries, organisations must periodically offer their staff training and skill development programmes. It is imperative for organisations to host additional seminars and symposiums in order to foster a deeper grasp of the employment needs. Industries from the manufacturing and service sectors, such as those in textiles, medicines, tyres, rubber, sugar, electronics, and information technology, were included in the survey. This poll concentrated on executives

up to manager level; however, the employee's standing in the firm and in the industry were not utilised as filters.

Data collection: The information was gathered in hard copy utilising a questionnaire that was printed. After being moved to the computer, the data was examined further. Online forms were used to collect data for the pilot project.

Pilot study

The pilot study was carried out to accommodate the complete picture of the working lives of the employees in the manufacturing and service sectors of Kerala region and Telangana region in order to guarantee the validity of the questionnaire. To gather primary data for the pilot project, 50 samples each were provided to a chosen group of workers from Kerala region and Telangana region's manufacturing and service sectors. The employees who completed the pilot study were informed about the purpose and goals of the survey, and they examined and scrutinised the questionnaire, allowing themselves enough leeway to make any necessary changes. The pilot study's inputs were then used to develop the final questionnaire. The final questionnaire was framed using the information from the pilot study and the literature. The preliminary format of was included in the draft, which was essentially the same as the pilot study version with very few modifications. In order to assess the validity and reliability of the survey's variables and guarantee that the researcher collected the necessary data, the pilot study assisted in gathering data that was pertinent to the investigation.

Results and Discussion

The findings of the manufacturing and service sectors were contrasted in order to learn more about how these industries' employees view work-life balance and what factors affect it.

Qwl dimensions

The factors that emerged as significant for the service sector and the manufacturing sector showed slight variations. The manufacturing industry was characterized by seven key elements: job satisfaction, growth potential, workload, social integration within the company, safety and health in the workplace. In contrast, the service sector exhibited eight significant variables: commitment, job satisfaction, growth potential, skill utilization and development opportunities.

Table 1: The difference of loaded QWL dimensions

| QWL dimensions for manufacturing sector | QWL dimensions for service sector |
|---|--|
| Jobs Satisfactions | Commitment to work place |
| Sufficient and equitable remuneration | Sufficient and equitable remuneration |
| Skill utilization and opportunity for growth | Jobs satisfaction |
| Learning and skill enhancement opportunities | Learning and skill enhancement opportunities |
| Work Load | Secure and conducive workplace environments for safety and well-being. |
| Safe and healthy working conditions | Effective deployment of skills and avenues for professional development. |
| Fostering social inclusion within the organizational culture. | Incorporating social cohesion within the workplace structure. |
| | Work environment |

The same criteria were further investigated to determine the significance attributed by workers in the industrial and service sectors. To evaluate the theories pertaining to the chosen QWL dimensions, a student's t test was used. There is no discernible difference between the two sectors

when comparing the job satisfaction of employees in the two sectors, as Table -2 demonstrates (T value 0.52; p value = 0.590). The industrial sector had slightly higher work satisfaction (mean = 5.172±0.897) than the service sector (mean = 5.12420.803).

Table 2: The level of job satisfaction

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | T-value | p-value |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Job satisfaction Manufacturing sector | 216 | 5.172 | 0.897 | 0.072 | 0.52 | 0.590 |
| Job satisfaction Service sector | 184 | 5.122 | 0.801 | 0.062 | | |

Growth potential and the capacity to apply the skills are critical for both industries. It is evident from the mean (5.245±0.920) for the service sector that there was a greater demand than for the industrial sector (5.02±1.05). The T-value = -1.82 and p-value = 0.030 indicate that this difference was likewise significantly different.

Table 3: The level of job satisfaction

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | T-value | p-value |
|---|-----|-------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Opportunity for growth Manufacturing Sector | 215 | 5.02 | 1.03 | 0.083 | -1.82 | 0.030 |
| Opportunity for growth Service Sector | 185 | 5.245 | 0.920 | 0.05 | | |

Growth potential and the capacity to apply the skills are critical for both industries. It is evident from the mean (5.245±0.920) for the service sector that there was a greater demand than for the industrial sector (5.02±1.03). The T-value = -1.82 and p-value = 0.030 indicate that this difference was likewise significantly different.

Table 4: The Difference of Opportunity for growth

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | T-value | p-value |
|---|-----|-------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Advancement avenues within the Manufacturing Sector | 213 | 5.02 | 1.03 | 0.083 | -1.82 | 0.030 |
| Prospects for advancement within the Service Sector | 187 | 5.245 | 0.920 | 0.05 | | |

If social integration is to lead the organisation to success, it necessitates a thorough comprehension and positive interpersonal relationships between the staff and the organisation. The industrial sector (mean = 5.227±0.940) in this survey gave social integration a higher priority in the service sector (mean = 5.130±0.830). The p-value of 0.327, however, indicates that this factor does not appear to have a substantial impact on manufacturing sector employees relative to service sector employees.

Table 5: The Difference of Social of Integration

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | T-value | p-value |
|--|-----|-------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Social Integration within the Manufacturing Sector | 212 | 5.227 | 0.940 | 0.073 | 0.97 | 0.327 |
| Social Integration within the Service Sector | 188 | 5.130 | 0.830 | 0.062 | | |

Conditions that are safe and healthy for workers are crucial for those in the industrial and service sectors alike. The manufacturing sector exhibited a stronger inclination towards safe and healthy working conditions, as seen by their mean score of 5.22±1.26, compared to 5.10±1.15 for the service sector. There was no discernible Safety Across Manufacturing and Service Sectors (T = 1.16; p = 0.258).

Table 6: The Difference of Safety Across Manufacturing and Service-Sectors

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | t-value | p-value |
|----------------|-----|------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Safety_Manu | 280 | 5.22 | 1.26 | 0.3 | 1.16 | 0.258 |
| Safety_Service | 120 | 5.10 | 1.15 | 0.085 | | |

A fair and adequate wage was regarded as a crucial component of the QWL dimension by both the industrial and service sectors. This may be observed from these sectors' mean values, which were 5.05±1.1 and 5.08±0.88, respectively. T = -0.32, p = 0.732 indicates that this difference is not statistically significant.

Table 7: The Difference of AFC between in the manufacturing, service sectors

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | t-value | p-value |
|-------------|-----|-------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| AFC_Manu | 284 | 5.07 | 1.2 | 0.086 | -0.32 | 0.732 |
| AFC_Service | 116 | 5.087 | 0.85 | 0.065 | | |

The manufacturing and service industries both considered training and development to be a significant part of the QWL factor. Between the two sectors, there was no statistically significant difference (T = -0.14; p = 0.853).

Table 8: Trainings and Development

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | t-value | p-value |
|------------|-----|------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| TD_Manu | 285 | 5.03 | 1.16 | 0.093 | -0.14 | 0.853 |
| TD_Service | 117 | 5.06 | 1.0 | 0.083 | | |

It was discovered that overall employee satisfaction in the manufacturing and service sectors was comparable and not statistically significant (T = -0.23; p = 0.390).

Table 9: The Over-all Satisfaction

| | N | Mean | Std. Dev | SE Mean | T-value | p-value |
|---|-----|------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| Overall Satisfaction Manufacturing sector | 287 | 5.62 | 1.11 | 0.093 | -0.23 | 0.390 |
| Overall satisfaction Service Sector | 113 | 5.65 | 1.10 | 0.083 | | |

Overall, all other hypotheses were disproved, with the exception of the element Opportunity for Growth, showing that the manufacturing and service sectors share the same understanding of the QWL components.

Table 10: Hypothesis status

| Sl. No. | Hypothesis | Status |
|---------|---|--------------|
| 1 | The variance in job satisfaction among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is notable | Not Accepted |
| 2 | The divergence in opportunities for growth among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is substantial. | Accepted |
| 3 | The disparity in social integration within the work organization among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is notable. | Not Accepted |
| 4 | The variation in safe and healthy working conditions among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is significant | Not Accepted |
| 5 | The disparity in adequate and fair compensation among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is notable. | Not Accepted |
| 6 | The discrepancy in training and development opportunities among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is substantial. | Not Accepted |
| 7 | The divergence in overall satisfaction among employees in manufacturing and service sectors is significant. | Not Accepted |

Conclusion

The positive and negative aspects that affect how employees see the quality of their work life have been identified by this study. In practical terms, these characteristics can help organisations design strategies that aim to positively integrate employees' professional development and quality of work life, ensuring long-term competitive gain.

Manufacturing Sector

To raise the degree of satisfaction, the business must thus be sure to offer fresh opportunities for employment. Reductions in negative emotions, absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover rate can be achieved through raising job satisfaction. Previous research has indicated that the manufacturing industry's repetitious work practices lead to employee unhappiness. Companies should give workers the freedom to approach their work in a creative and original way to break free from standard operating procedures and add challenge to the work. This report unequivocally demonstrates that employees are not receiving ongoing training. A crucial component that can bring people self-assurance, clarity, and understanding of the organization's policies and standards is training. Thus, it is imperative for manufacturing businesses to prioritise staff training that not only enhances their skill set but also gives them the confidence to make decisions related to their roles. A safe and healthy workplace is among the elements with the lowest loadings. The majority of manufacturing businesses are concerned about this because working there frequently entails physical risk factors, such as procedures that result in injuries and exposure to dangerous radiation and chemicals, which pose a threat to life itself. As a result, manufacturing companies ought to put up safety equipment like fire extinguishers, fire alarms, and first aid kits and teach their staff on how to utilise it.

In order to encourage employees to perform better, manufacturing companies should rethink their HR strategies and implement objective performance appraisal systems with built-in performance-linked incentives, awards, and recognition programmes. Employers ought to treat all candidates equally, without regard to their age, gender, race, or ethnicity. Employees should have a comfortable working environment with enough equipment, breaks, and a division of labour. The Ombudsman ought to be accessible to handle employee complaints and disciplinary actions.

Service sector

The results of this study demonstrate that workers' organisational commitment in the service industry has a

significant influence on their general job satisfaction. Any QWL shortfall lessens the employee's dedication to the company. This may lead to people searching for possibilities outside the company, being averse to accepting accountability, and failing to hear what consumers have to say. As a result, businesses in the service industry should create HR procedures that enhance QWL within the company, as this can raise employee loyalty to the company. Employees in the service industry in this study had lower levels of social integration, safe and healthy working conditions, and job satisfaction. Workplace stress can be caused by a variety of factors, including shifting work shifts, losing out on opportunities, losing leisure time, and using risky working practices. Job stress can therefore have an impact on job satisfaction. Given that working in the service industry typically entails stress, employers must make sure that workers are properly consulted about their work by setting reasonable goals, due dates, and other parameters. The social integration element is another facet of QWL that has been revealed by this investigation. Employers could help their staff members by assisting their supervisors in identifying their areas of need. Some strategies to help include sharing product and process information and fostering friendly interactions to boost staff members' trust in the management system.

References

1. Loscocco KA, Roschelle AR. Influences on the quality of work and nonwork life: Two decades in review. *J Vocat Behav.* 2014;39:182-225.
2. Lowe G, Schellenburg G, Shannon HS. Correlates of Employees' Perception of a Healthy Work Environment. *Am J Health Promot.* 2014;17(6):390-399.
3. Lyness KS, Thompson DE. Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *J Appl Psychol.* 2014;82:359-375.
4. Maccoby M. Helping labour and management set up a quality-of-worklife program. *Monthly Labour Review.* 2014;2(2):28-32.
5. Maddison RN, *et al.* Information systems methodologies. Sussex: Wiley Heyden, on behalf of British Computer Society; c2014.
6. Malhotra P, Singh B. An analysis of Internet banking offerings and its determinants in India. *Internet Research.* 2010;20(1):87-106.
7. Kornhauser A. Mental health of the Industrial Worker. New York: Wiley; c2015.
8. Kossek EE, Ozeki C. Work-family conflict, policies,

- and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *J Appl Psychol.* 2015;83:139–149.
9. Kotze M. The nature and development of the construct quality of work life. *Acta Academia.* 2015;37(2):96-122.
 10. Kotze M. Indicators of the Quality of Work Life (QWL) of people with and without disabilities: A comparative study. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities and Nations.* 2018;8(2):155-170.
 11. Hossain MM, Islam MT. QWL and job satisfaction of Nurses in Government Hospitals in Bangladesh. *Indian J Ind Relat.* 2016;34(3):33-34.
 12. Houlihan M. Tensions and variations in call centre management strategies. *Hum Resour Manage J.* 2016;12(4):67-86.
 13. Hutchinson S, Purcell J, Kinnie N. The Challenge of the Call Centre. *Hum Resour Manage Int. Digest.* 2016;8(5):4-7.
 14. Shortliffe EH, Buchanan BG, Feigenbaum EA. Knowledge engineering for medical decision making: A review of computer-based clinical decision aids. *Proceedings of the IEEE.* 1979 Sep;67(9):1207-24.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.