

# A Study on Perception of Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Rayalaseema Region, Andhra Pradesh, India

<sup>1</sup>K. Inthiyaz

Research Scholar,  
Department of Management Sciences,  
JNTUA, Anantapuramu, India.  
Email: yaaz2012@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>T. Narayana Reddy

Associate Professor & Additional  
Controller of Examinations,  
Department of Management Sciences,  
JNTUA, Anantapuramu, India.  
Email: tnreddyjntua@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>P. Subramanyachary

Professor,  
Department of Management Sciences,  
Siddhartha Institute of Engineering and  
Technology,  
Puttur, India.  
Email: palakonda001@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The study of work environments is very important because it may differentiate between high and low performers among banks. However, there is large gap in studies on exploring the quality of work life in Andhra Pradesh. This study aims to explore the level of Quality of Work Life in the bank industry situated in the Rayalaseema region, Andhra Pradesh, India. It also examines the relationships between environmental factors and job satisfaction. The result reveals that the level of Quality of Work Life of the population is elevated. The bulk of employees have adequate confidence regarding their skills, their job characteristics, opportunity to participate in decision making and relationships. However, some of them complained about their wage levels. Further, the study finds a significant relationship between environmental factors and job satisfaction. This study contributes to the understanding of quality of work life and job satisfaction in a significant area in India, that is, among bank's employees in Rayalaseema region, Andhra Pradesh

**Keywords-** *Quality of work life, Job Satisfaction, Bank Employees & Rayalaseema region*

\*\*\*\*\*

## I. INTRODUCTION

It is not enough for banks to have good leaders with visions; rather, bankers need to create a distinguished work environment in order to achieve their strategic goals. Quality of work life has become an important issue recently days. In fact, many researchers have agreed upon the importance of QWL for bankers seeking to improve levels of job satisfaction and commitment among their employees. Moreover, Narehan et al., [1] argued that to improve product or service quality, we should start with improvement of QWL. The authors highlighted the linkage between work environment and QWL. Actually, some authors consider QWL as "an indicator for paying attention to human beings' needs and placing them in the job content" [2]. This means that management should give high priority to the needs of the most important component of their organization, namely, human resources, if they want to survive and sustain in the current competitive market.

Almaghrabi [3] mentioned that QWL terminology was first used in 1972 during an international industrial relations conference. Since then, it has developed approaches like the Re-engineering HR technique, which appeared during 1990s. This technique was created to cope with organizational changes and development policies in order to ease the cases of tension and anxiety that spread among workers in Asian countries from being fired by employers. Thus, it aims to provide employees with a pleasant and secured work environment in which they can achieve a professional growth and receive their due rights.

Based on conclusions by Bagtasos [4] and Narehan et al., [1], there has been less focus and limited studies from Asian countries regarding QWL compared to North American and European countries. India is not exceptional. According to

Almarshad [5], the QWL research in India is limited and mostly focuses on the Information Technology industry work environment. In fact, the country faces a unique issue with regard to participation of women in the workforce; this aspect requires special consideration related to work environment in order to enforce organizations to accommodate to these women workers' needs [6], such as adjusting working schedules and providing child care [7]. Therefore, this paper aims to investigate the level of QWL in the bank industry situated in the Rayalaseema Region, Andhra Pradesh. It also examines the relationships between environmental factors and job satisfaction.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The term 'Quality of Work Life (QWL)' is reputed to have originated from an international labour relations conference in 1972 at Arden House, Columbia University, New York (Efraty & Sirgy, 1990). Quality of work life (QWL) is a philosophy, a set of principles, which holds that people are the most important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making valuable contribution and they should be treated with dignity and respect. QWL refers to the impact of the workplace on satisfaction in work life (job satisfaction), satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001). The quality of work life exerts a strong influence on not only job satisfaction but such other aspects of satisfaction as with family, social life and economical life, among others. This construct also includes the workplace effect on a staff's satisfaction with his/her job, non-work life realms, overall life, and subjective well-being. Extent of work life quality transcends job satisfaction (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001).

## 2.1 Quality of Work Life

Hackman & Oldham (1980) represented QWL Because of favourable operating surroundings that supports & promoted satisfaction by providing staff with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities. The work surroundings permits to satisfy employees personal wants is taken into accounts a vital issue to produce a positive interaction impact, which can results in a superb QWL.

**Cunningham and Eberle (1990)** emphasized that the personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organization, such as compensation, promotion, recognition and development meet their expectations. The elements that are relevant to an individual's QWL include the task, the physical and social work environment within the organization, organizational system and relationship between life on and off the job. **Chan and Einstein (1990)** explained QWL reflects as a concern for people's experience at work, their relationship with other people, their work setting and their effectiveness on the job. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions 2002 described that the QWL is a multi-dimensional construct, made up of a number of interrelated factors that need careful consideration to conceptualize and measure. QWL is associated with job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety, job security, competence development and balance between work and non-work life. Quality of work life is a process by which an organization responds to employee needs for developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.

**Saraji and Dargahi (2006)** study explained QWL as a comprehensive, department wide program designated to improve employee satisfaction, strengthening workplace learning and helping employees had better manage, change and transition by conducting descriptive and analytical study.

**Factors influencing QWL.** **Belwal and Belwal [6]** argued that perceived QWL differed from person to person, thereby, the factors that contribute to QWL may also differ from person to person; however, some researchers have agreed on several factors that lead to a higher QWL if they are improved. In general, QWL programs include paying attention to the factors related to work environment like safety and health of employees, reducing job stress, and opportunity for promotion [2]. **Nayak et al., [8]** identified four predictors of perceived QWL, including communication, empowerment, teamwork, and work life balance.

Further, **Teryima et al., [9]** found that "employee attitude, working environment, opportunities for growth and advancement, nature of work, stress, job challenges, development and career potentials amongst others" are the challenging factors that influence QWL attainment. **Gupta et al., [10]** added organizational commitment to this list as well as team work and management relations. Moreover, some researchers suggested other aspects by which QWL can be determined. These included fair compensation, job security, working conditions, health issues, management behavior, working time, and participation in decision-making. In addition, **Sirgy et al. [18]**, in an attempt to create a new

measure of QWL based on theories of need satisfaction and spillover identified seven major needs, including health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetic needs. Each need has several sub-dimensions. Further, **Almarshad [8]**, in an attempt to create a comprehensive model to evaluate QWL in Saudi Arabia, came up with four dimensions, including job stress, work occupy, job satisfaction, and working conditions.

On the other hand, **Zare and Janani [2]** believe that the reason behind low quality of product is shortages of QWL. For example, workers usually prefer to have a word in their work issue and participation in decision making in order to perform well. In fact, good QWL contributes not only to improvement of human outcomes but also to improve job satisfaction, employee morale, organizational effectiveness, and thereby accomplishment of the strategic objectives. At the same time, if QWL is high, it reduces employees' grievances, absenteeism, and leave intention [11]. **Horst et al., [12]** agreed with the previous opinions, and they recommended a good management of QWL as a successful approach to improve employees' commitment, health, life, productivity, and thereby reduce organizational expenses. Therefore, **Almarshad [8]** argued that managers should establish priorities, and these priorities should be reflected in their strategies and plans when dealing with improvement of QWL factors.

## III. METHODOLOGY

This study is descriptive in nature. The population included the employees of public and private sectors with more emphasis on bank employees working in Rayalaseema region, Andhra Pradesh, India. QWL is measured by the perceptions of employees towards their organization and its content. The study used a cross-sectional survey through self-administered questionnaires. A series of 5-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) were used to assess the level of QWL and job satisfaction. This study has adapted the "Quality of Work Life Questionnaire" developed by **Almaghrabi [3]** to measure the level of QWL in industry. It consists of 6 parts: work moral environment, job characteristics, wages and remuneration and supervision style. These aspects were selected because of their appropriateness to the Saudi work environment, and they have good reliability and validity. The alpha reliability of the scales is stated in Table 1. The items used to measure job satisfaction were those developed by **Roche [13]**. These organizations were selected with the goal of including all sectors in the region to avoid the possible bias that might arise from focusing on only one sector and to increase the ability to make comparisons among sectors.

### Sample size

A structured questionnaire has been designed to acquire data from the participants of the industry situated in bank employees working in Rayalaseema region, Andhra Pradesh, India. There were 500 questionnaires given to 10 different bank employees working in Rayalaseema region, Andhra Pradesh, India Table 1 shows that 8 banks completed and returned the questionnaires. Each bank did not provide the

completed questionnaire as given to them, but overall, 410 questionnaires were received, and 390 of these were usable for this study, which is about 78%. This is a very good response rate.

**Reliability analysis**

Cronbach’s Alpha was used as a reliability test to each section of the data: Moral Environment, Job Characteristics, wages and Remuneration, Working in Group, Supervision Style, Participation in Decision Making, and Job Satisfaction. Sufficient reliability was found among the variables. Table 2 shows their respective values. The participants were of mixed age, i.e., 39% of the belonged to 20-30 years’ age bracket, 36% were from 31-40, 20% fell under 41-50 years, and 5% fell into the last age group, i.e., 51-60 years. Most of the respondents belong to quite matured group of ages (56%), and only 25% were of age above 40 years. Quite a large number of the respondents were educated with either associates or bachelor’s degrees (56%). Only 8% of the respondents held higher education degrees. Regarding work experience, the study faced a problem of missing values: 47% did not report values; however, in the remaining 53%, 35% of the total sample size is well experienced and fall in the categories from 6-10 years to 31-35 years of work experience. Only 18% of the respondents had work experience less than 5 years (Table 3).

work. On the other hand, we computed the mean value of each variable, and this confirms the above results of Table 4: the mean values are quite high, and most of them are very close to 4 on a scale of 5. The overall mean value of the moral environmental factors is 3.65 on a scale of 5, which is quite reasonable to support the argument that most of the respondents at work are satisfied with their workplace (Table4).

**Job characteristics**

The study included 6 variables relating to job characteristics: Job Dimension, Job responsibility, Job required skills, Freedom in Job, Volume of work, and Task Challenge. Table 5 displays the percentage for these variables and the mean value of the responses for each of the variables in the Job Characteristics factor. 68% of the respondents either strongly agree or agree that there should be a defined job dimension, 71% either strongly agree or agree about that Job responsibility should be defined, 70% were in favor of the necessary skills required by the job, 57% tended to agree for the freedom of action during the job to be accomplished, 52% agreed that the volume of work was be appropriate, and 55% assumed that tasks assigned at the job should be taken as challenges and fun. The overall mean value (3.748) of the responses displayed that most of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed to the variables related to Job Characteristics.

**Moral environment factors**

In the environmental factors, many of the variables present a positive notion about the working environment of the organization. They responded that they felt that there was a mutual trust (58%), freedom of doing job (55%), a friendly environment (66%), mutual respect (74%), satisfaction of achievement (70%), and interpersonal relationship (66%) at their workplace. This suggests that a large number of respondents are satisfied with the moral environment at

| Questionnaire response                      | Frequency | Rate |
|---|-----------|------|
| No. of questionnaire sent                   | 500       | 100% |
| No. of questionnaire returned               | 410       | 82%  |
| No. of questionnaires excluded              | 20        | 4%   |
| No. of questionnaires included in the study | 390       | 78%  |

**Table1: Sample study response rate (n=390).**

| Research factors       | Cronbach's alpha | Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| Moral environment      | 0.893            | 0.896  |
| Job characteristics    | 0.753            | 0.824  |
| Wages and remuneration | 0.800            | 0.861  |
| Work group             | 0.871            | 0.871  |
| Supervision style      | 0.942            | 0.942  |
| Participation in dm    | 0.912            | 0.912  |
| Job satisfaction       | 0.842            | 0.843  |

**Table 2: Cronbach’s Alpha Value of research factors.**

**Demographic Variables**

| Demographic item | Classification | Frequency | Percentage | Cumulative |
|------------------|----------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Age              | 20-30 years    | 151       | 39%        | 39%        |
|                  | 30-40 years    | 141       | 36%        | 75%        |
|                  | 40-50 years    | 77        | 20%        | 95%        |

|                         |              |     |      |      |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----|------|------|
| Educational level       | 50-60 years  | 21  | 5%   | 100% |
|                         | High school  | 89  | 23%  | 23%  |
|                         | Intermediate | 102 | 26%  | 49%  |
|                         | UG           | 157 | 43%  | 92%  |
|                         | PG           | 32  | 8%   | 100% |
| Marital status          | Married      | 275 | 71%  | 71%  |
|                         | Single       | 115 | 29%  | 100% |
| Overall work experience | Up to 5 year | 72  | 18%  | 18%  |
|                         | 6-10 years   | 54  | 14%  | 32%  |
|                         | 11-15 years  | 28  | 7%   | 39%  |
|                         | 15-20 years  | 25  | 6%   | 45%  |
|                         | 20-25 years  | 13  | 3%   | 48%  |
|                         | 25-30 years  | 6   | 2%   | 50%  |
|                         | 30-35 years  | 8   | 3%   | 53%  |
| Missing Values          | 184          | 47% | 100% |      |

**Table 3: Respondents Demographic Information (n=390).**

**Source: Primary Data through Questionnaire.**

| Moral environment  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean        |
|--|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| I work in a working environment featuring mutual trust among all parties | 24                | 56       | 84      | 160   | 66             |             |
|  | 6%                | 14%      | 22%     | 41%   | 17%            | 3.48        |
| I enjoy the freedom to work at my job                                    | 33                | 72       | 71      | 157   | 57             |             |
|  | 8%                | 18%      | 18%     | 40%   | 15%            | 3.34        |
| There are intimate friendships between me and my colleagues at work      | 13                | 38       | 87      | 163   | 89             |             |
|  | 3%                | 10%      | 22%     | 42%   | 23%            | 3.71        |
| I feel I am respected by others in my organization                       | 10                | 31       | 60      | 190   | 99             |             |
|  | 3%                | 8%       | 15%     | 49%   | 25%            | 3.86        |
| I feel good about that accomplishment I achieve in my work               | 10                | 35       | 73      | 187   | 85             |             |
|  | 3%                | 9%       | 19%     | 48%   | 22%            | 3.77        |
| I feel the quality of dealing with my colleagues in the organization     | 10                | 40       | 84      | 168   | 88             |             |
|  | 3%                | 10%      | 22%     | 43%   | 23%            | 3.73        |
| <b>Overall mean value</b>  |                   |          |         |       |                | <b>3.65</b> |

**Table 4: Percentage response and frequency of Moral Environmental factors (n=390).**

**Source: Primary Data through Questionnaire.**

| Job characteristics   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| My job dimensions and practical tasks are characterized by importance | 15                | 34       | 77      | 179   | 85             |      |
|   | 4%                | 9%       | 20%     | 46%   | 22%            | 3.73 |
| I feel responsible for everything that I'm doing                      | 14                | 37       | 62      | 170   | 106            |      |
|   | 4%                | 9%       | 16%     | 44%   | 27%            | 3.92 |
| I possess the necessary skills to perform the job                     | 17                | 31       | 70      | 180   | 92             |      |
|   | 4%                | 8%       | 18%     | 46%   | 24%            | 3.77 |
| I have the freedom to act in deciding everything in the job           | 28                | 64       | 117     | 135   | 46             |      |
|   | 7%                | 16%      | 30%     | 35%   | 12%            | 3.27 |
| The volume of work in my job is suitable                              | 22                | 67       | 98      | 149   | 54             |      |
|   | 6%                | 17%      | 25%     | 38%   | 14%            | 3.37 |

|                                  |    |     |     |     |     |      |
|----------------------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| My tasks are challenging and fun | 24 | 66  | 88  | 151 | 61  |      |
|                                  | 6% | 17% | 23% | 39% | 16% | 3.41 |
| <b>Overall Mean Value</b>        |    |     |     |     |     | 3.58 |

**Table 5: Percentage response of the Job Characteristics variable (n=390).**  
Source: Primary Data through Questionnaire.

**Wages and remuneration**

One of the important factors of this study has been Wages and Remuneration, which has six variables: 1- Income Level, 2 – Income matches with job, 3-understanding of wages system, 4-fairness of wages, 5-wages matches with skill level, and 6-performance evaluation. Table 8 presents the opinion of the respondents about these variables and shows the percentage responses. It seems that in all the six variables, the respondents either remained neutral to responses or strongly agreed and agreed to the notion. 22% of the participants remained neutral, and 43% either strongly agreed or agreed to level of the income that they receive. Only 30% agreed that the income depended on the assigned work, and 27% remained neutral. About 43% of the respondents assumed that they understood the wages system and agreed to the statement, whereas 26%-remained neutral. When asked about the fairness of wages compared to other colleagues, just 34% agreed with the statement, whereas 32% remained neutral. Similarly, 33% of the respondents agreed to the fairness of the wages based on the efforts applied by them; however, 31% remained neutral. Finally, only 30% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed

that the performance determines the rewards and compensation for them (Table 6).Table 6 shows that most of the respondents were not very satisfied with their wages and earnings. The overall mean value (2.92) is an average response value. One of the reasons for this low value could be that a large number of the respondents remained neutral to the responses of the variables of Wages and Remuneration. The mean value for these variables lies between 2.77 and 3.07 on a scale of 5.

**Supervision style**

The fifth factor for this study is the supervision style, which also consists of 6 variables: (1) Encourage participating, (2) Has ability to plan, (3) Information Sharing, (4) Fair treatment, (5) Explaining objectives, and (6) Encourage delivering maximum. Overall, the response to this factor is very encouraging, and most of the participants responded positively. The mean value response of each of the variables is also a little higher. Table 10 displays the mean value ranges from 3.49 to 3.52. Overall, the mean value of this factor is 3.50 on a scale of 5, which is skewed positively.

| <b>Wages and remuneration</b>   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| I am quite happy with my income in work                               | 60                | 75       | 87      | 125   | 43             |      |
|   | 15%               | 19%      | 22%     | 32%   | 11%            | 3.04 |
| My income depends on the amount of my work                            | 82                | 83       | 106     | 85    | 33             |      |
|   | 21%               | 21%      | 27%     | 22%   | 8%             | 2.86 |
| I understand fully the system of wages and bonuses in my organization | 57                | 63       | 103     | 128   | 39             |      |
|   | 15%               | 16%      | 26%     | 33%   | 10%            | 3.07 |
| My wage is fair comparing with those of my colleagues                 | 64                | 71       | 123     | 101   | 31             |      |
|   | 16%               | 18%      | 32%     | 26%   | 8%             | 2.91 |
| My wage is fair comparing with my skills and efforts                  | 63                | 80       | 120     | 96    | 31             |      |
|   | 16%               | 21%      | 31%     | 25%   | 8%             | 2.88 |
| My performance determines the amount of my rewards and compensation   | 73                | 90       | 110     | 87    | 30             |      |
|   | 19%               | 23%      | 28%     | 22%   | 8%             | 2.77 |
| <b>Overall Mean Value</b>   |                   |          |         |       |                | 2.92 |

**Table 6: Percentage response of Wages and Remuneration variables (n=390).**  
Source: Primary Data through Questionnaire.

| <b>Supervision style factors</b>                                  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|------|
| My supervisor encourages me to participate in key decision-making | 25                | 50       | 86      | 162   | 67             |      |
|   | 6%                | 13%      | 22%     | 42%   | 17%            | 3.50 |
| My boss possesses a great ability to key pre-                     | 24                | 47       | 86      | 170   | 63             |      |

|   |    |     |     |     |     |      |
|---|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| planning work   | 6% | 12% | 22% | 44% | 16% | 3.52 |
| My boss gives complete information for his subordinates   | 26 | 45  | 90  | 164 | 65  |      |
|   | 7% | 12% | 23% | 42% | 17% | 3.51 |
| Our boss treats us fairly and equitably   | 21 | 49  | 87  | 155 | 78  |      |
|   | 5% | 13% | 22% | 40% | 20% | 3.56 |
| Our boss explains for us the work objectives with motivational way  | 23 | 44  | 96  | 171 | 56  |      |
|   | 6% | 11% | 25% | 44% | 14% | 2.88 |
| Our president has a high capacity for instigation of his subordinates to make the maximum possible effort | 25 | 47  | 100 | 140 | 78  |      |
|   | 6% | 12% | 26% | 36% | 20% | 3.51 |
| <b>Overall Mean Value</b>   |    |     |     |     |     | 3.52 |

**Table 7: Percentage response of Supervision Style variables (n=390).  
Source: Primary Data through Questionnaire.**

#### IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Today, all organizations must continuously improve QWL if they want to exist and compete in the market. In particular, organizations in Andhra Pradesh face more challenges with regards to QWL due to the India vision 2030, which calls for the private sector to play a great role in attracting talent and hiring young people. This challenge has also increased since the number of women participating in workforce has increased, and they require some particular considerations like flexible working hours and special structures or separation men from women during working hours.

The above stated findings reveal that the overall level of QWL of respondents is high. The majority of employees perceived a positive notion about working environmental factors. They thought their job dimension and responsibilities were clearly defined and emphasized by organizations. They also thought that they possessed the necessary skills to carry out their jobs. However, participants' perceptions were varied regarding wage and remuneration, as most employees were not very happy with their income. This scattered opinion may be related to the fact that this survey covered both private and public sectors and small and large firms. Employees said that they found their job to be critical. This is not surprising since Yanbu contains the most technological advanced plants on which the economy of the country depends heavily.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Narehan H, Hairunnisa M, Razak AN, Lapok F (2014) The Effect of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Programs on Quality of Life (QOL) among Employees at Multinational Companies in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 112: 24-34.
- [2] Zare K, Janani H (2015) Correlation between Quality of Work Life and Efficiency of Managers of Sports Clubs in City of Tabriz. *International Journal of Sport Studies* 5: 410-414.
- [3] Almaghrabi (2007) *Systematic and Behavioral Skills for HR Development*. Cairo: The Modern Library for Publication and Distribution.
- [4] Bagtasos MR (2011) Quality of work life: A review of literature. *DLSU Business & Economics Review* 20: 1-8.
- [5] Almarshad SO (2015) A Measurement Scale for Evaluating Quality of Work Life: Conceptualization and Empirical Validation. *Trends in Applied Sciences Research* 10: 143-156.
- [6] Belwal S, Belwal R (2014) Work-Life Balance, Family-Friendly Policies and Quality of Work Life Issues: Studying

- Employers' Perspectives of Working Women in Oman. *Journal of International Women's Studies* 15: 96-117.
- [7] Thomas R (2014) Culture of Work environment: Secret Contents in Aleqtasidiah Saudi Arabia
- [8] Nayak T, Sahoo CK, Prabodh Kumar M, Bijaya Kumar S (2016) HR interventions and quality of work life of healthcare employees: an investigation. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 48: 234-240.
- [9] Teryima SJ, Faajir A, John E (2016) Examining employee quality of work life (QWL) as a determinant of managerial effectiveness in business organizations: a study of Nigeria Breweries plc, Lagos. *The Business & Management Review* 7: 268.
- [10] Gupta B, Hyde AM, Anvesha (2016) Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life among Academicians 9: 8-19.
- [11] Tabassum A, Rahman T, Jahan K, (2011) Quality of work life among male and female employees of private commercial banks in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Economics and Management* 5: 266-282.
- [12] Horst DJ, Broday EE, Bondarick R, Filipe L (2014) Quality of Working Life and Productivity: An Overview of the Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research* 2: 87-98.
- [13] Roche WK (2009) who gains from workplace partnership? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 20: 1-33.
- [14] Inthiyaz, K. (2017). Impact of employee skill development on organizational performance in banking industries with special reference to YSR district. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research (IJEMR)*, 7(3), 62-65.