Quality of Work-Life and Employee Performance in Manufacturing Companies

Ms. Renu Chaudhary* and Mr. Rajesh Shahi

Abstract

The objective of this investigation is to look at the relationship between employee performance and quality of work-life in manufacturing companies. A self-administrative questionnaire was used to gather data for the study from 231 manufacturing company employees in the Butwal Industrial Estate using a convenience sample approach on a five-point Likert scale. In the research study's causal and descriptive comparative research design, Hays Process Macro Approach and Correlation were utilized as research design tools. The study's conclusions showed a strong connection between employee performance and work conditions, relationships, and cooperation, organizational culture, social integration, and compensation and reward. Moreover, it is also found that there is significant effect of Work condition, Relation and Cooperation, Organization culture, social integration culture, Compensation, and Reward has the highest influences on the job performance. Consequently, it can be assumed that there is a higher chance of improving employee performance if manufacturing organizations focus on these areas, namely Organization culture and reward and compensation in favor of employees.

Key words: *Employee Performance, Work condition, Relation and co-operation, Organization culture, co-operation, social integration and Compensation and Rewards.*

Ms. Renu Chaudhary*

MBS-F Scholar at the Lumbini Banijya Campus Nepal Email Id: chaudharyrenu607@gmail.com.

Mr. Rajesh Shahi Asst. Professor in Lumbini Banijya Campus, Nepal Email Id: shahiraju@gmail.com *Corresponding author

I. Introduction

The primary strategic resources used by each firm were its human resources. Unquestionably, effective human resource management based on behavioral sciences is essential for workplace success. It is required to comprehend ideas and constructs linked to human resources and its particular instruments more thoroughly, as well as to have the ability to employ these constructs and instruments, in order to meet the challenge of effective use of this resource (Blanchard, 1988). Due to its significance, quality of work life is one of the factors that many managers who want to improve quality in human resources have lately taken into account.

Although research on the factors that affect quality of life has a long history (Samuels and Alexander, 2003), it is unclear where the term "quality of work life" first appeared. However, it is likely that Rensis Likert and his approach to systemic change at the Social Research Institute of the University of Michigan (Hood & Smith, 1994).

"Quality work life" is defined in the definition as the capacity of employees to satisfy major personal needs as a consequence of their performance at work as gauge of the overall conditions of the workplace, Quality Work Life has become more significant in organizational behavior. It influences people, their work, performances, and personality in adding to the company's overall development, therefore every organization may profit from it. Essentially, it pertains to the connection between the workplace and the employees. It emphasizes building a workplace where people cooperate and produce outcomes as a team. Work, home, the person, and the organization all benefit from a high quality of work life (QWL). To preserve an employee's satisfaction and motivation, the business must meet their needs, such as remuneration, and well-being (Cavry, safety, 1995). Maintaining employee happiness is vital for their capacity to enhance customer support, boost confidence, and perform better. In response to the tendency of change in a multitude of industries, along with the environment. technologies, and the emergence of worker unions, owners are providing pay as reward and developing specialized perks. The goal is to create a highquality working environment that will captivate and retain the brightest minds across all disciplines. Several scholars have explored the many conceptions of the work life quality in the past, taking into account all of its characteristics. The phrase "quality of work life" (QWL) has been around since the 1960s, although Hian and Einstein stated during the

II. Review of Literature

Theoretical Review

A theoretical framework is an arrangement that provides insight into the connected theories and concepts. Henri et al. (2006) said that QWL consisted of job characteristics and Work situation influenced the employee's work life. Social and physical work circumstances have been shown to have an effect on employees' mental health, according to study on the subject. Workplace settings that are conducive to employees' welfare and well-being are referred to as QWL (Hood & Smith, 1994).

Social integration, economic cooperation, and identity inclusion are three significant facets of a newcomer's experience in a welcoming conference of international labour relations in Rome that it was first used in 1972. (Hian & Einstein, 1990).

The expression "work-life balance" indicates that unless a certain balance is achieved, the responsibilities of a paid employment threaten other aspects of life. It is a form of communication that has developed as the result of social reform. Because of the more lasting changes in labor market in the recent days, nature of work, family, demographic changes, and government laws, there is a specific feeling of stress and strain amid paid service as well as the lifetime. Everyone, not only those who have direct care obligations, experiences the quality of work-life balance differently throughout their lives (Dargahi & Seragi, 2007). Organization researchers and professionals have been engaged in employee engagement and their work-life balance for a very long time. Increasing focus on the state sponsored projects and efforts, typically through the goal of achieving improved performance quality. This interest stems from the knowledge and evidence that having a motivated and content workforce has advantages (Wyatt & Wah, 2001).

community (Loscocco & Roschelle, 1990). Social integration refers to the extent to which newcomers participate in collaborative social connection among their group members, are content with the other members of the group, and are appealing to the group (Wyatt &Wah, 2001).

According to the (Sirgy et al., 2008) framework of the connection among relationship, cooperation and employee performance, it was discovered that a good rapport between a supervisor and a subordinate inspires workers to provide their best efforts.

Remuneration is the remuneration that employees receive in return for their efforts,

and it is typically the foundation of a skilled workforce. Executing your remuneration budgeting techniques effectively often affects immediately the caliber and performance of your company's personnel pool (Maanen & Schein, 1979). The term "compensation package" can refer to more than just financial pay. Incentives, work-life balance, health insurance, and other advantages are also discussed.

Empirical Review

The excellence of an employee's working conditions has the great influence on their degree of motivation and, by extension, their output. The quality of their connections with the business, and especially with the surrounding, greatly influences the error rate, degree of innovation, degree of cooperation with other personnel, rate of absenteeism, and consequently how they work (Nash, 1985). Organizations will need to create effective work environments given the rapidly changing and increasingly competitive nature of the workplace. This will be accomplished through strategies like personal development programs, improved collaboration and at all organizational teamwork levels, labor/management including partnership councils, and a dedication to performing a good job and delivering great performance (Cooper, 2006). According to Ahmad (2001), it's commonly misunderstood that a worker's pay is inversely proportional to how well they accomplish their job. Yet, several surveys of employees have shown that this is not generally true. Pay raises and bonuses tied to

III. Research Methodology

The study aims to examine the relationship between Quality of Work life and Employee Performance in manufacturing companies of Butwal industrial Estate. This study looks at the various methods and procedures of researcher adopted in conducting the study. performance often have a minimal effect in the near run. These supplementary money are less likely to be regarded as a reward and more of an "entitlement.". There are additional elements that, when taken together, offer a more potent predictor of employee success.

To determine the quality of the working environment Brooks and Anderson (2005) used work context, work design, work life/family life, and work world. Work conditions (Sirgy et al., 2008; Ahmad, 2001), occupational stress (Cunningham, 1990), professional remuneration growth, and incentives, and social support are the five aspects of quality of work life that are the focus of this study (Purdy & Ford, 2010) According to Serey (2006), the construct of quality of work life contains the criteria of commitment, consciousness, capacity, and, concern. The authors of the study had emphasized the need of assessing the value of work-life in both the job and non-job contexts, and they have proposed six categories, including career satisfaction and work, job pressure, work control, workplace, work-life balance, and overall well-being (Cole et al., 2005). According to Zohir (2007), financial benefits, social welfare, security, and leave policies all improve employees' quality of life at work. This group of advantages impacts the performance of the company. Also, according to this research report (Zohir, 2007), nonfinancial benefits have a good impact on both worker quality of life and business success. As an illustration, consider canteen amenities, festival bonuses. attendance bonuses. transportation amenities, and pay increases.

The demographic, size of the sample, sampling methods, sources of data collection, data analysis tools and techniques, were all employed in the study. Both causalcomparative and descriptive research designs were used in this study. More specifically, this study examines the effect of work condition, relation and co-operation, organization culture, social integration, compensation and rewards. There are altogether 64 manufacturing companies in Butwal Industrial Estate, out of them there are 28 Plastic factories (Butwal Industrial Estate, 2022) where number of employees working are 573. Therefore, the population of the study is 573. A sample is a small portion of

$$n = \frac{n_0}{1 + (n_0 - 1)/N}$$

something that demonstrates how the remainder should or is. The Cochran's formula, which is as follows, was applied to get the sample size for the study:

Where,

 $n_0 = \frac{t^2 P Q}{d^2}$, P=0.5, Q=0.5, d=5%, α =5%, t=1.96 and N= 573

Where N = "total employees in the company (573)"

d= "Acceptable error (5%=0.05)"

P= "Proportion of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (0.5, from normal area of table)"

t= "(1.96, from Normal area of table)"

"The calculated sample size is 231 (rounded of)."

IV. Results and finding

Descriptive Statistics: Mean and Standard Deviation

The mean is a statistical measure used to express the central tendency or average of a group of numbers. One of several measures of central tendency, it is also referred to as the arithmetic average. That is probably the central tendency metric that you are most accustomed to. The sum of squares (SS) of the

The Regression model

Except for the fact how this approach makes use of many independent variables, multiple linear regression analysis is essentially similar to the simple linear model. Quantitatively, the multiple linear regression model can be expressed as:

 $Y = a + b1X_1 + b2X_2 + b3X_3 + b4X_4 + b5X_5 + \epsilon$

Where:

- Y Dependent variable
- X₁, X₂, X₃, X₄, X₅ Independent (explanatory) variables
- a Intercept
- b1, b2, b3, b4, b5 Slopes
- ϵ Residual (error)

The regression equation of the study is as follows:

Y = a + b1x1 + b2x2 + b3x3 + b4x4 + b5x5

Employee Performance = a (Intercept) + b1 (Work condition) + b2 (Organization culture) + b3 (Relation and Cooperation) + b4 (Social integration) + b5 (Compensation and Reward).

dispersion, a metric of how dispersed a dataset is from their mean, is employed to determine the Standard Deviation (SD). The SD is calculated by taking the square root of the dispersion, which is the difference from every piece of data from it's own mean. The statistics diverge farther from the mean the larger the variation inside the collecting data, hence the greater the typical dispersion, the further scattered the dataset is.

 Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Independent variable and Dependent variable

IV	n	Ā	Σ	Cronbach Alpha
Work condition	210	3.51	1.39	0.706

Relation and Cooperation	210	3.98	1.32	0.746
Organization culture	210	4.49	0.85	0.729
Social integration	210	3.86	1.42	0.724
Compensation and Reward	210	3.76	1.23	0.786
Employees Performance	210	3.98	1.24	0.781

Note: Results from SPSS

According to table no. 2 above, the values for Cronbach Alpha are.706,.746,.729,.724,.786, and 0.781 for work situation, organization culture, relationship and cooperation, social integration, compensation and reward, and employee performance, respectively.

values for work conditions, The mean organizational culture, relationships and cooperation, social integration, compensation and reward, and employee performance are determined in Table No. 2 above to be 3.51, 4.49, 3.98, 3.86, 3.76, and 3.98, respectively.

Inferential Results

Table 2: Correlation

		Work condition	Organizati on culture	Relation and Cooperation	Social integration	Compensat ion	Employee Performance
Work condition		1	.942**	.954**	.663**	.974**	.821**
Organization			1	.927**	.596**	.964**	.691**
culture							
Relation and	Pearso			1	.676**	.984**	$.851^{**}$
Cooperation	n						
Social integration	Correl				1	.654**	.623**
Compensation	ation					1	.793**
Employee							1
Performance							

Note: Result drown from SPSS

The value of r with respect to Work condition, Organization culture, Relation and Cooperation, Social integration, Compensation, in relation to Employee Performance are 0.821, 0.691, 0.851, 0.623, and 0.793 respectively, which means there is strong positive relationship between independent variable and Dependent variable i.e., Work condition, Organization culture, Relation and Cooperation, Social integration, Compensation, and Employee Performance.

Regression analysis

Work condition

Table 3:	Summary	of the	Regression	Analysis
----------	---------	--------	------------	----------

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of Estimate
1	0.562 ^a	0.315	0.307	0.535

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work condition

Table 4: ANOVA

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Adjusted R ²		SE of Esti	mate
1	0.562 ^a	0.315	0.307			0.535	i
		SS	Degree-of- freedom	N	IS	F-Stat	P-value.
1	Regression	0.292	1	0.2	292	1.017	0.315 ^a
	Residual	33.833	208	0.2	287		
	Total	34.125	209				

Table 3: Summary of the Regression Analysis

Note: Result drown from SPSS a. Predictors: (Constant), Work condition

Table 5: Coefficient

		Unstand	lardized β	Standardized B	t-stat.	p-value
		β	SE	β		•
1	(Constant)	4.477	.155		28.900	.000
	Work condition	.036	.036	.092	1.008	.315

Note: Result drown from SPSS, SE=Std. Error a. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Interpretation

y = a + bx1

Employees' performance= constant + slope x ease

EP = 4.477 + 0.036

t = (28.900) (1.008)

P-value = (0.000) (0.000)

SE = 0.155 (0.036)

 $R = .562 \quad R2 = .315$

Relation and Cooperation

Table 6: Model Summary

Work condition.

accepted.

The t- statistic's p value (0.315) is less than 0.01; hence, there is insufficient support for

the H0. As a result, the H6 states that the

working conditions have a considerable

impact on employees' performance, is

From the above calculation, the R Square is

0.315 that express 31.5% disparity in

employees' performance is elucidated by

	R	\mathbf{R}^2	Adjusted-R ²	SE of Estimate
1	0.634 ^a	0.401	0.349	0.494

Note: Result drown from SPSS, SE= Std. Error

a. Predictors: (Constant), Relation and Cooperation

Table 7: ANOVA

	SS	df	MS	F-Stat	Sig.
--	----	----	----	--------	------

Table 6: Model Summary

	R	R	2	Adju	sted-R ²	SE of Estima	ate	
1	0.634 ^a	0.4	-01	0	.349	0.494		
 1	Regression	5.334		1	5.334	21.862	0.0)00 ^a
	Residual	28.791	20	08	0.244			
	Total	34.125	20	09				

Note: Result drown from SPSS, MS=Mean Square a. Predictors: (Constant), Relation and Cooperation

b. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Table 8: Coefficients

		Unsta	ndardized β	Standardized β			
Model		β	SE	β	t-value	p-value	
1	(Constant)	3.769	0.189		19.987	0.000	
	Relation and Cooperation	0.198	0.042	.395	4.676	0.000	

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Interpretation

y = a+bx Employees' performance= constant + slope x ease EP = 3.769+ 0.198

The null hypothesis cannot be accepted since the p value (0.000) of the t-value is below 0.01. As a result, the alternative hypothesis H7 is adopted, which states that relationships and cooperation have a major impact on $t = (19.98) \quad (4.676)$ P-value = (0.000) (0.000) SE = 0.189 (0.042) R = .634 R2 = .401

employees' performance. From the above calculation, the R square value is 0.401 indicating Relation and Cooperation explicate the 40.1% variation in employees' performance.

Organization Culture

Table 9: Regression Results

	R	\mathbf{R}^2	Adjusted R ²	SE of Estimate
1	0.465 ^a	0.216	0.209	0.476

Note: Result drown from SPSS a. Predictors: (Constant), Organization culture

Table 10: ANOVA

	Model	SS	df	MS	F Stat.	P-value.
--	-------	----	----	----	---------	----------

Table 9: Regression Results

	R	R ²	A	djusted R ²	SE	of Estimate	
1	0.465 ^a	0.216		0.209		0.476	
1	Regression	7.375		1	7.375	32.532	0.000^{a}
	Residual	26.750)	208	0.227		
	Total	34.125	5	209			

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organization culture

b. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Table 11: Coefficients

Model		Unstand	ardized β	Standardized β t		Sig.
		В	SE	β		0
1	(Constant)	3.647	.177		20.626	.000
	Organizing Culture	.226	.040	.465	5.704	.000

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Interpretation

Employees' performance= constant + slope x ease

$$\begin{split} EP &= 3.647 + 0.226 \\ t &= (20.62) \ (5.704) \\ P\text{-value} &= (0.000) \ (0.000) \\ SE &= 0.177 \ (0.040) \\ R &= .465 \quad R2 \quad .216 \\ The null hypothesis cannot be accepted as p-$$

value is (0.000) at significance level of 0.01.

y = a + bx

As a result, the alternative hypothesis H8, which states that organizational culture has a considerable impact on employee performance, is accepted.

The above equation's R2 value is 0.216, which indicates that the organization's culture accounts for 21.6% of the difference in performance.

Social integration

Table12: Regression Results

	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of Estimate
1	.737 ^a	.543	.448	.522

Note: Result drown from SPSS a. Predictors: (Constant), Social integration

Table 13: ANOVAs

		SS	df	MS	F-Stat.	P-value
1	Regression	1.912	1	1.912	7.004	.009 ^a
	Residual	32.213	208	.273		
	Total	34.125	209			

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social integration

Table 13: ANOVAs

		SS	df	MS	F-Stat.	P-value
1	Regression	1.912	1	1.912	7.004	.009 ^a
	Residual	32.213	208	.273		
	Total	34.125	209			

b. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Table 14: Coefficient

		Unstanda	rdized β	Standardized β		
		В	SE	β	t-value	p-value
1	(Constant)	4.194	.170		24.717	.000
	Social Integration	.104	.039	.237	2.646	.009

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Interpretation

y = a + bx

Employees' performance= constant + slope x ease

EP. = 4.194 + 0.104

t = (24.71) (2.64)

P-value = (0.000) (0.000)

SE = 0.170 (0.039)

Compensation and Reward

Table 15: Regression Results

	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of Estimate
1	.465 ^a	.216	.209	.476

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation and Reward

Table 16: ANOVA^b

Model		SS	df	MS	F-stat.	p-value
1	Regression	7.375	1	7.375	32.532	.000 ^a
	Residual	26.750	208	.227		
	Total	34.125	209			

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation and Reward

b. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

$R = .737 \quad R2 \quad .543$

The t- statistic's p value (0.009) is less than 0.01, hence there is insufficient support for the H0. As a result, the H9 indicating that social integration has a considerable impact on employee performance is accepted.

The following equation's R2 value is 0.543, which indicates that social integration accounts for 54.3% of the variation in an employee's performance.

		Unstanda	ardized β	Standardized β	t-value	p-value
		В	SE	β		-
1	(Constant)	3.647	.177		20.626	.000
	Compensation and Reward	.226	.040	.465	5.704	.000

Table 17: Coefficients

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Dependent Variable: employees' performance

Interpretation

y = a + bx

Employees' performance= constant + slope x ease

EP = 3.647 + 0.226

t = (20.62) (5.704)

 $R = .465 \quad R2 = .216$

The H0 cannot be accepted since the p value (0.000) of the t-statistic below 0.01. As a result, the H10 is adopted, which states that compensation and reward have a considerable impact on employee performance.

In the above calculation, the R^2 is 0.216 indicating 21.6% difference in performance is clarified by Compensation and Reward.

P-value = (0.000) (0.000)

SE = 0.177 (0.040)

Overall Variables

Table 18: Model Summary

	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of Estimate
1	.616 ^a	0.38	0.358	0.429

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a Predictors: (Constant), Work condition, Relation and Cooperation, Organization culture, social integration, Compensation and Reward.

Table 19: ANOVA^b

		SS	df	MS	F-stat.	p-value
1	Regression	12.960	4	3.240	17.604	.000 ^a
	Residual	21.165	115	.184		
	Total	34.125	209			

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work condition, Relation and Cooperation, Organization culture, social integration, Compensation and Reward.

b. Dependent Variable: Employees Performance

Table 20: Coefficients

		Unstandardized β		Standardized B	t-value	Sig.
		В	SE	β		b
1	(Constant)	2.872	.233		12.336	.000
	Work condition	.097	.036	.245	2.680	.008
	Relation and Cooperation	.148	.038	.296	3.932	.000
	Organization culture	.228	.039	.468	5.895	.000
	Social integration	.126	.038	.286	3.271	.001
	Compensation and Reward	.132	.035	.383	4.323	.032

Note: Result drown from SPSS

a. Dependent Variable: Employees Performance

Regression equation showing the relation between all independent variable and dependent variable

Y=a+b1X1+b2X2+b3X3+b4X4+b5x5

Y=2.872+.097X1+.148X2+.228X3+.126X4+ .132X5

V. Discussion, Conclusion and Implication

Discussion

According to research (Henri et al., 2006), job characteristics and working conditions both influence on an individual's quality of work life (QWL). Both the physical and social aspects of the workplace, as has been shown by several studies influence the psychological health of workers. According to Ahmad (2001), the primary tenet of QWL is to conditions establish working where employees may collaborate with one another to accomplish organizational goals and boost employee performance. The findings of the former research are thus confirmed by the current study.

Similarly, the three key aspects of newcomers' experiences in the society they are joining are social integration, economic integration, and identity integration (Loscocco & Roschelle, 1990). Social integration refers to newcomers'

Overall, in the above equation the value of R2 is 0.380, which suggests that 38.0% variation in Workers Performance is explained by Work situation, Relation and Cooperation, Organization culture, social integration, Pay and Reward.

cooperation, satisfaction, and appeal to the team (Wyatt & Wah, 2001). Organizational socialization is the process of establishing the attitudes, actions, and knowledge needed to work in a company (Maanen & Schein, 1979). The perspectives of the employee, who is attempting to define his or her function within the company, and the viewpoint of the organization, which is attempting to influence and mold its new members, are the two key forces at play in this process. Therefore, it is clear that both the newcomer and the organization influence the socialization process. The newcomer can influence the organization because they are now a member of it, but the organization also affects them since they are now a part of it. A successful socialization process has advantages for both the person and the company, including lowering uncertainty, boosting work satisfaction, and transmitting organizational culture. Ineffective socialization, however, can have negative effects on the organization. According to Fisher (1986), inadequate

socializing encourages turnover intentions, which have a costly knock-on effect on productivity and work flow (Shaw & Delery, 2005; Ahmad & Kushwaha, 2016). Recruitment and training expenses are wasted since they raise prices. This demonstrates the significance of a thoughtful socialization process. This one thus confirms the findings of the former research.

Similarly, it was discovered that a good connection between a supervisor and a subordinate inspires workers to perform more effectively based on the Sirgy et al. (2008) model of the link between Relation, Cooperation and Employee Performance. Sirgy et al. (2008) further stated that enjoyable **QWL** programs contribute to the improvement of healthy relationships by offering work resources to support the employee's expectations, reducing role conflict related to work and personal life, improving numerous roles, reducing role expectations, reducing stress from both workand non-work-related sources, and the enhancement of a role's relevance. In this research, Ahmad (2001) adopted the Work-Life Identity model because it goes into detail on how programs for people's personal nonwork and working lives affect their own overall well-being. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of initiatives that promote a high-quality work-life balance on employee performance (Shaw & Delery, 2005). As a result, this one supports the results of the earlier study.

A productive workforce is typically built on compensation, which is the incentive provided to employees in exchange for their services. Executing your pay planning strategies effectively often immediately affects the caliber and performance of your company's personnel pool (Maanen & Schein, 1979. The term "compensation package" may refer to more than just monetary pay. Incentive, healthcare insurance, time off, and work-life harmony are also part of the deal. Nowadays, workers place equal value on non-monetary forms of compensation. That is what Ahmad (2001) says a salary guarantee does. When employees are compensated well, they are less likely to leave the organization.

Similar to this, culture in organizations plays a crucial role in achieving organizational success (Shahzad et al., 2017). The relationship between outcomes and staff satisfaction and corporate culture is strong. According to Shahzad et al. (2017), the organization culture may encourage employees to engage in decision-making and to contribute their innovative ideas in order to enhance the overall performance of the firm. Skoran (1983) emphasized that organizational culture is the foundation for sustaining an organization's competitive advantage over According time. Skoran (1983). to organizational affects culture member behavior; hence, culture is necessary for enhancing member performance. According to (Robbins & Judge, 2016), organizational culture is viewed as a system put in place by the organization's members and develops into a quality that sets it apart from other Organizational organizations. culture is defined by values, fundamental presumptions, expectations, and organizational descriptions that define the organization and its people, according Lapina to et al. (2015). Organizational culture serves as both the foundation and defining feature of the company and a social glue that ties individuals together via shared beliefs (Lapina et al., 2015). It is important to realize that, in companies, culture is not necessarily a positive thing. If an organization's culture discourages innovation and resists change, culture might become a barrier (Robbins & Judge, 2016). Thus, the findings of previous study are consistent with this study.

Conclusion and Implication

According to the results, there is a strong correlation between the following factors: Work conditions, relations and cooperation, organizational culture, social integration, compensation and reward, and quality of work life. Moreover, it is also found that there is significant effect of Work condition, Relation and Cooperation, Organization culture, social integration, Compensation and Reward on Employee Performance. Among the different Organization variables used culture. Compensation, and Reward has the highest influences on the job performance. This leads to the conclusion that there is a greater likelihood improving employee of performance if manufacturing organizations focus on these factors, namely organizational culture and compensation and reward that is employee-friendly.

The survey's results served as the foundation for the report's recommendations. The

References

- Ahmad, S. (2001), "Paradigms of quality of work life", Journal of Human Values.19 (1).73-82.
- Ahmad, S.Y. & Kushwaha, B.P. (2016). Potential of film–induced tourism and its impact on destination development. Prabandhan Guru, VII (1&2), Jan-Dec, 9-14.
- Amiri, A.M., Kushwaha, B.P., and Singh, R.K. (2023). Visualization of Global Research Trends and Future Research Directions of Digital Marketing in Small and Medium Enterprises using Bibliometric Analysis, Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-04-2022-0206

following suggestions are made in light of the study's findings:

- There are only five factors in this research. Thus, it is advised that future researchers incorporate more variables that explain work-life quality.
- It is advised that other researchers increase their sample sizes as this study's sample size is limited in order to get a more focused and accurate conclusion.
- Since the research study has been focused only on manufacturing companies, it is also recommended to conduct such studies in other types of industry such as manufacturing and services industries.
- Since the employees provided positive response towards different dimension of quality of work-life so organization should take initiatives to develop and implement strategies in the favor of employees to uplift them perform.
- Blanchard, J. (1988). AMOS 18.0 User's Guide, SPSS, New York. Arneson, H. and Ekberg, K. (2006), "Measuring empowerment in working life: a review", Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation. 26(4) 37-46.
- Brooks, B.J. and Anderson, P. (2005)."Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance", Journal of Organizational Behavior.25(8).951-968.
- Cavry, R.M. (1995), "The moderatormediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-2082.

- Chunnigham, R. (1990). Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions. Journal of Social Sciences, 2(2), 61-67.
- Cooper, D. (2006). Management Building Competitive Advantage, 6th ed., Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston.Bentler, P.M. (2007), "On tests and indices for evaluating structural models", Personality and Individual Differences, 42(5), 825-829.
- Dargahi, G., &Seragi, B. (2007), "A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams", Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(2), 331-346.
- Hasan, N.; Singh, A.; Agarwal, M.; Kushwaha, B.P. (2022). Evaluating the Role of Microfinance Institutions in Enhancing the Livelihood of Urban Poor, Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Vol. ahead-of-print No. aheadof-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-09-2021-0175
- Henri, B., Booske, B.C. and Sainfort, F. (2006), "Job and organizational determinants of nursing home employee commitment, job satisfaction and intent to turnover", Ergonomics, 48(10), 1260-1281.
- Hian, C.S. and Einstein, E.A. (1990), "Antecedents and outcomes of empowerment empirical evidence from the health care industry", Group and Organization Management, 24(1), 71-91.
- Hood, R.M., & Smith, K. (1994). Men and Women of the Corporation, 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books.
- Kaur, G. and Kushwaha, B.P. (2021). Essential Aspects for the Development of Women Entrepreneurial Intention in India. Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government, 27(1): 2381-2388.
- Kushwaha, B. P. (2021). Paradigm shift in traditional lifestyle to digital lifestyle in Gen Z: a conception of consumer behaviour in the virtual business

world. International Journal of Web Based Communities, 17(4), 305-320.

- Kushwaha, B. P., Tyagi, V., Sharma, P. B., & Singh, R. K. (2022). Mediating role of growth needs and job satisfaction on talent sustainability in BPOs and call centres: Evidence from India. Journal of Public Affairs, 22(1), e2400.
- Kushwaha, B.P., Kaur, G., Singh, N., and Sharma, A. (2022). Integrating Employees, Customers and Technology to Build an Effective Sustainable Marketing Strategy, International Journal of Sustainable Society, 14(4), 310-322.
- Kushwaha, B.P., Shiva, A., and Tyagi, V. (2023). How Investors' Financial Well-Being Influences Enterprises and Individual's Psychological Fitness? Moderating Role of Experience under Uncertainty, Sustainability, 15(2), 1699; https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021699
- Kushwaha, B.P., Singh, R.K. and Tyagi, V. (2021). Investigating Privacy Paradox: Consumer Data Privacy Behavioural Intention and Disclosure Behaviour, Academy of Marketing Studies Journal, 25(1), 1-10.
- Kushwaha, B.P., Singh, R.K., Varghese, N. and Singh, V.N. (2020). Integrating social media and digital media as new elements of integrated marketing communication for creating brand equity. Journal of Content, Community and Communication, 11(6), 52-64. DOI: 10.31620/JCCC.06.20/05
- Kushwaha, B.P., Tyagi, V, and Shiva, A. (2021). Investigating the role of reinforcement and environmental factors in balancing the state of apprehension: evidence from India. World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, 17(2/3): 142-160.
- Kushwaha, B.P., Tyagi, V. and Singh, R.K. (2021). Impact of Message Design on Display Ads Involvement and Effectiveness: An Evidence from India,

Int. J. of Management Practice, 15(4), 532-547.

- Lapina, R., Taylor, T., &Sarros, J. (2015). Trouble at mill: quality of academic work life issues within a comprehensive Australian university. Studies in Higher Education, 25, 279-94.
- Loscocco, D. J. &Roschelle, R. (1990). Quality of work life perspectives for business and the public sector. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Maanen, G. T. & Schein, J. W. (1979).
 Human Resource Management. U.S.A: The McGraw-Hill companies Inc.
- Nash, G. (1985). Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 4, 146-164.
- Nash, M. (1985). "Managing Organizational Performance", Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, California.
- Purdy, R. A. & Ford, J. K. (2010). Emerging issues and new directions for training research. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 10, 345–384.
- Robbins, J. and Judge, I.(2016). Insecure job and low pay leads to job dissatisfaction, Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business. 1(11), 1-16.
- Rubel, and Kushwaha (2021). Increasing the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Inventory Management by Optimizing Supply Chain through Enterprise Resource Planning Technology, EFFLATOUNIA-Multidisciplinary Journal, 5(2), 1739 – 1756.
- Samuels, Y.& Alexander, A. (2003). The impact of rewards programs on employee engagement, Loyola University Tom McMullen.
- Shahzad, J., Kirkpatrick A., Locke, E., (2017). Locus of Knowledge as a Determination of the Effects of Participation on Performance, Affect, and Perceptions. Organizational Behaviour

Human Decision-Making Process, 61, 276-288

- Shaw, R. &Delery, B. (2005). Basic Human Values: Theory, Measurement, and Applications, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Singh, R.K., and Kushwaha, B.P. (2021). The Influence of Digital Media Marketing and Celebrity Endorsement on Consumer Purchase Intention, Journal of Content, Community & Communication, 14(7), pp. 145-158. DOI: 10.31620/JCCC.12.21/12.
- Singh, R.K., Kushwaha, B.P. and Tyagi, V. (2021). Essential Aspects for the Development of Women Entrepreneurial Intention in India. Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government, 27(1): 2326-2339.
- Sirgy, M.J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D.J. (2008). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spill over theories. Social Indicators Research, 55(3), 241–302
- Skoran, D. J. (1983). Quality of work life perspectives for business and the public sector. London: Addison-Wesley.
- Wyatt, I. O. &Wah, K. M. (2001). The interactive effect of collectivism and organizational rewards on affective organizational commitment: Cross Cultural Management. An International Journal, 16(1), 28-43.
- Zohir, S. C., (2007). Role of Dhaka Export Processing Zone: Employment and Empowerment, Research Report, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka.