An Appraisal Of The Impact Of Quality Of Work Life And Job Satisfaction Upon Employee Retention In Pharmaceutical Companies In Uttarakhand

Sunita Kumari Giri [1], Prof. (Dr.) Surekha Rana [2]

[1] Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, Gurukul Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India.

[2] Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, Gurukul Kangri Vishwavidyalaya, Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India.

*Corresponding author: Sunita Kumari Giri

Abstract

The study examined how Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Retention relate in pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand as well as how they impact Employee Retention. To collect data for the study, a well-designed and validated questionnaire was administered. Employee Retention was highly associated with various aspects of Quality of Work Life as well as Job Satisfaction as determined by the questionnaire study (N = 385), and both aspects had an impact on Employee Retention significantly. There was an impact at the individual level and when clustered together. The study was conducted in order to understand the effects of Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction on Employee Retention in pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand. The contribution of the study was deliberated in relation to understanding the Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction as significant predictors of Employee Retention in pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, Employee Retention, Pharmaceutical, Uttarakhand.

Introduction

Whenever efficiency and competence of an organization have been discussed or stated, employee knowledge and understanding have been the primary defining factors. A company's efficiency is determined by how it attracts, recruits, inspires, and retains its employees. Adaptability and flexibility are essential for organizations to succeed in the 21st century. It is crucial to create a good and friendly working atmosphere for an employee to perform at their best. The principal advantage of any organization is a satisfied, happy, and hardworking employee. Workforce efficiency and productivity are therefore closely tied to the effectiveness of any organization's workforce. In order for

employees to be competent and satisfied, the work environment is important. As a result of having a comfortable and safe working environment, an individual is able to appreciate the workplace environment and develop a commitment to it (Car, 2004; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999; Emery & Thorsrud, 1976; Eskildsen & Nussler, 2000; Guest, 2002).

Quality of work life (QWL) refers to the degree to which an organisation's work environment is favourable or unfavourable for its employees. The notion of quality of work life seems to be a useful tool for managers in recruiting talented employees and keeping them engaged. Additionally, it appears as a promising concept to foster a high participation culture and high organizational performance (Moloi, 2007). A significant variable of organizational efficacy was the perception of Quality of Work Life (Mohan, Sehgal, & Rana, 1993). The quality of work life is based on humanistic standards and reflects democratic principles (Costanza et al., 2007). Managers' primary task is not to hire and fire employees, but to guide employees toward productivity, moral responsibility, and social responsibility within the organization (Hosseinabadi, Karampourian, Beiranvand, & Pournia, 2013). Increasing employee autonomy, improving physical conditions, improving healthy technologies, and enhancing job security are all factors within the concept of work life quality (Dahl, Nesheim, & Olsen, 2009). Finally, it can be concluded that quality of work life is a complex and multifaceted concept that has been explored in all its forms.

It is believed that Job Satisfaction (JS) is one of the most important phenomena in any organization or institute, as well as for researchers who are interested in studying it as a field of study (Spector, 1997). An important aspect of job satisfaction is feeling accomplished on the job. It also indicates satisfaction and passion leading to salary, promotion, appraisals, and appreciation (Kaliski, 2007). A measure of job satisfaction can be described as the degree to which an employee is satisfied with the incentives he/she receives at work (Statt, 2004). According to organizational literature, job satisfaction has a number of dimensions, such as how much time an individual makes available for work and for personal calls. There are different approaches to job satisfaction depending on the individual. Motivating employees to feel accomplished is related to their inner qualities and sense of accomplishment (Setyaningrum, Setiawan, & Surachman, 2017). In order to be satisfied with their work and their duties, employees must demonstrate an operational orientation towards it (Price, 2001). Employees who are unhappy are more likely to look for jobs outside their companies (Hellman, 1997).

ER (employee retention) refers to employee relationships that last over time. It can also be described as an organization's ability to retain its employees. It is a process where employees encourage their co-workers to remain with the company for as long as possible. According to literature (Adeoye & Hope, 2020), retention is the deliberate process by which an organization creates an enticing work environment that keeps employees engaged for a long time. It is critical for organizations to retain and engage employees because employees are the driving force behind the organization's goals and objectives. Engagement and retention begin at the time of recruitment. Almost every

aspect of the business affects retention and engagement, so it always seems to be a never-ending process (Roopavathi & Kishore, 2020) and directly affecting the employee/employer relationships around the world. Regardless of the region, recruitment process and retention seem to take the biggest hits (Herjanto & Harper, 2020). There aren't too many employees in today's workforce who aren't in a position to take advantage of good opportunities. They switch over to their next job as soon as they are dissatisfied with their current employer. Retaining them is the employer's responsibility. Employers who are interested in retaining our employees should devise policies and practices designed to ensure that we provide them with a working environment that encourages them to remain employed (Hladio, 2019).

Organizations can avoid being embroiled in the awkwardness of high attrition if they understand factors that affect job satisfaction, quality of work life, and employee retention. In order for an organization to achieve and endure, quality of work life, job satisfaction, and retention are key factors. No one can quantify the satisfaction a person feels when he achieves his goals. Employee job satisfaction is influenced by both direct and indirect factors. In the current world of competitive business that demands quality and efficiency, companies that can create an attractive and motivating work environment are well prepared to compete and succeed. Organizations today face challenges both in retaining and developing their human resources. A company's ability to attract and retain qualified employees has become crucial to its success, as the knowledge and skills of employees have become irreplaceable in today's business environment. It would be of great interest to study the interrelationships among quality of work life, job satisfaction, and employee retention concepts and the possible effects on the overall system.

As a result, this research was designed to learn more about how Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Employee Retention affect Employee Retention in pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand, as well as to find out what impact these factors have on Employee Retention.

Research Methodology

Participants and procedure

A workplace survey was conducted inside pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand that provided the data for the present study. Prior to the data collection, there was an active dialogue between the researchers, representatives of the pharmaceutical companies (i.e., managers and the HR department), and representatives of the employees (i.e., unions). Pharmaceutical companies were sent a link to a web survey, and all 400 respondents were invited to participate in the study by email. Completing the web survey took approximately 20 minutes. The survey was filled out by 385 respondents (96% participation rate). The present study was primarily focused on representatives working directly within a pharmaceutical company, so all participants reporting any position within the company or any management positions were included in the study. Therefore,

385 respondents were included in the final sample. Participants provided informed consent and the study was approved.

Materials and measures
During the current study, data were collected primarily through the use of a validated questionnaire, which included a number of scales pertaining to Quality of work life, Job satisfaction, and Employee retention, as well as the various factors responsible for measuring each of these factors. The questionnaire contained general questions such as an organization's demographics and details of respondents. Additionally, the questionnaire included questions about Quality of work life, Job satisfaction, and Employee retention. There were two main sections to the questionnaire: Part 1 and 2. The first part of the survey consists of 10 demographic questions. The second part consisted of 3 subsections: A, B and C. There are 24 questions in subsection A about 'Quality of Work Life', 18 questions in subsection B about 'Job Satisfaction', and 16 questions in subsection C about 'Employee Retention'. Likert's scale categorized under interval scale was used to record the respondent's response by specifying by what range the respondent agrees or disagrees with the statement, i.e., range between strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Predictors (Independent variables) and Dependent variables
As independent variables, Quality of Life at Work (QWL) and Job Satisfaction (JS) were examined. The dependent variable was employee retention (ER). In this study, quality of work life (QWL) and job satisfaction (JS), as well as their impact on employee retention (ER), was investigated from the perspective of organizational factors and other pre-framed factors. Hence, the design of this study was descriptive.

Pre-testing of the Questionnaire (Reliability Testing)
A pilot study was conducted to determine whether the questionnaire was consistent. Responses were requested from 25 company respondents and feedback was received from 20 respondents within the specified time frame. The Cronbach's alpha test was conducted (Table 1), the corrected questionnaire was resubmitted to the Cronbach's alpha test and a satisfactory result was obtained which indicated the questionnaire's reliability and thus it was finalized for the proposed survey.

Table 1. Reliability statistics using Cronbach's Alpha

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Number of questions
Quality of Work Life	.844	.858	24
Job Satisfaction	.948	.950	18

Employee Retention	.954	.955	16

Statistical data analysis

In data analysis, reasoning is applied in order to understand and construe the information collected through questionnaires (Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2003). In order to analyze the data and achieve the desired results, various tools were used in this study. Different analyses are chosen depending on various factors, such as the kind of sample, its characteristics, and whether or not the assumptions of the test are met. The analysis was conducted using SPSS version 22 (Statistical Package for Social Science). Among the techniques used for the study were reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha, descriptive statistics, corelations, and stepwise or hierarchical regression analysis.

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations

Reliability scores (Cronbach's alpha) were already reported in Table 1. Cronbach's alpha scores were satisfactory for all scales (Heo, Kim, & Faith, 2015). Demography data were presented as Frequency and percent and reported in Table 2. In total, 385 responses were received representing several unique manufacturing companies. Out of the responses received, 23.9% were located in Dehradun, 50.4% located in Haridwar, 5.7% located in Kotdwar and 20.00% were located in Udhamsingh Nagar. There were 63.9% male and 36.1% female respondents in the survey. There were 19.5% respondents aged below 25 years, 52.7% between 26-35 years, 19.0% between 36-45 years, 6.2% between 46-55 years and a 2.6% were found to be above 55 years. A 56.1% respondents were married and rest 43.9% were unmarried. Majority of the respondents were found to be graduate (44.2%) followed by 35.8% post Graduate, 12.2% Professional courses and 7.8% were under Graduate. All participating companies were engaged in continuous manufacturing activities. The respondents experience ranged from less than one to over four years. While 10.9% respondents had less than a year of experience, 21.0% had 1-2 years, 26.2% had 3-4 years, 17.9% had 5-6 years and 23.9% respondents had over 6 years of experience. The present data indicated 66.0% respondents as Middle Management followed by 22.1% Lower Management and 11.9% as Top Management. In addition, majority of the respondents were observed to be salaried between 200000-400000 per annum (43.9%) followed by 24.4% salaried less than 200000, 19.7% salaried between >400000-600000 and only 11.9% were found to be salaried per annum above 600000. When the respondents were asked about their job changes, a major 85.2% indicated a 0-2 times of job change followed by 3-5 times of job change by 11.7%, 6-8 times by 2.6% and as low as 0.5% were found to change their job more than 8 times. The frequency and percent data from the organizational demography are presented in table 2. Also represented are the top pharmaceutical companies in India. Participants came from three departments (Quality Control, Quality Assurance, and Production) with varying levels of experience.

On the basis of the demographics of the respondents and the companies, the sample appears to be a good representation of the pharmaceutical companies in India and can therefore be used to derive inferences about the current state of these companies. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyse the relationships between all scales and measures (Table 3). Significant correlations were observed between all scales. Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction were positively related to Employee Retention. Finally, correlations for the three outcome measures showed strong relations between Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Employee Retention.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses
Hierarchical regression analyses were performed (Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6) to test the hypotheses and investigate the relationships between Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Employee Retention.

Table 2. The table summarizes the respondent demographics.

Demographic Parameters	Frequency	Percent
Location/City		
Dehradun	92	23.9
Haridwar	194	50.4
Kotdwar	22	5.7
Udhamsingh Nagar	77	20.0
Gender		
Male	246	63.9
Female	139	36.1
Age		
Below 25 years	75	19.5
26 - 35 years	203	52.7
36 - 45 years	73	19.0
46 - 55 years	24	6.2
Above 55 years	10	2.6
Marital status		
Married	216	56.1
Unmarried	169	43.9
Highest education level attained		
Under Graduate	30	7.8
Graduate	170	44.2

Post Graduate	138	35.8
Professional Courses	47	12.2
How long you are working in this organization?		
Less than 1 Year	42	10.9
1-2 Years	81	21.0
3-4 Years	101	26.2
5-6 Years	69	17.9
More than 6 Years	92	23.9
Present position in the organization		
Top Management	46	11.9
Middle Management	254	66.0
Lower Management	85	22.1
Present annual salary in the organization		
Less than 200000	94	24.4
200000-400000	169	43.9
>400000-500000	76	19.7
Above 500000	46	11.9
Number of Job changed		
1-3 times	328	85.2
4-5 times	45	11.7
6-7 times	10	2.6
Above 7 times	2	0.5

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and correlations

Correlations					
	Gender	Age	QWL	JS	ER
Gender	1	-.086	-.019	.010	-.001
Age	-.086	1	-.041	-.041	-.093
QWL	-.019	-.041	1	.810**	.810**

JS	.010	-.041	.810**	1	.838**
ER	-.001	-.093	.810**	.838**	1
Mean	1.3610	2.1974	3.0868	3.1251	3.1185
Standard Deviation	.48093	.91144	.55121	.75272	.73668
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

n = 385, **p<0.01

Table 4. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

Model Summary[c]									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.810[a]	.657	.656	.43216	.657	732.868	1	383	.000
2	.867[b]	.752	.751	.36759	.096	147.359	1	382	.000
a. Predictors: (Constant), QWL									
b. Predictors: (Constant), QWL, JS									
c. Dependent Variable: ER									

Table 5.: Hierarchical Regression analysis (ANOVA) of Dependent Variable (ER) with independent variable (QWL and JS).

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	136.869	1	136.869	732.868	.000[b]
	Residual	71.529	383	.187		
	Total	208.398	384			
2	Regression	156.781	2	78.390	580.142	.000[c]
	Residual	51.617	382	.135		
	Total	208.398	384			
a. Dependent Variable: ER						
b. Predictors: (Constant), QWL						
c. Predictors: (Constant), QWL, JS						

From the data from Table 4 and 5, Model 1 (QWL) with R^2=0.657; and the ANOVA results for Model 1: F (1, 383) = 732.88, p = 0.000 indicated JS as a significant predictor of ER. There is 65.7% variance caused upon ER by QWL. From Model 2 (JS) with

(R^2=0.752); and the ANOVA results for Model 2: F (2, 382) = 580.14, p = 0.000 indicated JS as a significant predictor of ER when taken together with QWL. The addition of JS did change significantly in ER. The change in R^2 (ΔR^2 =0.096) from Model summary change statistics of Model 2; and the ANOVA results for Model 2: F (1, 382) = 147.36, p = 0.000, indicated that JS account for a significance amount of variance in ER above and beyond QWL.

Unstandardized coefficients designate the extent of the dependent variable varies with an independent variable when all other independent variables are seized constant (Table 6). Considering above table of Coefficients, the unstandardized coefficient, B, for QWL is equal to 1.083 which indicated that for each one unit increase in QWL, there is an increase in ER of 1.083 unit. When in model 2, JS had been added to model 1 alongside QWL, the unstandardized coefficient, B, became 0.513 and 0.516 for QWL and JS respectively. Similarly for each one unit increase in JS, there is an increase in ER of 0.516 unit, suggesting a positive impact of JS upon ER.

Table 6.: Coefficients of Dependent Variable (ER) with independent variable (QWL and JS).

Coefficients[a]							
Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**	**Collinearity Statistics**	
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**			**Tolerance**	**VIF**
1 (Constant)	-.225	.125		-1.792	.074		
QWL	1.083	.040	.810	27.072	.000	1.000	1.000
2 (Constant)	-.076	.107		-.710	.478		
QWL	.513	.058	.384	8.846	.000	.344	2.904
JS	.516	.042	.527	12.139	.000	.344	2.904
a. Dependent Variable: ER							

General discussion

Due to the importance of Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Retention, the aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship between Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Retention in pharmaceutical companies in Uttarakhand. It was important to conduct this study due to the role pharmaceutical companies play in economic growth, as well as their contribution in creating employment

opportunities and improving the quality of life for consumers. Furthermore, no study of employee job satisfaction, quality of work life, or retention of employees has been undertaken to date. As a result, one of the objectives of this study was to generate scientific thinking about employee life satisfaction and employee retention in pharmaceutical companies. As well, the study will provide information about how to motivate and increase the performance of employees to business leaders in general and middle managers specifically. In today's increasingly complex environment, corporate managers are not able to effectively use dynamic theories to maintain and advance knowledge without research. This study's results and theoretical knowledge will help pharmaceutical companies improve productivity, performance, motivation, and employee retention through effective management, resulting in higher productivity, job satisfaction, and employee retention. The key determinants of organizational success are the job satisfaction, morale and performance of its employees, the quality of their work life, and their tendency to remain in the company. When employees do routine jobs with clear roles and responsibilities, they prefer clear directions over sympathy from management. Employees with a high need for autonomy and achievement will find greater intrinsic value in participation in decision making, resulting in a greater willingness to work towards achieving targets and greater satisfaction with work. It is possible for middle managers to persuade lower managers to create an environment of trust, openness, and confidence that encourages employees to view problems as opportunities to learn and contribute to their solution. The middle management should create an environment that makes the employee believe in his work, which will inspire him or her to work harder and harder. Planning and initiative, organization and direction, cooperation and coordination, the effectiveness of the organization, and employee performance and satisfaction are among the responsibilities of middle managers. The results of this study can be helpful for designing and developing training programs as well as in-house schedules and other activities to boost employee retention, improve quality of work life, and increase job satisfaction. As the research results are context-specific, the contextual significance of this work cannot be ignored. Participants in this study were mid-level managers (supervisors) and lower-level managers, rather than high-level managers and chief executives with overall responsibility for organizational performance. The study has demonstrated that a significant correlation exists; ways in which this relationship occurs can be predicted with reasonable accuracy, and the causal effect cannot be argued without further investigation that replicates and revalidates the findings in other studies.

In order to improve productivity, increase quality of work life, boost satisfaction at work, and retain employees, pharmaceutical companies may benefit from the findings of this research by taking the following actions:

- Review/redefine job descriptions and work structures to prevent job dissatisfaction.
- The age group of employees (26-35) that is more ambitious and expects immediate promotions, higher salaries, and more authority and freedom to work independently should be managed.

- Reform the promotion strategies and reimbursement structure to ensure internal equity and promote a culture of performance, justice, and fair play. Employees are thus more satisfied with their jobs and therefore more likely to remain in their jobs.
- Design and implement various training and non-formal learning activities for the benefit of employees to boost employee job satisfaction and retention.
- Making sure stress levels are controlled through the effective management of workloads, ensuring optimal work life quality, and clearly defining job descriptions and work structures resulting in improved job satisfaction.
- A higher quality of work life will lead to greater job satisfaction, ultimately resulting in higher retention of employees.

Conclusions

Organizations' competitive position was strengthened by existing challenges and multifaceted economic circumstances. Since India is well integrated in the global economy, organizations contributing to India's economy are compelled to reduce costs and to survive in this highly competitive market. To accomplish this, organizations must reduce costs and increase performance and productivity. Pharma industry is well regulated and is predicted to grow exponentially in coming years and significantly contribute to India's economy. Specifically, the present study revealed that some key organisational variables, including Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Retention had relationships with each other. Specifically, the impact of Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction upon Employee Retention was investigated as well as the interrelationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction. Both individually and when combined, the results clearly confirmed that Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction have a significant impact on Employee Retention. Employee Retention is largely impacted by both Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction. Employee retention was significantly impacted by all the predictors of quality of work life. All the predictors of employee retention were also found to be significantly impacted by most of the predictors of job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the current study serves as a solid foundation for improving our understanding of employee retention, quality of life at work, and job satisfaction in pharmaceutical companies. A fair and adequate wage package, professional development, job growth, social integration, and personal development are factors that significantly impact employee/worker retention.

Declaration Of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest in this manuscript.

Reference

Adeoye, A. O., & Hope, O. (2020). Organizational Culture, Employee Retention and Employee Loyalty: Empirical Evidence from Nigeria. Academic Journal of Economic Studies, 6(3), 139-145.

Car, M. (2004). The quality of Human Resources Management and competitive advantage of the small and the middle companies in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Paper presented at the An Enterprise Odyssey. International Conference Proceedings.

Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Ali, S., Beer, C., Bond, L., Boumans, R., . . . Farley, J. (2007). Quality of life: An approach integrating opportunities, human needs, and subjective well-being. Ecological economics, 61(2-3), 267-276.

Dahl, S.-A., Nesheim, T., & Olsen, K. M. (2009). Quality of work. Concept and measurement. Quality of Work in the European Union. Concept, Data Debates from a Transnational Perspective. Brussels: PIE-Peter Lang, 19-40.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. Psychological bulletin, 125(2), 276.

Emery, F., & Thorsrud, E. (1976). Democracy at work: The report of the Norwegian industrial democracy program (Vol. 2): Springer.

Eskildsen, J. K., & Nussler, M. L. (2000). The managerial drivers of employee satisfaction and loyalty. Total Quality Management, 11(4-6), 581-588.

Guest, D. (2002). Human resource management, corporate performance and employee wellbeing: Building the worker into HRM. The journal of industrial relations, 44(3), 335-358.

Hellman, C. M. (1997). Job satisfaction and intent to leave. The journal of social psychology, 137(6), 677-689.

Heo, M., Kim, N., & Faith, M. S. (2015). Statistical power as a function of Cronbach alpha of instrument questionnaire items. BMC medical research methodology, 15(1), 1-9.

Herjanto, H., & Harper, P. (2020). Toward a new model of customer temptation. Business Research Impacting Business Processes, 78.

Hladio, M. (2019). Employee Retention: Fantasy or Reality. Retrieved from https://www.amanet.org/articles/employee-retention-fantasy-or-reality/

Hosseinabadi, R., Karampourian, A., Beiranvand, S., & Pournia, Y. (2013). The effect of quality circles on job satisfaction and quality of work-life of staff in emergency medical services. International emergency nursing, 21(4), 264-270.

Kaliski, B. S. (2007). Encyclopedia of business and finance. In (2nd ed ed.). Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA (Firm).

Mohan, I., Sehgal, M., & Rana, A. (1993). Managerial hierarchy and perception of quality of working life. Management Business Education in India: Essays in Honour of Professor TN Kapoor, 99.

Moloi, T. J. (2007). Testing Hackman & Oldham's Theory of Enhancing the Quality of Work Life of Employees. International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities Nations, 7(3).

Price, J. L. (2001). Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. International Journal of manpower.

Roopavathi, S., & Kishore, D. K. (2020). Motivational Factors of Employee Retention and Engagement in Organisation. Journal of Information and Computational Science, 10(2), 1080.

Setyaningrum, R. P., Setiawan, M., & Surachman, S. (2017). Organizational commitments are mediation of relationships Between servant leadership and employee performance. Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen, 15(4), 693-701.

Spector, P. E. (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences (Vol. 3): Sage publications.

Statt, D. A. (2004). The Routledge dictionary of business management: Routledge.

Zikmund, W. G., Babin, B. J., Carr, J. C., & Griffin, M. J. T. S.-W. (2003). Business research methods 7th ed.