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**Abstract**

In today’s world the importance for the QWL is growing very much from time to time. So, in every organization this QWL factor has been prioritized for the organizations benefit.

QWL plays a very important role in every organization which affects the employees, performance, work and self-development which includes both individuals as well as organization development. QWL refers relationship between the employees and their working environment in an organization. A good QWL improves both employee and organization growth together. For the managers and the administrators QWL means enhancing the psychological aspects in the work environment so that the productivity of employees in the organization can foster.

Retail industry in India contributes about 10% to the country GDP. Retail trading of India almost provides about 9% of jobs to the citizens. The Indian economic and its rapid growth in recent years are making it as a favorite destination for the global retail giants to come and invest in the country. The Indian retail market estimated value is US$ 600 billion and stands in the list of Top5 retail markets in the world with the basis of its economic value.

In India until 2011, only the single-branded stores were working but the Government of India in November 2011, granted permission for multi-branded stores to work along with the single- branded stores. So, here we have need to study on QWL concept relationship with retail sector.
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**Introduction**

Quality of work life means the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the working environment of the employees in an organization. It focuses on every organizational input which mainly aims for the employee’s satisfaction and organizations effectiveness. The purpose here is to develop working condition and jobs which are very good for staff and also for the organization to perform excellent.

There are a lot of factors which influence the work life of an employee in an organization and these factors whether it is a major or minor will surely have a heavy impact of their work life. Some of these factors involving in Quality of work life are: (a)Open communication: Free to do an open communication with the co-staff in the work place is very important for a good work life. This will create a good relationship between the staff who works in an organization. (b)Job security: Every organization should provide a secured job security for its employees. If the employees are satisfied with the job security provided to them, then their productivity in the work place will enhance which is very important for the organization to achieve its vision. (c)Opportunities: The staff should be provided with an opportunity to enhance their knowledge and skills in the organization and for these different types of trainings and development programs should be conducted for them. (d) Reward system: A reward for an employee in an organization who worked well can either be in the form of monetary or non-monetary. By giving the reward to the employees for their hard work, the organization can motivate its other employees to work well. (e) Stress: The stress given can diminish the employee performance level. So, more stress will impact as a bad quality of work life and less stress as good quality of work life. (f) Career growth: A good career growth opportunity for an employee will motivate them to perform better in the organization. It can be in the form of salary hike, promotion, responsibility etc. (f) Employee participation in decision making: Every organization should encourage its employees to participate in the organization decision making. By giving this opportunity the organization can show that they value their employees which will create a good quality of work life.

**Literature Review**

QWL has become an emerging subject of focus in last few decades. There has been more emphasis is given on out of work life. The study has concentrated on faculty members of two university in which data was collected with help of T test and complete analysis was done through correlation method (Mirkamali & Thani, 2011). (Shivani, 2017) consider factors like job performance, job security and satisfaction of employee to understand whether these elements have impact on QWL. Work has become a part of our daily life, so, having a good work life will definitely impact on overall quality of life of each individual. Here a decision about different measures that has been taken in organization balance employee work life is also briefed. Advantage of focusing on QWL would make impact on attrition, performance and absenteeism. (Shraddha Sharma et al., 2014) mentions about QWL factors like Organization Commitment, Organizational Belongingness, good Compensation, employee’s involvement in organization decision making and problem solving is implemented in educational sectors for teachers. Plastic industry has been maintained well by involving the employees in organization decision making and by motivating them to do the work properly. They also reduced the stress level of employees to give a good work life (Arpit Patel, 2016). (Dr. Florence John and Dr. Nirmala Mohan, 2014) remarked the demographic profile of the staffs in Rane Ltd which is based on the staff’s marital status, job satisfaction and the category of executives. Here the results concluded that the marital status did not affect the staff office timings, the roles and responsibilities do not change according to their category of executives.

Since work is playing significant role in human life and creating experiences. There is upmost requirement for building satisfaction at work place. Study is done on subjective matter of QWL keep focus on employee satisfaction, security of job, performance. It states that finding exact factors impacting QWL is difficult, but various physical factors, policy matters would directly or indirectly impact on managing work life of employees (Shefali & Rooma, 2014). Organization success depends on productivity of employee, it is required QWL must be given proper attention from organization point of view as well. As QWL is important for organization also along with its employees. Work life experience can be positive or negative but it will have effect on other round of a person life. Reasons of decrease of quality of work life can be stress in job, lack of career opportunities or policies that is created by companies (Hymavathi & Dr. Saraswathi, 2018). High QWL policies would make an organization have best results in terms of productivity as there will be no turnover and high commitment is given by employees. Here study has used Pareto Technique for better and deeper understanding of concept. QWL must be provided a deeper thought by organizations to make employee feel satisfied in working as they will investing their time in work place the most. Hence its responsibility of employer makes sure they are not failing in keeping up the expectations by employee (Afroz, 2017).

(Deepak Kochar, 2015) researcher feels that with presence of QWL factors helps employees to feel safe and secured to do their job in the organization and also get positively motivated towards their career growth. The present study reveals that the monetary consideration, nature of job, infrastructure, current performance and future growth are very strongly associated with job satisfaction which aims in having a comfortable livelihood.

**OBJECTIVES**

* To analyze about the working conditions of staff in retail sector.
* To examine the quality of work life among shop floor level staff in retail sector.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The contemporary study comes under descriptive and exploratory research as its foremost point is on concept of quality work life which helps to identify the various factors affecting in selected sector. The study is done through collection of primary data through the help of structured questionnaire.

Sampling: Sample size of our study is 102. Sampling technique implemented for research is convenience sampling.

Sampling area: The data gathering was done in site Badrappa Layout, Bengaluru.

Tools used for Analysis:

 The data was provided for analysis into IBM SPSS 20 software package.

Percentage Analysis, Multiple Correlations, Regressions and Chi-square tests were used in analyzing the data.

**Hypothesis**

H11: There is significant relationship between quality of work life and use of capacities at work.

H12: There is significant relationship between quality of work life and opportunities at work.

H13: There is significant relationship between quality of work life and learning and development.

**DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1: Case Processing Summary |
|   | N | % |
|  Cases | Valid | 102 | 100.0 |
| Excludeda | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 102 | 100.0 |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 2: Reliability Statistics |
| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
| .72 | .72 | 102 |

Reliability Statistics: The reliability co-efficient is 0.720 and the numbers are close to 1. Usually, the alpha should be above 0.7 which are considered as having good internal consistency. Hence the outcome of table (Table -2) shows 0.72 it can be considered as data is ideal.

II Demographic Details of the Respondents

Table 3: Profile of the Respondents

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Categories** | **No of Respondents** | **Percentage** |
| Age | 21-25 | 85 | 83.33 |
| 26-30 | 14 | 13.72 |
| 31-35 | 3 | 2.94 |
| 36-40 | 0 | 0 |
| Monthly income | 9,000-10,0000 | 50 | 27.47 |
| 10,000-11,000 | 76 | 41.76 |
| >11,000 | 56 | 30.77 |
| Education | SSLC | 33 | 32.35 |
| PUC | 41 | 40.19 |
| Graduation | 28 | 27.45 |
| Work experience  | > 4 months | 11 | 10.78 |
| 4-8 months | 14 | 13.72 |
| 9-12 months | 38 | 37.25 |
| < 12 months | 39 | 38.23 |
| Salary | Rs.5000- Rs.10,000 | 54 | 52.94 |
| Rs.11,000- | 48 | 47.05 |
| Marital status | Married | 25 | 24.5 |
| Unmarried | 77 | 75.49 |

Interpretation:

Overhead table provides complete demographic details of the respondents. We can infer that the majority of the respondent’s age is between 21-25(85). Highest number of respondents have completed their PUC (41) education in the organization. Respondents have experience of more than 12 months which is 39 and the next highest is the experience of 9-12 months which is 38.

Majority of our respondents get their salary as 5000-10,000 (54). Table above clearly states that the majority of respondents are unmarried which is 77. Overall picture of the respondents is provided in table shown above.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable 1** | **Variable 2** | **Chi square value**  | **P value** | **Results** |
| Quality of Work Life | Use of capacities at work | 70.718 | 0.786 | Accepted |
| Quality of Work Life | Opportunities at Work | 105.789 | 0.302 | Rejected |
| Quality of Work Life | Learning and Development | 141.920 | 0.003 | Rejected |

**Correlations Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Qualit y ofwork life | Occupie d spaceby thework in life | Job satisfacti on | Work engageme nt | Learning and developme nt |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 1 | 0.042 | -0.001 | 0.095 | -0.117 |
| Qualityof work life | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | 0.676 | 0.993 | 0.341 | 0.24 |
| N | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 |
| Occupi ed space by the work life | Pearson Correlation | 0.042 | 1 | 0.049 | 0.214 | -0.077 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.676 |  | 0.627 | 0.031 | 0.44 |
| N | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | -0.001 | 0.049 | 1 | -0.133 | -0.064 |
| Job satisfac tion | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.993 | 0.627 |  | 0.182 | 0.523 |
| N | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | 0.095 | .214\* | -0.133 | 1 | -.086\* |
| Work engage ment | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.341 | 0.031 | 0.182 |  | 0.389 |
| N | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 |
|  | Pearson Correlation | -0.117 | -0.077 | -0.064 | -0.086 | 1 |
| Learning anddevelop ment | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.24 | 0.44 | 0.523 | 0.389 |  |
| N | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 102 |

Interpretation and results:

As per above table the correlations factors which is analyzed with all dimensions found to be negatively as well as positively not significant at (two tailed). It also shows that the null hypothesis is accepted with two dimensions like occupied space by the work life and Work engagement is having positive significance. There is minor negativity correlation between learning and development and quality of work life.

**Regression table**

## Model Summaryb

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | RSquare | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |
| R SquareChange | FChange | df1 |
| 1 | .146a | .021 | -.019 | 2.16905 | .021 | .529 | 4 |

Interpretation: -0.019 is the adjusted R square. This means that the regression analysis can explain -1.9% of the data. Such as occupied space by the work in life, job satisfaction, learning and development, work engagement on quality of work life.

**Anova**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Sum ofSquares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Regression | 9.960 | 4 | 2.490 | .529 | .715b |
| Residual | 456.364 | 97 | 4.705 |
| 1 |  |  |  |
| Total | 466.324 | 101 |  |

Interpretation:

p value from the ANOVA table is 0.715 which is greater than the significance value of

0.05 and this leads us to reject the null hypothesis, in other words we accept the alternate hypothesis and say that there is a significant impact Occupied space by the work in life, Job satisfaction, Learning and development, Work engagement on Quality of work life.

C**o-efficient**

## Coefficientsa

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Un standardized Coefficients | Standardize dCoefficients | T | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
|  | (Constant) | 10.917 | 3.010 |  | 3.627 | .000 |
|  | Occupied space by thework in life | .015 | .099 | .016 | .152 | .880 |
|  | Job satisfaction | .003 | .108 | .002 | .024 | .981 |
| 1 | Learning and development | -.109 | .101 | -.109 | -1.076 | .285 |
|  | Work engagement | .082 | .103 | .083 | .795 | .429 |

**Conclusion**

This study indicates that there is limited satisfaction with the quality of work life the retail industry. Participants said that job security will influence quality of work life more than any other factors. Learning and development are also having an important factor for experiencing quality of work life in mentioned sector.

 The retail industry demands different style of working and also the work environment is under severe pressure. However small efforts made by retail outlet may not make much difference. The results may show dissatisfaction of quality of work life.
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