Volume : 2 | Issue : 2 | Feb 2013 • ISSN No 2277 - 8160

Research Paper | Management

Quality of Work Life: A Study Among Nurses in Coimbatore

Dr. A. Valarmathi — Director, Vivekananda Institute of Management Studies, Off Sathy Road, Karuvalur Road, Kovilpalayam, Coimbatore – 641 107

Dr. Hema Bhalakarishnan — Associate Professor, Vivekananda Institute of Management Studies, Off Sathy Road, Karuvalur Road, Kovilpalayam, Coimbatore – 641 107

ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper concerns a study of the quality of work life for the employees of service sector – with special reference to Hospitals. The aim of the paper is to determine whether and how the quality of work life affects the satisfaction level of nurses of hospitals and the implications of these findings suggest that quality of work life in hospitals can be enhanced by these factors as "Attitude of management towards employees", "Safe & healthy working conditions", "Opportunities to use & develop human capacity", "Opportunity for training & career growth", "Social integration in the work force", and "Job Security".

KEYWORDS: Quality of Work life, Job Satisfaction, Training, Compressed Work Schedule

Introduction

Days have changed where Quality of work life meant only job enrichment and job enlargement. People tend to work for organizations where humanized job roles are defined and quality exists. A high quality of work demands high quality working conditions. Quality of work life can be defined as the environment at the work place provided to the people on the job. Elizur and Shye stated that quality of work performance is affected by quality of life as well as quality of working life. QWL programs is the another dimension in which employers has the responsibility to provide congenial environment i.e. excellent working conditions where people can perform excellent work also their health as well as economic health of the organization is also met.

Review of Literature

A clearer understanding of the inter-relationship of the various facets of quality of working life offers the opportunity for improved analysis of cause and effect in the workplace. According to Guna Seelan Rethinam, Maimunah QWL is a multi-dimensional construct, made up of a number of interrelated factors that need careful consideration to conceptualize and measure. It is associated with job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety and well-being, job security, competence development and balance between work and non work life. Bunmi Omolayo (2007) says leadership is a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organization goals. Ogbonna and harris (2000) concluded that organizational performance is influenced by a competitive and innovative culture.

OBJECTIVES

- To find out overall job related satisfaction of nurses towards the quality of work life in hospitals in Coimbatore.
- To identify the relationship between management and nurses in grievance handling.
- To identify the opinion on opportunities to nurses with respect to age and experience.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is descriptive in nature since it attempted to portray the characteristics of a particular group (here nurses). The researcher endeavors to present the existing facts by collecting primary data through questionnaire using simple random sampling method where all the members of the population have equal chance of inclusion in the study. The sample size is 100. Closed ended questions are predominantly used. The following are the statistical tools used for the analysis: Descriptive analysis, One way Anova, Two way Anova, Pearsons correlation

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Descriptive statistics:

The descriptive procedure displays univariate summary statistics for several variables in a single table and calculates standardized values (z scores).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Salary	100	1.00	4.00	2.9900	.98980
Loan	100	1.00	4.00	2.5400	.95790
Rotation	100	1.00	5.00	3.3200	.98350
Security	100	1.00	5.00	3.4300	.91293
Authority	100	2.00	4.00	3.6700	.51355
Training	100	2.00	5.00	3.6900	.73437
Relation	100	2.00	5.00	3.6900	.69187
Settlement	100	1.00	5.00	3.4300	.72829
Activities	100	1.00	5.00	3.6800	.72307
Schedule	100	1.00	5.00	3.5800	.85493
Enjoyment	100	1.00	5.00	3.6500	.91425
Health	100	1.00	5.00	3.7200	.73964
Safety	100	2.00	5.00	3.6200	.82609
Opportunity	100	1.00	5.00	3.6500	.72995
Workload	100	1.00	4.00	3.4100	.66810
Colleagues	100	1.00	5.00	3.9400	.91916
Procedure	100	2.00	5.00	3.5000	.82266
Interference	100	2.00	5.00	3.0600	.94088
QWL	100	1.00	5.00	3.4800	.91541

Interpretation

The values less than three is dissatisfied and the values three or above three is satisfied. The mean value for the salary and loan facility was 2.99 and 2.54 respectively. Hence the respondents were not satisfied with salary and loan facility.

One Way ANOVA (Table 2)

Variance of mean opinion of respondents among various age groups

Null hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for grievance settlement factor among the varied age groups

Null hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for quality of work life among the varied age groups

Null hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for satisfaction level of opportunities among the varied age groups

Null hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for safety among the varied age groups

Table 2: Mean opinion of respondents among various groups

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Grievance	Between Groups	1.068	3	.356	.665	.576
	Within Groups	51.442	96	.536		
	Total	52.510	99			
QWL	Between Groups	2.953	3	.984	1.181	.321
	Within Groups	80.007	96	.833		
	Total	82.960	99			
OPPURNTS	Between Groups	1.123	3	.374	.696	.557
	Within Groups	51.627	96	.538		
	Total	52.750	99			
SAFETY	Between Groups	41.693	3	13.898	51.579	.000
	Within Groups	25.867	96	.269		
	Total	67.560	99			

Interpretation (Table 2)

Assuming a 5% level of significance, the null hypothesis 4 rejected since the level of significance is 00.0%. On the other hand hypothesis 1, 2 and 3 are accepted since their levels of significance are 57.6%, 32.1% and 55.7% respectively. Hence it is inferred that,

- There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on quality of work life among the varied age groups
- There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on opportunities given among the varied age groups
- There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunities with regard to the experience among the varied age group
- There is no significant difference in the mean opinion on grievance settlement among the varied age groups

TWO WAY ANOVA

Table 3: Two way analysis of variance between age and experience of respondents for opportunity

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Intercept	Hypothesis	396.984	1	396.984	1083.558	.002
	Error	.631	1.723	.366a		
Age	Hypothesis	1.325	3	.442	1.040	.496
	Error	1.150	2.709	.425b		
Experience	Hypothesis	.752	2	.376	.782	.469
	Error	11.250	23.419	.480c		
Age*Experience	Hypothesis	1.751	4	.438	.854	.495
	Error	46.134	90	.513d		

Two way analysis of variance was performed to identify the impact of the variables such as experience of the nurses, salary of the employees, training of the employees in Hospital Coimbatore

Two way analysis of variance between the Age and Experience of the respondents for opportunity

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunities among the varied age group

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunities with regard to the experience of the respondent

Null Hypothesis3: There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunities with regard to the experience among the varied age group

Interpretation

Assuming a 5% level of significance , the null hypothesis 1 , 2 and 3 are accepted since their level of significance are 49.6% , 46.9% and 49.5% greater than 5%.Hence it is inferred that,

- o There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunity among the varied age group
- o There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunity with regard to the experience of the respondent
- o There is no significant difference in the mean opinion for opportunity with regard to the experience among the varied age group

CORRELATIONS

Table 3.13 Relation between employee-employer relationship and relationship with colleagues

		RELATION	COLLEAGS
RELATION	Pearson Correlation	1	.495(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	100	100
COLLEGUES	Pearson Correlation	.495(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	100	100

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Interpretation

From the above table, it is inferred that, Pearson's correlation value is .495 at 1% level of significance : the above correlation value is significant. This implies positive correlation between employee employer relation and relationship with colleagues.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

➢ Financial Strain Affects Nurses Wellbeing: As hospitals in Coimbatore has good reputation among the people of Kerala, employees also expect a salary which is on par with the best in the industry. So it is advisable for the management that there can be an increment in salary and other financial benefits.

➢ Challenging Loan Facilities: It is advisable for the organization to provide easy availability of loans by entering in to a tie up with any of nationalized bank and the total sanction able amount may be as per employee's salary and the security given by them.

➢ Nurses Working Hours has increased: It will be better for the management to appoint final year students as apprentice in the nursing department by providing small incentives as it will help to minimize the work load of staffs in the department.

➢ Compressed Work Schedule (CWS): The organization can introduce a system of compressed work week means say if a person wants 5 or 6 days of leave in a particular month, the organization can grant him leave on the basis that he will undertake additional work hour in that month itself.

➢ Organizational Attitudes should soften: Most importantly, as is a reputed organization with more than five hundred employees, it will be good for the organization to have a separate HR department which will take care of all the matters pertaining to employees say from recruitment to retirement.

CONCLUSION

For every individual leading a peaceful life in the comfort zone is the highest priority. Be it a white collared or a blue collared job, working at ease is preferred. Hence quality of work life stands first in describing the job satisfaction and and job related satisfaction. This way, the nurses in hospitals also demand the same from their management.

REFERENCES

Buchanan, D. A., & Boddy, D. (1982), Advanced technology and the quality of Work Life" Journal of Occupational Psychology, Vol.55, 1-11. | Chander, Subash and Singh, parampal (1983), —Quality of work life in a University: An Empirical Investigation, Management and Labour Studies, Vol.18, No.2, pp. 97-101. | Delamotte, Y. and Walker, K. F., (1974) "Humanisation of Work and the Quality of Working Life — Trends and Issues", International Institute for Labour Studies Bulletin , Vol. 11, , pp. 3-14 | Gardon, Herman (1984), —Making sense of Quality of work life programmes, Business Horizons. | Glasier, E (1976), —State of the Art, Questions about Quality of Work Life, Personnel. | Goodman, P.S. (1980), —Quality of Work Life Projects in 1980's Industrial Relations Research Association: pp-487-494 | Gosh, Subratesh (1992), —Quality of Work Life in Two Indian Organizations Decisions, Vol.19, No.2, pp-89- 102. | Grayson, C.J (1973), —Management Science and Business Practice, Harvard Business Review, Vol.51, No.4 | Havolovic, S.J. (1991), —Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomesll Industrial Relations, Vol.30, No.3, pp.469-479 | Katzell, R.A., Yankelovich, D., Fein M., Ornate, D.A. & Nash, A. (1975), —Work Productivity and Job Satisfactionll, The Psychological Corporation, New York. | Ledford, G. E. and Lawler, E. E. (1982). —Quality of work life programs, coordination, and productivityll, Journal of Contemporary Business, Vol. 11, 93-106 | Louis, Davis and Cherns Albert, B (1975), —The Quality of working Lifell, Vol. 1, Free Press, New York. | Runcie, J. F. (1980), —Dynamic Systems and the Quality of Work Lifell, Personnel, Vol. 57(6): 13–. 24. | Sandrick k (2003). Putting the emphasis on employees as an award.Winning employer,Baptist health care has distant memories of the workforce shortage, Trustee.,pp. 6-10. | Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher, 1984. QWL: New working relationships in the communication industry. Labor Studies J., Vol. 9: 261-274.