

Quality of Work Life among Employees in the Garment Industry: A Study

Dr. R. Mohanasoundari

Principal, Theeran Chinnaamalai College of Arts and Science for Women, Tirupur.

ABSTRACT

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is an important aspect of employee well-being that influences job satisfaction, productivity, motivation, and organizational commitment. It refers to the extent to which employees are able to satisfy their personal and professional needs through their work environment. Factors such as working conditions, compensation, job security, career growth opportunities, work-life balance, welfare facilities, and interpersonal relationships play a significant role in determining the quality of work life of employees. The garment industry is one of the major employment-generating sectors and is characterized by intense competition, demanding production schedules, and a diverse workforce. In such an environment, maintaining a satisfactory Quality of Work Life is essential for enhancing employee performance and organizational effectiveness. This study aims to assess the Quality of Work Life among employees working in the garment industry and identify the factors that influence their level of satisfaction. The study examines employees' perceptions regarding various dimensions of QWL, including workplace environment, remuneration, occupational safety, employee welfare measures, supervisory support, and opportunities for career advancement. It also seeks to evaluate the level of satisfaction among employees and determine areas requiring improvement. The findings of the study are expected to provide valuable insights for management in developing policies and practices that enhance employee well-being, increase productivity, and promote a positive work environment within the garment industry. Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of Quality of Work Life as a key factor in achieving employee satisfaction and organizational success in the garment industry.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life (QWL), Garment Industry, Employee Satisfaction, Working Conditions, Job Satisfaction, Employee Well-being, Occupational Safety, Employee Welfare, Work Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) 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. Quality of work life is the measure of how safe & satisfaction employee feels with their jobs. Employee at grass-root level experience a sense of low level of wages, poor working conditions, unfavorable terms of employment in human treatment by their supervisor & like whereas their managerial personal feel frustrated because of alienation over their conditions of employment, interpersonal conflict, role-conflict, job pressure, lack of freedom in work, absence of challenging work etc. Certain values were attributed to work in the past. Work was worship & people had sincerity & commitment to work. But today employees would not believe in such values of work. He works for his

salary, he works hard if the conditions are conducive & congenial & terms of employment are favorable to him. As such, the work norms have been changing from time to time.

“Quality of work life refers to the favorableness & unfavorable ness of a job environment” for Rople, J.Richard & J.Loy defines quality of work life as, “The degree of which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in organization”.

The defining of quality of work life involves three major parts: a) The safe work environment provides the basis for the person to enjoy working. The work should not pose a health hazard for the person. The employer and employee, aware of their risks and rights, could achieve a lot in their mutually beneficial QWL is defined as "The quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment."

B) The working time has been established by the state according to legislation. The standard limits on overtime, time of vacation and taking of free days before national holidays have been separately stipulated. The differences regarding the working time have been established for the persons under 18 years of age, pregnant women, breast-feeding mothers and the person raising the disabled child. And C) the appropriate salary is agreed upon by the employee and the employer. The Government of the Republic establishes each year the rate of minimum salary; the employer should not pay less than that to the employee.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The garment industry is a labour-intensive sector that employs a large number of workers, many of whom come from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Employees in this industry often face varying working conditions, income levels, and social environments that directly influence their Quality of Work Life (QWL). Understanding these factors is essential for improving employee satisfaction, productivity, and organizational effectiveness. In many garment industries, socio-economic conditions such as income, education, family background, and living standards play a significant role in shaping employees' attitudes toward work. At the same time, interpersonal relationships and cooperation among co-workers also have a strong impact on workplace harmony, motivation, and job satisfaction. Despite the importance of these factors, there is limited systematic evaluation of how socio-economic conditions and co-worker relationships together influence the Quality of Work Life of employees in the garment industry. This study is therefore undertaken to assess the socio-economic conditions of employees and to evaluate the interpersonal relationships and cooperation among co-workers and their impact on Quality of Work Life. Based on the objectives of the study, the following research questions are framed:

What are the socio-economic conditions of employees working in the garment industry?

How do socio-economic factors such as income, education, and family background influence the Quality of Work Life of employees?

What is the nature of interpersonal relationships among co-workers in the garment industry?

How does cooperation among co-workers affect employee satisfaction and Quality of Work Life?

To what extent do workplace relationships contribute to improving or reducing the Quality of Work Life of employees in the garment industry?

NEED FOR THE STUDY

When an individual enters into a job with a certain values he holds, guarded by these values he is motivated to seek meaning in his job. For this he should find his job satisfactory and the facilitating environment, the safety and welfare provisions available, training opportunities and his dealings with

his supervisors, all these will automatically pave the way for his better and efficient functioning. The employees of any organization is of significant nature in attaining strategic objectives and especially blue collar workers who toil through 8 hours for the product to go out perfectly finished for gaining profit. So the need for Quality of work Life is of pivotal nature to the organization.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To assess the socio-economic conditions of employees in the garment industry.
- To evaluate the interpersonal relationships and cooperation among co-workers and their impact on Quality of Work Life.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of QWL movement which originally included only job redesign efforts based on the socio-technical systems approach has gradually widened very much so as to include a wide variety of interventions such as quality circles, suggestion schemes, employee participation, empowerment, autonomous work teams etc. These have been described in the following pages. While the specifics of these interventions vary in each case the common elements in all these interventions seem to be as under:

1. Restructuring of multiple dimensions of the organization by instituting a mechanism. This introduces and sustains changes over time.
2. Focus on work teams;
3. Autonomy in planning work;
4. Focus on skill development; and
5. Increased responsiveness to employee concerns.

METHODOLOGY

A case study method is followed in the present study. This method is ideal and handy as far as research study in quality of life control is concerned. For this study primary data was collected from selected garments industry. To realize the objective of the study as such and to explore the Quality of Work Life of employee selected garments industry, the Convenient sampling method were adopted.

HYPOTHESIS

- Is there any significance difference between the various departments with respect to age group, year of experience, size of the family, number of department, number of child, and income per month.
- Is there any significance difference between the various departments with regard to economic condition, safety and healthy working condition, workers and supervisors relationship, opportunity for career growth, social relevance of work, motivation and satisfaction factor, social welfare measure, constitutionalism for work organization and occupational stress.

DATA COLLECTION

The present study is based primarily on data collected from a selected garment industry. The required information was obtained from employees working in the management, production, packing, and loading departments of the organization. All the data collected are relevant to the objectives of the study.

A total of 65 respondents were selected for the study. The data collected are purely primary in nature and were gathered directly from the respondents through appropriate research methods.

TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

The collected data are classified analyzed and interpreted. The present study has used simple percentage and ANOVA Test to assess the quality of work life in selected respondent of the garment industry.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. **Nanjundeswaraswamy and Beloor (2022)** conducted a study on the quality of work life of employees working in the Indian garment industry. The study collected responses from 851 employees across 133 garment units. The findings revealed that compensation and rewards, job security, grievance handling, work environment, training and development, and employee relations were the major factors influencing Quality of Work Life. The study concluded that most employees were not fully satisfied with the existing QWL practices and recommended improvements in employee welfare and working conditions.
2. **Beloor and Nanjundeswaraswamy (2023)** examined the enablers of Quality of Work Life among garment industry employees using Pareto Analysis, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and Interpretive Structural Modeling (ISM). The study identified training and development, job satisfaction, compensation, employee relations, grievance handling, work environment, job security, and workplace facilities as key determinants of QWL.
3. **Rubel, Kee, and Rimi (2023)** investigated the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee outcomes in the ready-made garment industry of Bangladesh. The study found that higher levels of QWL positively influenced job satisfaction, employee retention, and job performance. The researchers highlighted the importance of supportive work environments in improving organizational effectiveness.
4. **Jayaraman, George, Siluvaimuthu, and Parayitam (2023)** studied the relationship between Quality of Work Life and Work-Life Balance among employees. The findings indicated that collegiality, job security, and job satisfaction significantly enhanced employees' work-life balance and overall well-being. The study emphasized the strategic importance of QWL initiatives in improving employee productivity and satisfaction.
5. **Martini, Fleury-Bahi, and Proquez (2024)** examined the quality of work life of women garment workers in the fashion and luxury sectors in France. The study highlighted the importance of healthy working conditions, employee recognition, occupational safety, and social support in improving workers' overall quality of work life.

Putri et al. (2024), through a systematic review of Quality of Work Life studies, identified work environment, organizational support, job security, career development opportunities, and employee welfare measures as critical determinants of employee well-being and job satisfaction. The review emphasized the need for organizations to adopt employee-centered policies to enhance QWL.

The reviewed studies indicate that Quality of Work Life is influenced by factors such as compensation, job security, working conditions, employee welfare, career development, workplace relationships, and organizational support. The literature also suggests that improved QWL leads to higher job satisfaction, better employee retention, enhanced productivity, and greater organizational commitment. However, studies focusing specifically on garment industry employees in particular regions remain limited,

creating a need for further research in this area.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This research work intends to analyze the primary data for understanding the various aspects of work life of employee of selected Garment Industry. The variables such as Economic condition, Safety and Healthy, Opportunity for career growth, Social Relevance, Motivation and Satisfaction, Social Welfare Measures, & Constitutionalism factors were analyzed. The results of the analysis are reported below.

Table: 1: Department wise details of the Gender in the Company.

Departments	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Management	3 (100) [6.3]	0	3 (100) [4.6]
Production	17 (65.4) [35.4]	9 (34.6) [52.9]	26 (100) [40]
Packing	12 (63.2) [25]	7 (36.8) [41.2]	19 (100) [29.2]
Loading	16 (94.1) [33.3]	1 (5.9) [5.9]	17 (100) [26.2]
Total	48 (73.8) [100]	17 (26.2) [100]	65 (100) [100]

Source: Primary data

() – Parenthesis indicates the column wise percentage

[] – Parenthesis indicates the row wise percentage

The above table interprets about the gender in different departments. In management 6.3 percentage of workers are male and there is no female workers. In the production department averagely 35.4 percentage are male and 52.9 percentage are female. Likewise in packing 25 percentages are male and 41.2 percentage are female workers. Finally in loading department we have 33.3 percentage female workers remaining 5.9 percentage are female. The reason for no female workers in the management department is because the workers are given preference on the basis of relation or influence

Table:2: Department wise details of the Educational Qualification of the workers in the Company

Department	Educational Qualification				Total
	Below 10 th	10 th -12 th	UG Degree	PG Degree	
Management	-	-	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	3 (100)

			[4.3]	[50]	[4.6]
Production	4 (15.4) [66.7]	12 (46.2) [37.5]	10 (38.5) [43.5]	-	26 (100) [40]
Packing	1 (5.3) [16.7]	7 (36.8) [21.9]	10 (52.6) [43.5]	1 (5.3) [25]	19 (100) [29.2]
Loading	1 (5.9) [16.7]	13 (76.5) [40.6]	2 (11.8) [8.7]	1 (5.9) [25]	17 (100) [26.2]
Total	6 (9.2) [100]	32 (49.2) [100]	23 (35.4) [100]	4 (6.2) [100]	65 (100) [100]

Source: Primary data

This table deals with the educational qualification among the different workers in different departments. To start with the management department we have 33.3% of UG Degree holders & 66.7% of PG degree holders. In the production section we have 15.4% of the workers who have done their primary schooling, 46.2% have workers have done their higher secondary schooling in the same section and 38.5% have done their UG degree. Next we have the packing section in which 5.3% of workers have done primary education, 36.8% have completed higher secondary education, 52.6% of the same section have completed the UG Degree and 5.3% of the workers have done PG Degree. In the Loading section we have the 5.9% of workers who have done primary education, 76.5% of the workers have done the higher secondary education, 11.8% of the workers have completed UG Degree & 5.9% of the workers in the loading section have completed the PG Degree. The reason for choosing the Degree holders in the Management Department is to manage the industry well organised & effectively.

Table: 3: Department wise details of the Marital Status of the workers in the Company

Department	Marital Status		Total
	Married	Unmarried	
Management	3 (100) [8.3]		3 (100) [4.6]
Production	12 (46.2) [33.3]	14 (53.8) [48.3]	26 (100) [40]
Packing	11 (57.9) [30.6]	8 (42.1) [27.6]	19 (100) [29.2]
Loading	10 (58.8) [27.8]	7 (41.2) [24.1]	17 (100) [26.2]
Total	36	29	65

	(55.4) [100]	(44.6) [100]	(100) [100]
--	-----------------	-----------------	----------------

Source: Primary data

The above mentioned table elucidate about the marital status about the workers in the different department. It shows that in Management section nearly 8.3% of the workers are married. In the Production department 33.3% of the people are married & 48.3% of workers are unmarried. In the Packing section 30.6% of the workers are married & 27.6% of the workers are Unmarried. In the Loading section the 27.8% of the people are married & 24.1 % are unmarried.

Table: 4: Respondent Native Place.

Department	Native Place		Total
	Rural	Urban	
Management	3 (00) [9.4]	0	3 (100) [4.6]
Production	14 (53.8) [43.8]	12 (46.2) [36.4]	26 (100) [40]
Packing	3 (15.8) [9.4]	16 (84.2) [48.5]	19 (100) [29.2]
Loading	12 (70.6) [37.5]	5 (29.4) [15.2]	17 (100) [26.2]
Total	32 (49.2) [100]	33 (50.8) [100]	65 (100) [100]

Source: Primary data

The above table explains about the Native place of the worker in different department. In the Management department the 9.4% of the workers are from the rural area & there are no workers from the urban area. In the production department we have 43.8% from the rural area and 36.4% as of the urban region. In packing section 9.4% of the workers are from the rural area and 48.5% from the urban area. In loading section 37.5% of the workers are from rural area & 15.2 % are as of the urban. This shows that the rural area workers are migrated to the urban area for their livelihood.

Table: 5: Respondent membership in association

Department	Membership in Association		Total
	No	Yes	
Management	-	3 (100) [75]	3 (100) [4.6]
Production	25 (96.2) [41]	1 (3.8) [25]	26 (100) [40]
Packing	19 (100) [31.1]	-	19 (100) [29.2]
Loading	17 (100) [27.9]	-	17 (100) [26.2]
Total	61 (93.8) [100]	4 (6.2) [100]	65 (100) [100]

Source: Primary data

In the above mentioned table it gives explanation about the Membership in Association among the different workers in the different department. In management department 75% of the workers are members in the association. In production department 41% of the workers are not the members in the association & 25% of the workers are members in the association. In packing section 31.1% of the workers are not the members in the association. In loading section we have 27.9% worker who are not the members in the association. Thus it shows that merely 93.8% of workers are not the members in the association & only 6.2% of the workers are members of the association. Thus it clearly shows that they are unorganized.

Table: 6: Personal detail of the respondent

Department	Respondent Age	Experience	Education in Year	Size of Family	Number of Dependent	Number of Children	Income per Month
Management	41.67	11.00	16.33	6.67	3.67	2.00	10666.67
	125	33	49	20	11	6	32000
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Production	29.19	4.50	12.04	4.35	2.35	.50	6407.69
	759	117	313	113	61	13	166600
	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Packing	31.21	6.95	13.37	4.95	3.47	1.06	5268.42
	593	132	254	94	66	19	100100
	19	19	19	19	19	18	19

Loading	33.41	6.00	12.18	5.47	2.65	.94	4311.76
	568	102	207	93	45	16	73300
	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Total	31.46	5.91	12.66	4.92	2.82	.84	5723.08
	2045	384	823	320	183	54	372000
	65	65	65	65	65	64	65

Source: Primary data

The above table deals with the report on the Respondent Age, Experience, Education in the Year, Size of the Family, Number of Dependent, Number of Children, and Income per Month. The average mean of the Respondent Age in different department is 31.46%. The experience of the different workers in different department is 5.91% out of which the management has taken about 11 years experience. 12.66% is the mean of the education in year in different department. The average mean of the size of the family is 4.92%. Averagely 2.82% is the mean for the number of dependent in different department. The mean of number of children in different department is 0.84% Finally the average mean of the Income per month is 5723.08% out of which 10666.67% is the income earned by the workers in the management department, 6407.69% is the mean income earned by the production department workers, 5268.43% of mean income workers in the packing section, in the loading section the average mean income of the worker is 4311.76%. This shows that the mean in different sectors is almost similar. Except the Income, this is mainly because it depends on the experience of the person & the position. The experience of the packing section workers is higher than the production section this is mainly because they involve various processes rather than in the production section.

ANOVA Test

The analysis of variance was used to understand the differences between various departments and factors such as responded age, experience, education in year, size of family, number of dependent, number of children, and income per month. It has been proved through the ANOVA test. To substantiate this information Duncan test was applied to test the differences.

Duncan test was grouped as two in all the categories except income per month. Production, packing, loading as one group and management as other group. The result implies that the management requires higher education experience, age, so the management has been categorized as a separate group. But the income per month has been categorized into four different groups depending upon their departments. This is mainly because each categories has own salary.

Table: 7: ANOVA Test: Personal detail

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Respondent Age	Between Groups	512.173	3	170.724	4.954	.004
	Within Groups	2101.981	61			
	Total	2614.154	64			
Experience	Between Groups	149.999	3	50.000	3.713	.016
	Within Groups	821.447	61			
	Total	971.446	64			

		971.446	64			
Education in Year	Between Groups	64.034	3	21.345 6.435	3.317	.026
	Within Groups	392.520	61			
	Total	456.554	64			
Size of Family	Between Groups	22.881	3	7.627 5.274	1.446	.238
	Within Groups	321.734	61			
	Total	344.615	64			
Number of Dependent	Between Groups	16.614	3	5.538 2.150	2.575	.062
	Within Groups	131.170	61			
	Total	147.785	64			
Number of Children	Between Groups	8.052	3	2.684 .906	2.961	.039
	Within Groups	54.386	61			
	Total	62.438	64			
Income Per Month	Between Groups	123291556.720	3	41097185.573 631538.162	65.075	.000
	Within Groups	38523827.896	61			
	Total	161815384.615	64			

Source: Primary data

The analysis of variance was used to understand the differences between various departments and factors such as responded age, experience, education in year, size of family, number of dependent, number of children, and income per month. It has been proved through the ANOVA test. To substantiate this information Duncan test was applied to test the differences.

Table: 8: Working environment of the respondents (Category 1)

Report										
department		Economic conditions	Safty and Healthy working condi.	Workers and Supervisor Relationship	Opportunity for career growth	Social relevance of work	Motivation and satisfaction factor	Social welfare measure	Constitutionalism for work organisation	Occupation stress
management	Mean	3.8889	1.5833	4.0370	4.1667	3.9667	4.2000	3.8333	2.8095	2.4444
	Sum	11.67	4.75	12.11	12.50	11.90	12.60	11.50	8.43	7.33
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
production	Mean	3.8974	3.4904	3.7137	3.9327	4.3423	4.1154	3.9519	2.9945	2.3846
	Sum	101.33	90.75	96.56	102.25	112.90	107.00	102.75	77.86	62.00
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
packing	Mean	4.5789	3.9474	4.0351	4.1184	4.2368	4.1579	4.4079	3.3158	2.6667
	Sum	87.00	75.00	76.67	78.25	80.50	79.00	83.75	63.00	50.67
	N	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
loading	Mean	3.5686	1.9559	3.4575	3.3382	4.0824	3.7294	3.6324	2.8487	2.0392
	Sum	60.67	33.25	58.78	56.75	69.40	63.40	61.75	48.43	34.67
	N	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Total	Mean	4.0103	3.1346	3.7556	3.8423	4.2262	4.0308	3.9962	3.0418	2.3795
	Sum	260.67	203.75	244.11	249.75	274.70	262.00	259.75	197.71	154.67
	N	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65

Source: Primary data

The first category includes economic conditions, safety and healthy working condition, opportunity for career growth, social relevance of work, social welfare measure, and occupational stress. Out of which the economic conditions, social relevance of work, social welfare measures, & occupational stress. The loading, management, productions belong to one group & packing belongs to another group. This is mainly because the loading, management & production section workers agree with the above said conditions & packing workers strongly agree with it. On the other side we have the safety & healthy working conditions & opportunity career growth where, Loading & production on the hand & Packing & Management in Opportunity career where it shows that they agree on one side & strongly agree with another side on the above said condition. In safety & healthy working condition, Management & Loading grouped as one category & Production & Packing agree with it. This is because they have risk in operating the machine in Production & Packing rather than the Loading & management.

The above table explicate about different factors in various department. In the department such as Management, production, packing& loading the average mean of economic conditions is 4.0103%. The safety & healthy working conditions of the various department has the average mean of 3.1346%. 3.7556 is the average mean for the workers & supervisor relationship in various department. Opportunity for career growth in various department has the average mean of 3.8423%. 4.2262% is the average mean for the social relevance of the work in different departments. Motivation & satisfaction factor has the average mean of the 4.0308 of different department. Social welfare measure has the average mean of 3.9962 of various department. 3.0418 % is the average mean of the constitutionalism for work organisation in different department. occupation stress has the average mean of 2.3795% in various department. Thus the average mean shows that the organisation is working efficiently & effectively,

Table: 9: ANOVA Test: Working environment of the respondent (Category 2)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic conditions	Between Groups	9.836	3	3.279	6.535	.001
	Within Groups	30.602	61	.502		
	Total	40.438	64			
Safty and Healthy working condi.	Between Groups	46.681	3	15.560	14.177	.000
	Within Groups	66.954	61	1.098		
	Total	113.635	64			
Workers and Supervisor Relationship	Between Groups	3.278	3	1.093	3.251	.028
	Within Groups	20.505	61	.336		
	Total	23.783	64			
Opportunity for career growth	Between Groups	6.296	3	2.099	4.392	.007
	Within Groups	29.150	61	.478		
	Total	35.446	64			
Social relevance of work	Between Groups	.906	3	.302	3.439	.022
	Within Groups	5.359	61	.088		
	Total	6.266	64			
Motivation and satisfaction factor	Between Groups	2.123	3	.708	1.993	.124
	Within Groups	21.655	61	.355		
	Total	23.778	64			
Social welfare measure	Between Groups	5.601	3	1.867	4.586	.006
	Within Groups	24.835	61	.407		
	Total	30.437	64			
Constitutionalism for work organisation	Between Groups	2.280	3	.760	2.011	.122
	Within Groups	23.056	61	.378		
	Total	25.336	64			
Occupation stress	Between Groups	3.549	3	1.183	4.853	.004
	Within Groups	14.868	61	.244		
	Total	18.417	64			

Source: Primary data

The second category includes workers & supervisor relationship, motivation & satisfaction factor & Constitutionalism of the work organisation which has only one group. Where, the workers of the different department are fully satisfied with the workers & supervisor relation ship & Motivation & satisfaction factor. In constitutionalism of work organisation the workers in different departments try to remain neutral in their answer.

FINDINGS

In the foregoing chapters the objectives set out in the introductory part have been realized with the help of the Primary data. This chapter tense to present the actual findings that has emerged in the study, the outcome of the study is as follows, to begin with the macro picture focuses at the Quality of work life of the employees in selected garments industry. Further it extends to find the Personal data & working environment in different departments in the company.

- Female employees were not represented in the management department, as recruitment was largely influenced by personal relations and referrals.
- Degree holders were preferred in the management department to ensure effective organizational administration.
- A majority of workers had migrated from rural areas to urban areas in search of better employment opportunities.
- Most employees (93.8%) were not members of any workers' association, indicating a largely unorganized workforce.
- The average age of employees was 31.46 years, with an average work experience of 5.91 years. Employees in the management department had the highest average experience.
- Income levels varied across departments, with management employees earning the highest average income due to greater experience and higher positions.
- Employees reported positive perceptions regarding economic conditions, career growth opportunities, motivation, job satisfaction, social welfare measures, and social relevance of work.
- Worker-supervisor relationships were found to be satisfactory across departments.
- Safety and health conditions were rated moderately satisfactory.
- Occupational stress levels were relatively low among employees.
- Overall, the findings indicate that the organization provides a satisfactory Quality of Work Life and operates efficiently and effectively.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Since a majority of employees are not members of any workers' association, the management should encourage employee participation in welfare committees, grievance redressal mechanisms, and employee associations. This will improve communication between employees and management and help address workplace concerns effectively.
2. The organization should provide regular training, skill development programs, and equal employment opportunities, particularly for female employees in managerial positions. This will promote career growth, increase employee satisfaction, and create a more inclusive work environment.

CONCLUSION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is an important factor that influences employee satisfaction, motivation, productivity, and overall organizational performance. It reflects the extent to which employees are able to fulfill their personal and professional needs through a supportive work environment. Key dimensions of QWL include safe and healthy working conditions, reasonable working hours, fair compensation, job security, welfare facilities, and opportunities for personal and professional growth. The present study assessed the Quality of Work Life of employees in the garment industry by examining various aspects such as working conditions, employee welfare measures, compensation, work environment, and employee satisfaction. The findings indicate that the majority of employees are satisfied with the overall work environment and organizational support provided by their employers. Safe working conditions, cordial relationships among employees, and adequate welfare facilities contribute positively to their quality of work life. The study concludes that a favorable Quality of Work Life enhances employee commitment, job satisfaction, and productivity. However, continuous efforts are required to further improve employee welfare, career development opportunities, and work-life balance. By focusing on these aspects, garment industries can create a more positive and productive workplace, resulting in improved employee well-being and organizational success.

REFERENCES

1. Beloor, V., & Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S. (2024). Enablers of quality of work life of employees in garment industry: An integrated hybrid approach of Pareto, SEM and ISM. **Research Journal of Textile and Apparel*, 28*(4), 716–744. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RJTA-05-2022-0050>
2. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Beloor, V. (2022). Quality of work life of employees working in the Indian garment industry. **Research Journal of Textile and Apparel*, 28*(2), 220–234. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RJTA-01-2022-0007>
3. Rubel, M. R. B., Kee, D. M. H., & Rimi, N. N. (2023). Quality of work life and employee work outcomes: A hierarchical model with mediation analysis. **International Journal of Business and Society*, 24*(2). <https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.5625.2023>
4. Jayaraman, S., George, H. J., Siluvaimuthu, M., & Parayitam, S. (2023). Quality of work life as a precursor to work–life balance: Collegiality and job security as moderators and job satisfaction as a mediator. **Sustainability*, 15*(13), 9936. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15139936>
5. Prasanna, S. M., & Tiwari, R. R. (2024). Prevalence of work-related musculoskeletal disorders and quality of life assessment among garment workers in Tiruppur district, Tamil Nadu. **International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 30*(1), 146–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2023.2278939>
6. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., Beloor, V., & Swamy, D. R. (2019). Quality of work life – Development and scale validation for textile sectors in India. **International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8*(6), 2247–2254. <https://doi.org/10.35940/IJEAT.F8432.088619>