

# Exploring the Impact of Employment Status on the Quality of Life of Industrial Personnel

**SangitaMadhukar Deokar<sup>1</sup> & Ajit B. Chandnashive<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, JnanaPrabodhini's Psychology Institute, Pune, India

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, ChandmalTarachand Bora College, Shirur, Pune, India

## Abstract

The present study aims to analysis how employment recruitment type which include permanent and contractual making effect on the Quality of Life (QOL) of Industrial personnel. There are 125 sample include in this study among which 80 permanent and 45 contractual (68 men and 45 females) taken from various industries from Pune district. Sharma and Nasreen (National Psychological Corporation, Agra) 42 items Quality of Life scale used for measuring Quality of Life. For analysing data of quantitative SPSS compared group mean and different employees' recruitment type used. For analysing Qualitative, data collected by using open-ended question related to employees life theatrical analysis used. Quantitative result of this study showing that there is no significant difference in employee's quality of life base on their appointment type, but at other side qualitative result showing different between contractual and permanent employees which is related to job insecurity, facilities provided by employer, workload, supervisor pressure, male- female job challenges. "This study highlights recommendations for making changes to industry policies, which would be particularly beneficial for contractual employees. Study recommended that future research should pay more attention on other aspect of contractual employees which is psychological wellbeing, marital relationship, job stability, work life balance.

**Keywords:** Quality of Life (QOL), Employment status (Contractual or permanent), Industrial Personnel's.

## Introduction

### Quality of Life at Work

According to WHO (1997/2020) quality of life much boarder term which involve how people recognize their well-being across physical health, mental health, social support and environment condition. For employees quality of life concept many time correlate with quality of work life which concentrated on status of job security, paid fairness, sovereign, work life balance, job environment, organization support employees overall life satisfaction and wellbeing (Perri et al., 2024)

### Theoretical Frameworks

Current study is based on many theories which examine how employment status might influence quality of life.

1. Job Demands- Resources (JD-R) Model-

Job Demand Resources theory stated that supervisor support, independence this job resources provide support to employees those doing work under too much pressure and help them for better performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Ferreira & Gomes, 2022). Employees from various industries although they are contractual or permanent required greater performance in less resources and facilities which create negative impact on their wellbeing (Ferreira & Gomes, 2022).

2. Conservation of Resources (COR) theory

Hobfoll (1989) mentioned in COR theory that employees experiencing more stress due to lack of resources or resources loss or threat to their life. Contractual employees experiencing more stress and instabilities and less facilities which make employees more unstable and reduce their energy.

3. Social Determinants of Health

Employment quality may make impact on social health, employment insecurity may link with unstable contracts, less income and treat to life is related to low well-being outcomes (Perri et al., 2024; Bhattacharya & Ray, 2021).

4. Person- Environment Fit

Individual needs and workplace characteristics is extremely important to QOL, fitness or correlation between this two is crucial, If difference is found between contractual workers individual needs and job output or remuneration making stress and low feeling about life.

## **Empirical Background**

An experiential study supports these studies. Contractual or unstable worker suffering from low life satisfaction and high job insecurity (Van Gyes, 2007; Bhattacharya & Ray, 2021). Many European study shown that contractual employees have very low job resources which include higher authority pressure, workplace environment which diversify employees their attitude toward work and wellbeing (Taris, Peeters, & Le Blanc, 2020). Recent study showing that instability among employees negatively affect on employees mental health and overall wellbeing (Perri et al., 2024; Wu, 2022).

## **Impact Factors in Industrial Settings**

Employee's quality of life affected by many factor those are as per following

**Job security and employment type:** There is much difference between contractual and permanent employee's stabilities, benefits and social protection. Permanent employees feel more job stabilities; facilities and social protection at the other side contractual employees feel job insecurity, instability and limited social protection (Bhattacharya & Ray, 2021).

**Compensation and welfare:** Paid fairness, health insurance, paid leave are important things for wellbeing (International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 2024).

**Workload and physical condition:** heavy work that required high physical energy or physical stamina and long shifts duties diversely affect on physical health and life satisfaction.

Organization support: Organization help for employees progression, provide on job training, taking feedback from employees for improving policies, and social support increases growth chances of employees.

Work life balance: Flexibilities in scheduling and authority are very important, especially for women and caregivers (Medina-Garrido, Biedma-Ferrer, & Sánchez-Ortiz, 2023).

Technological and Surveillance stress: High demand of technological knowledge and use of technological at workplace making weaker impact on employees autonomy and wellbeing (Soffia et al., 2024).

## **Literature Review**

Research in recent years has expanded our understanding of how employment status influences employee well-being:

Perri et al. (2024) found in his study which was conducted in Canada and identified that uncertainty among employees, low payment is positively correlated with mental health challenges and decrease life satisfaction.

Bhattacharya and Ray (2021) study conducted in U.S. indicated that contractual workers quality of life affected by job pressure, paid unfairness and health.

In Korea, Lee et al. (2024) indicated in his study that quality of life which includes job stability and benefits is correlated with employee's wellbeing and health problems.

Ferreira and Gomes (2022) study indicate that contractual worker adaptability little bit related to weakness of contractual worker and it is risk factor for emotional tiredness.

A pan- European study conducted in 30 countries indicated that contractual workers, especially third party employees is greater demands, fewer control and insecurity than permanent employees (Taris, Peeters, & Le Blanc, 2020).

### **Synthesis:**

Current study on contractual employees indicates that job instabilities and limited resources closely link to quality of life. Current study gives more attention on qualitative and quantitative approach data analysis, quantitative approach include day today life experience.

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

Current study using convergent mixed methods design which involves Quantitative analysis of QoL test scores and data for qualitative analysis collected from employees daily life experience related to their job stabilities overall experience related to job.

## **Participants**

Participant for this study taken by using purposive sampling method, include industrial employees from IT, Food, Pharma, Bank, Automobile and Education industries both permanent and contractual. Total 125 industrial employees include in this study, among which 80 permanent and 45 contractual employees, gender wise bifurcation of sample is 68 men and 57 women.

## **Instrument**

Quality of Life Scale (QoL) by Sharma & Nasreen was used to measure measure quality of life, this scale includes 42 items, which have three point scale (Always, Seldom, Never). Test is measuring following factor Physical Health, Psychological Well-being, Social Relationship, Environmental Support.

## **Procedure**

In this study purposive sampling method was used for data collection, contractual and permanent employees information taken from various industries HR department, from friends, relative then reach out to them, give all study information to them, it was make sure that all participant are voluntarily participate in study, and gave assures them for confidentiality of their data, then took consent form from them, then ask them to solve qualitative questionnaire and ask open ended quantitative questions.

## **Ethical Considerations**

Written inform consent was taken from every participant, in that it is written that participants are any time taking back foot from study, and objectives and purpose of study and other necessary details told to participants.

## **Data Analysis**

For analysis of quantitative data SPSS software were used, mean, SD, and independent t-tests used for analysis of Quality of Life scale data. Qualitative dataanalysis (which was collected open ended question related to daily life experiences) by using thematic analysis.

## **Results**

### **Quantitative Findings**

**Table 1. Quality of Life by Employment Status**

Contract Type	n	Mean QoL (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Permanent Employees	41	105.10	6.37
Contractual Employees	87	105.00	7.41

Note: Descriptive statistics showing the QoL score mean for permanent employees  $M = (105.10)$  ( $SD = 6.37$ ) and Contractual employees mean ( $M = 105.00$ ) ( $SD = 7.41$ ). In conclusion not significance different is found between 2 mean.

**Table 2. Gender-Based Differences**

Group	t-statistic	df (degrees of freedom)	p-value	Significance
Men	0.18	69	0.855	Not Significant
Women	-0.53	55	0.599	Not Significant

Note: Independent sample t-tests showing no significant differences in Quality of Life scores base on gender. For men,  $t(69) = 0.18$ ,  $p = .855$ , and for women,  $t(55) = -0.53$ ,  $p = .599$ .

## Qualitative Findings

Qualitative analysis data indicated following things: Permanent employees have more job security, less work pressure, job stress, less worried about future than contractual employees.

Facilities differences, health policy differences, paid leaves, injustice paid fairness, and growth opportunity at workplace is less for contractual worker and more for permanent employees.

Contractual worker have to do long hours duties, required to do more physical work, drain their energy in work and this lead to stress, low life satisfaction among employees.

Contractual workers can't raise wise against injustice with them, they not have proper organization to do help them on the other hand permanent worker have very structured organization so they can gather together and rise communicative wise and sanctioned their requirements.

In many industry female worker have to do shift work that why their safety issues arise while travelling during night time. They also have to manage among family and work. Female's quality of life affected more than males.

## Integrated Summary

Quantitative analysis data SPSS analysis not found significant different in quality of life among contractual and permanent employees, but the qualitative data show more difference among these contractual and permanent employees, they stated on open ended interview about their difficulties in organizational setting which include instability in work, limited facilities, have to face more relationship issues, injustice with them. Women worker also told different issue related to their work life balance, gender discrimination faced by them.

## Discussion

### Interpretation of Main Findings

This study used both analysis qualitative and quantitative analysis in which quantitative analysis show not significance difference found between quality of life between contractual and permanent worker instead that qualitative analysis showing that there are difference between quality of among permanent and contractual employees, information was collected by interview of employees by asking open ended questions.

### Practical Implications:

Study suggested few changes in organization policy which was as per following:

1. More beneficial policy should be for contractual worker related to their medical leaves, health and safety.
2. Organization should take feedback from contractual employees for their betterment and involve them in decision making.
3. More advance instrument should provide to contractual employees too which help them to reduce their physical energy and stress.
4. Employees should get gender equality training so female employees get more health workplace.
5. Provide opportunity to contractual for self-growth.

### Limitations

- Only quality of life is measure in this study.
- Only 6 industrial employees data were collected from Pune district there result can't be generalize.
- Quantitative questionnaire not include very deeper item which able to make discrimination between contractual and permanent employees quality of life.

## Future Research

- Study can be conducted with quality of life with correlation of other variables.
- Intervention study can be conducted to improve quality of life of employees.
- Cross region study or urban rural comparison can be done.

## Conclusion

This study helps to analyze quality of life among permanent and contractual employees, analysis is based on qualitative and quantitative data in which quantitative data not showing significance different but qualitative data collected with open ended question ask to employees about their personal and professional life showing notable difference. Finding of this suggested some welfare policies to industrial employees which help to both employees and organization (for growing their productivity).

## References

- Bhattacharya, A., & Ray, T. (2021). Precarious work, job stress, and health-related quality of life. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 64(4), 310–319. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.23223>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
- Ferreira, P., & Gomes, S. (2022). Temporary work, permanent strain? Personal resources as inhibitors of temporary agency workers' burnout. *Administrative Sciences*, 12(3), 87. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030087>
- Lee, S., Kim, J., & Park, H. (2024). Employment quality: A social determinant of health and well-being in a changing labor market in Korea. *Social Indicators Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-024-03464-y>
- Perri, M., O'Campo, P., Gill, P., Gunn, V., Ma, R. W., Buhariwala, P., Rasoulia, E., Lewchuk, W., Baron, S., Bodin, T., & Muntaner, C. (2024). Precarious work on the rise. *BMC Public Health*, 24, Article 2074. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19363-3>
- Sharma, S., & Nasreen, N. (2014). *Quality of Life Scale*. National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Taris, T. W., Peeters, M. C. W., & Le Blanc, P. M. (2020). Testing demands and resources as determinants of vitality among different employment contract groups: A study in 30 European countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7), 2454. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17072454>
- Van Gyes, G. (2007, March 13). Impact of job control and demands on temporary and permanent workers. Eurofound. <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/en/resources/article/2007/impact-job-control-and-demands-temporary-and-permanent-workers>

World Health Organization.(1997/2020).*WHOQOL: Measuring quality of life*.

<https://www.who.int/standards/health-indicators/whoqol>

Soffia, M., et al. (2024, March 12). Workplace AI, robots, and trackers are bad for quality of life, study finds.

*The Guardian*.<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2024/mar/12/workplace-ai-robots-trackers-quality-of-life-institute-for-work>