A Comparative Study Of Employee Quality Of Work Life (QWL) In Public, Cooperative, And Private Sector Banks In Pune

Author : Kajal P Mokal , Dr.Vora Manoj Laxmichand

Research Scholar, Assistant Professor

Department of Commerce

Haribhai V Desai College, Pune, Maharashtra, India -411002

(Affiliated to Savitribai Phule Pune University)

Abstract:

This study empirically examines the **Quality of Work Life (QWL)** among employees across **Public Sector, Cooperative, and Private Sector banks** in Pune, India, positioning QWL as critical determinant of competitive advantage and organizational performance. Utilizing a cross-sectional, quantitative design with a balanced sample (N=90), the analysis focused on six key QWL dimensions. Statistical testing (ANOVA, Chi-square, Regression) confirmed statistically significant sectoral differences across all major QWL dimensions ($p<0.05$). Public banks led in Job Security (Mean 4.35) and Work-Life Balance (Mean 3.85); while Private banks excelled in Compensation (Mean 4.15) and Career Growth (Mean 4.25). Cooperative banks registered the highest mean for Social Integration (4.10). Multiple Regression Analysis identified Career Growth Opportunities ($\beta=0.45, p<0.001$) as the most influential factor driving overall employee satisfaction. The paper concludes by proposing sector-specific strategies to address the distinct challenges of stability, stress, and structural deficit in each banking cohort.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life (QWL), Public Sector Banks, Private Sector Banks, Cooperative Banks, Job Security, Career Growth, Work-Life Balance, Employee Satisfaction.

1. Introduction: The QWL Imperative in a Segmented Financial Landscape

The banking sector acts as the central engine of the modern Indian economy. What makes it unique is its three-part structure: the long-established stability of Public Sector Banks (PSBs), the high-speed, aggressive approach of Private Sector Banks (PVBs), and the local, community focus of Cooperative Banks (Co-ops). The success, efficiency, and quality of customer service across all these institutions are directly tied to one factor: the motivation and overall well-being of their employees. Because of this, ensuring a high Quality of Work Life (QWL) isn't just a kind gesture; it is a basic requirement for staying competitive and profitable.

QWL is a simple idea that covers the employee's total experience at work. This includes foundational elements like fair pay and job security, as well as crucial modern factors such as chances for professional

growth and the ability to balance work demands with personal life. When QWL suffers—often due to intense market competition, quick technological changes, and strict performance targets—the results are predictable: low employee morale, high turnover rates, and sharp drops in productivity. These negative outcomes seriously harm the reputation and financial health of any service business.

This dynamic is particularly pronounced in Pune, a rapidly growing city that serves as a major financial hub. Here, the struggle to hire and keep talented workers is fierce, forcing employees to make difficult choices. They must weigh the job security offered by a government-backed PSB against the greater financial rewards and rapid promotion paths found in a PVB.

However, most research published so far has only looked at the difference between PSBs and PVBs, largely ignoring the Cooperative banking sector. This study is designed to close that critical knowledge gap. We provide a comprehensive, evidence-based comparison across all three key banking types. By measuring employee opinions on specific QWL factors, this research delivers empirical evidence —not just assumptions—that bank leaders can use to create genuinely effective, sustainable employment policies. Our core aim is to pinpoint exactly which work life elements are succeeding, which are failing, and, most importantly, which elements matter most to overall employee satisfaction in this complex financial environment.

1.1 Research Objectives

The main goal of this research is to study and compare the quality of work life factors among staff in Public, Cooperative, and Private Banks in the Pune area.

Specifically, this research aims:

1. To measure and identify how employees feel about the most important parts of their jobs (like Job Security, Career Growth, Pay, Teamwork, Work Environment, and Work-Life Balance).

2. To compare the average QWL scores to see if there are important differences between the three types of banks (Public, Cooperative, and Private).

3. To find out which specific QWL factors are the strongest reasons for employees to be satisfied with their jobs across all the banks.

4. To create practical and specific advice for the management of each type of bank to improve employee well-being and performance.

1.2 Research Hypotheses:

Table 1: Research Hypotheses (Null and Alternative)

Null Hypothesis (H0)	Hypothesis (HA)
H01: There is *no significant difference* in QWL perceptions among the three sectors.	**H1:** Significant difference in overall QWL among the three sectors.
H02: Job Security perceptions are *not significantly different* across the three sectors.	**H2:** Job security is significantly higher in Public Sector Banks.
H03: Career Growth Opportunities perceptions are *not significantly different* across the three sectors.	**H3:** Career growth opportunities are significantly better in Private Sector Banks.
H04: Social Integration perceptions are *not significantly different* across the three sectors.	**H4:** Social integration is significantly stronger in Cooperative Banks.
H05: Career Growth Opportunities are *not the strongest positive predictor* of overall job satisfaction.	**H5:** Career Growth Opportunities are the strongest positive predictor of overall job satisfaction.

2. Literature Review

The analytical journey into employee experience begins with the core concept of **Quality of Work Life (QWL)**, which emerged in the 1970s. Pioneering theorist Richard Walton (1973) defined QWL not merely as fair working conditions, but as a broader environment encompassing fair Compensation (Pay), Job Security, Social Integration (Teamwork), and the critical Work and Total Life Space—the Work-Life Balance between professional demands and personal life. Furthermore, contemporary definitions, necessary for a comprehensive analysis of the modern banking environment, also incorporate the physical and psychological comfort of the Work Environment and the potential for Career Growth (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Guest, 2017). In service-intensive fields like banking, QWL is a strategic asset, directly correlating with positive organizational outcomes: high QWL results in reduced absenteeism and turnover, simultaneously boosting employee commitment and service quality (Guest, 2017).

Research on the Indian financial sector consistently highlights that QWL is fundamentally shaped by institutional ownership structure. A prevalent finding is the direct trade-off between the Public Sector and the Private Sector. Public Sector Banks (PSBs) are anchored by Job Security, which is their overwhelming advantage. As government-backed institutions, they offer employees a deep sense of permanency and stable retirement benefits (Sharma & Kothari, 2014). This stability, however, is often contrasted with slower Career Growth progression and bureaucratic rigidity.

Conversely, the Private Sector Banks (PVBs) are characterized by dynamism and high rewards. Their QWL strength lies in aggressive, performance-linked Compensation and streamlined, merit-based Career Growth Opportunities (Sinha, 2013). This model successfully attracts highly ambitious talent, but it demands a high price: studies consistently report that this reward structure generates excessive workload, high occupational stress, and significantly poorer Work-Life Balance (Gupta & Hyde, 2013). The competitive intensity inherent in the private banking model necessitates a constant push for targets, often leading to a transactional relationship that risks employee burnout.

A crucial gap exists in the literature regarding the Cooperative Banking Sector. These institutions, rooted in local communities, possess a unique cultural strength in Social Integration and Team Cohesion. The work atmosphere is typically perceived as close-knit, fostering high levels of trust and organizational support. However, this sector often suffers from structural deficits such as low investment in formal training, less competitive pay structures, and non-formalized career paths (D'Souza, 2002).

Finally, while sectoral differences define the QWL inputs, the ultimate driver of satisfaction remains consistent across the industry. Contemporary management literature emphasizes that once basic needs like security and base pay are met, Career Growth and Development become the single most influential factor (Sinha Chandranshu, 2012). This finding is crucial, suggesting that employees today view their profession not just as a job, but as a continuous trajectory, making opportunity the most powerful tool for engagement.

3. Research Gap

Table 2: Research Gap and Contribution Analysis

Area of Gap	Existing Literature Focus/Limitation	How This Study Fills the Gap
Comparative Scope	Research often focuses only on the Public vs. Private sector dichotomy.	Provides the first simultaneous, empirical comparative analysis of Public, Cooperative, AND Private sector banks.
Cooperative Sector QWL	The Cooperative banking sector is largely ignored, lacking empirical data on modern QWL factors.	Empirically quantifies QWL factors specifically for Cooperative Bank employees, validating their unique social strengths and structural deficits.
Predictive Modeling	Studies often stop at comparative analysis (ANOVA), failing to identify the hierarchy of QWL predictors.	Uses Multiple Linear Regression to determine the relative influence (β coefficients) of different QWL dimensions on overall job satisfaction.

4. Research Methodology:

Table 3: Summary of Research Methodology

Component	Detail / Description
Research Design	Quantitative, Descriptive, and Comparative.
Study Area	Pune Metropolitan Region (Maharashtra, India).
Sample Size (N)	N=90 (30 employees from each of the three bank types).
Sampling Technique	Convenience Sampling (Non-probability).
Data Collection	Primary Data collected via a Structured Questionnaire (5-point Likert Scale).
Data Analysis Tools	One-Way **ANOVA**, **Chi-square Test**, and **Multiple Linear Regression**.
Significance Level (α)	$\alpha=0.05$

4.1 Limitations of the Study

While this research provides valuable empirical insights into the segmented banking sector, the findings must be interpreted within the context of the following methodological constraints:

1. Geographic Scope Constraint: The study was confined exclusively to the Pune Metropolitan Region. Since QWL factors (such as compensation benchmarks and market stress levels) can vary significantly, the findings may not be fully generalizable to the national Indian banking sector or to rural areas.

2. Sampling Bias: The research utilized Convenience Sampling due to practical difficulties in obtaining complete employee lists across the three distinct bank types. This non-probability approach introduces a potential selection bias, limiting the formal statistical extrapolation of the results to the broader population.

3. Cross-Sectional Design: The study is cross-sectional, meaning data was captured at a single point in time. This prevents us from establishing definitive causal relationships between QWL factors and satisfaction or monitoring the dynamic effects of recent economic or policy changes over time.

4. Sample Size: Although the sample size (N=90) was sufficient for the primary comparative tests (ANOVA), a larger sample would have provided the statistical power necessary for more nuanced sub-segment analysis, such as controlling for specific job functions or employee tenure.

5. Subjectivity of Data: The primary data relies on self-reported perceptions measured via a Likert scale. Like all subjective measures, these results can be influenced by temporary moods, personal biases, or the tendency of respondents to give socially desirable answers.

4.2 Demographic profile summary of the respondents:

Table 4: Demographic Profile of Respondents by Banking Sector (N=90)

Demographic Variable	Category	Public Banks (n=30)	Coop Banks (n=30)	Private Banks (n=30)
Age Group	20-30 years	8 (26.7%)	10 (33.3%)	12 (40.0%)
	31-40 years	12 (40.0%)	10 (33.3%)	11 (36.7%)
	41-50 years	7 (23.3%)	7 (23.3%)	5 (16.7%)
	51 years and above	3 (10.0%)	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.7%)
Gender	Male	20 (66.7%)	18 (60.0%)	22 (73.3%)
	Female	10 (33.3%)	12 (40.0%)	8 (26.7%)
Educational Qualification	Graduate	10 (33.3%)	15 (50.0%)	9 (30.0%)
	Postgraduate	15 (50.0%)	10 (33.3%)	18 (60.0%)
	Diploma/ others	5 (16.7%)	5 (16.7%)	3 (10.0%)
Designation	Junior Staff (Clerk / Assistant)	10 (33.3%)	12 (40.0%)	9 (30.0%)
	Middle Management (Officer / Manager)	15 (50.0%)	12 (40.0%)	17 (56.7%)
	Senior Management (Chief Manager / AGM)	5 (16.7%)	6 (20.0%)	4 (13.3%)
Experience (Years)	0-5 years	12 (40.0%)	14 (46.7%)	15 (50.0%)
	06-10 years	11 (36.7%)	10 (33.3%)	12 (40.0%)
	Above 11 years	7 (23.3%)	6 (20.0%)	3 (10.0%)

5. Findings and Hypothesis Testing

5.1 Hypothesis Testing Outcomes

All core null hypotheses were rejected, confirming the initial assumptions of sectoral QWL segmentation.

Table 5: Summary of Hypothesis Testing Outcomes

Hypothesis (HA)	Primary Finding/Observation	Statistical Test Applied	Tentative Test Result (p)	Null Hypothesis (H0) Decision
H1: Significant difference in QWL.	Mean QWL scores differ significantly across sectors.	One-Way **ANOVA**	$p<0.05$	**Reject** H0 (Difference exists)
H2: Job security is higher by Public Banks.	**Public Banks** report significantly higher frequency of "Very Secure" ratings.	**Chi-square Test**	$p<0.01$	**Reject** H0 (Public banks are significantly more secure)

H3: Career growth is better in Private Banks.	Private Banks show the highest mean score for career growth perception.	One-Way ANOVA	$p<0.05$	Reject H0 (Difference exists, Private is highest)
H4: Stronger social integration in Cooperative Banks.	Cooperative Banks exhibit the highest mean score for social integration.	One-Way ANOVA	$p<0.05$	Reject H0 (Cooperative banks have stronger integration)
H5: Career growth is the strongest predictor.	Career Growth ($\beta=0.45$) is the primary driver of Overall QWL satisfaction.	Multiple Linear Regression	$p<0.001$	Reject H0 (A significant relationship exists)

5.2 Comparative QWL Means (Likert Scale: 1-5)

Table 6: Comparative Mean Scores and Standard Deviations (±) for QWL Dimensions (Likert Scale: 1-5)

QWL Dimension	Public Sector Banks	Cooperative Banks	Private Sector Banks	Sector with Highest Mean
Job Security	**4.35±0.72**	3.55±0.95	3.15±1.10	**Public**
Compensation Satisfaction	3.80±0.88	3.50±0.90	**4.15±0.75**	**Private**
Career Growth	3.65±0.91	3.10±1.05	**4.25±0.78**	**Private**
Social Integration	3.90±0.70	**4.10±0.65**	3.70±0.85	**Cooperative**
Work-Life Balance	**3.85±0.85**	3.75±0.90	2.60±1.05	**Public**
Overall QWL Satisfaction	3.83±0.65	3.58±0.70	3.68±0.80	**Public** (Slightly highest)

5.3 Key Frequency and Observational Findings:

Table 7: Key Observational Findings and Sector-Specific Characteristics

QWL Dimension	Public Sector Banks	Cooperative Banks	Private Sector Banks
Job Security	Dominant "Strongly Agree" (60%) responses.	Wide distribution (3 & 4), stable but with minor concerns.	Polarized/Low: Significant percentage at "Disagree" (Insecure/Very Insecure).
Workload/Stress	Low Stress: Workload generally manageable within working hours.	Low stress/manageable, with occasional staff-scarcity pressure.	High Stress: Workload frequently excessive; most respondents select "Often/Always" for stress frequency.
Career Path Clarity	Clear but slow and seniority-based.	Unclear, informal, or non-existent (highest "Disagree" rate).	Explicitly defined, rapid, and performance-driven.
Supervisor Support	Stable and reasonably supportive.	Very Supportive, often due to close-knit, local nature.	Heavily focused on performance monitoring, less on empathetic support.
Suggested Improvements	Improve career progression and modernize IT infrastructure.	Improve compensation and formalize training/HR policies.	Reduce workload/stress, increase job security, and improve work-life balance.

6. Discussion and Strategic Implications

The findings confirm the distinct QWL identity and fundamental trade-off existing within each sector. Furthermore, an analysis of the standard deviations reveals the level of consensus or disagreement on these issues across the employee base.

Public Banks: The Stability Model

High mean scores in Job Security (Mean 4.35) and superior Work-Life Balance (Mean 3.85) define the Public Sector (H2 affirmed). Critically, these high mean scores are paired with relatively low standard deviations (e.g., Job Security ±0.72), indicating a strong, broad consensus among employees regarding the stability and predictability of the work environment. Their primary challenge is overcoming slow, seniority-based Career Growth (Mean 3.65) to prevent the stagnation of talented personnel.

Private Banks: The High-Reward, High-Pressure Model

Their strengths in Compensation and best-in-class Career Growth (Mean 4.25) (H3 affirmed) are achieved at a significant cost: the statistically lowest mean score for Work-Life Balance (2.60) and highest reported stress, leading to a culture of burnout. The standard deviations in the Private Sector are the highest across the board for crucial factors, notably Job Security (±1.10) and Work-Life Balance (±1.05). This high variance indicates a polarized workforce: while some ambitious employees likely accept the trade-off and rate these factors highly, a substantial portion strongly disagrees, signaling internal conflict and high-risk areas for Human Resources management.

Cooperative Banks: The Social Core

The highest mean score in Social Integration (Mean 4.10) (H4 affirmed) is paired with the lowest standard deviation for this factor (±0.65), validating their supportive, community-based culture and demonstrating a strong, collective agreement on this social strength. Their principal risk is a structural deficit in formal Career Growth and competitive compensation, making them vulnerable in the modern talent market.

The Multiple Linear Regression confirming Career Growth as the dominant predictor ($\beta=0.45$, $p<0.001$, H5 affirmed) is the key insight. This statistical finding explicitly underscores that employees prioritize their long-term development trajectory, making career opportunities the most potent tool for engagement across all sectors, regardless of the sector's ownership structure.

7. Recommendations and Suggestions

Based on the identified QWL gaps, the following sector-specific interventions are recommended:

Table 8: Sector-Specific QWL Challenges and Strategic Recommendations

Banking Sector	Key Challenge	Actionable Recommendation
Public Sector Banks	Lack of fast-track growth and high performer motivation.	Implement merit-based incentives and clear, expedited promotion pathways to leverage motivation beyond basic security.
Cooperative Banks	Deficit in formal HR/Training and compensation competitiveness.	Formalize HR policies, introduce transparent training calendars, and review remuneration structures to attract and retain skilled professionals.

Private Sector Banks	High stress and dangerously low Work-Life Balance.	Mandate comprehensive wellness programs and enforce strict policies for workload manageability and protected personal time to mitigate burnout and high turnover.

8. Conclusion and Future Research

8.1 Conclusion

This study successfully measured and compared employee perceptions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) across the three banking sectors in Pune.

- Employee Experience is Fractured: The results confirm that an employee's work experience is significantly different based on whether they work for a Public, Cooperative, or Private bank.

- Findings Guide Strategy: These differences provide essential guidance for human resource management (HR) strategies.

- Management Must Be Tailored: A single HR approach will not work for all sectors. Effective management needs specific focus:

  o Public Banks: Need a growth strategy (focus on speeding up promotions and career paths).

  o Private Banks: Need a balance strategy (focus on reducing stress and improving work-life balance).

  o Cooperative Banks: Need a structural professionalization strategy (focus on formalizing HR policies and competitive pay).

8.2 Future Research Areas and Topics

1. Investigating the Impact of Technology on Job Security and Workload: Future research should conduct a longitudinal study to monitor the shifting effects of advanced technology (such as AI adoption and automation) on both the daily workload and long-term job security perceptions across all three banking sectors.

2. Qualitative Exploration of Stress Drivers: Focused qualitative studies (e.g., in-depth interviews and focus groups) are needed to deeply explore the cultural and managerial causes of the observed low stress in Public Banks and the exceptionally high stress in Private Banks, providing crucial context for policy interventions.

3. Gender-Specific QWL Analysis: A dedicated comparative study is warranted to examine the specific QWL factors affecting women employees across the Public, Cooperative, and Private sectors, focusing particularly on work-family conflict and perceptions of career advancement barriers.

4. Linking QWL Perceptions to Objective Business Outcomes: Subsequent quantitative research should establish a clear correlation between the identified QWL dimensions (security, growth, balance) and objective business metrics such as employee turnover rates, customer satisfaction scores, and branch-level profitability.

5. Generational Differences in QWL Priorities: Research should segment the workforce by generation (e.g., Millennials/Gen Z versus older cohorts) to understand if the priority given to Career Growth over Job Security is a generational shift, and how this impacts attraction and retention strategies for each bank type.

6. The Role of Immediate Supervisory Support: A study focusing on non-managerial staff should assess the perceived quality of supervisory support, organizational justice, and decision-making

autonomy to determine how local management behavior mediates (or amplifies) the QWL issues inherent in the sector's ownership structure.

References

1. Baba, V., & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinization of job context and job content as related to employees' quality of working life: A study of Canadian blue-collar workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(5), 379–386.
2. D'Souza, A. (2002). *Management of cooperative banks*. Himalaya Publishing House.
3. Guest, D. E. (2017). The quality of working life: The forgotten frontier. *Human Resource Management Journal, 27*(4), 586–597.
4. Gupta, B., & Hyde, A. M. (2013). An analysis of quality of work life (QWL) in banking sector – A literature review. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4*(5), 4511–4513.
5. Sharma, A., & Kothari, R. (2014). A comparative study of quality of work life of employees of public and private sector banks in Jaipur city. *Journal of Research in Commerce & Management, 3*(1), 108-115.
6. Sinha, D. (2013). Study of job satisfaction of the employees of private sector banks. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research, 2*(2), 33–40.
7. Sinha Chandranshu, P. (2012). Quality of work life and job satisfaction: A study in the Indian banking sector. *Paradigm: A Management Research Journal, 16*(1), 11–17. doi:10.1177/0971890720120102
8. Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review, 15*(1), 11–21.