



A Study On Factors Affecting Quality Of Work Life Among The Employees Of Cement Industry

KEYWORDS

Quality of work life, Employees, Experience and Monthly Income, Employment Tenure, Designation

M.VETRIMANI

M.Phil., Scholar, P.G & Research Dept. of Social Work, Shrimati Indira Gandhi College, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

Dr.K.KAVITHA MAHESWARI

Assistant Professor, P.G & Research Dept. of Social Work, Shrimati Indira Gandhi College, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

This descriptive study is an attempt to know about the quality of work life among the employees of Dalmia cements, Ariyalur, Tamil nadu. Quality of work life means "the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in the organization. The total size of the universe consists of 400 employees of the production unit. The researcher selected 120 employees as sample for the study. The researcher used standard questionnaire developed by, Santhosh Dhar, Upinder Dhar, Rishu Roy (2005). It was found that more than half of the respondents perceived high level of quality of work life and its dimensions like proactive, human relations, learning organization and work life balance. From the analysis it was found that more than half of the respondents perceived high level of quality of work life and its dimensions like proactive, human relations, learning organization and work life balance. Through the analysis it was revealed that there is no significant influence of monthly income, experience, designation and tenure of employment on overall quality of work life among the respondents..

Introduction

Quality of Work Life had been defined as "The quality of relationship between the employees and the total working environment". Quality of Work Life is the essential concept of favorable situations in a working environment. A better Quality of Work Life improves the growth of the employee's along with the organization growth (Pugalendhi, Subburethina, Umaselvi, Nakkeeran, Senthil 2011).

Major dimensions of quality of work life

Learning Organization:

Action and result oriented behavior, instead of the one that waits for things to happen and then tries to adjust (react) to them. Proactive behavior aims at identification and exploitation of opportunities and in taking preemptory action against potential problems and threats, whereas reactive behavior focuses on fighting a fire or solving a problem after it occurs. Learning organization is the term given to a company that facilitates the learning of its members and continuously transforms itself. A learning organization has five main features; systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision and team learning.

Proactivity

Proactive behavior by individuals refers to anticipatory, change-oriented and self-initiated behavior in situations, particularly in the work place. Proactive behavior involves acting in advance of a future situation, rather than just reacting. It means taking control and making things happen rather than just adjusting to a situation or waiting for something to happen. Proactive employees generally do not need to be asked to act, nor do they require detailed instructions.

Work-life balance

Work life balance is a concept including proper prioritizing between "work" (career and ambition) and "lifestyle". Related, though broader, terms include "lifestyle calm balance" and "lifestyle choices".

Work life balance is the separation between your work life and your personal life. It is the boundary that you create between

your profession, career, or business and every other segment that makes up your life. Aside from your career, these segments include your family, personal growth, spirituality, fitness and health, and community and friendships. Your mental state becomes much more confident, clear, and decisive because you are well-rounded and balanced.

Results of high quality of work life

- ✧ High Productivity
- ✧ Increase organizational effectiveness
- ✧ Reduce the absenteeism and labor turn over
- ✧ Increase the quality of life of employees
- ✧ High employee involvement, satisfaction
- ✧ Peaceful industrial relation

According to Joseph Zakhariya P.J (1999) Analysis of the factors influencing quality of work life reveals that factors like age, experience, educational qualification, etc. bear no relation to quality of work life. However, factors like job satisfaction and job perception in terms of suitability and challenges offered were directly related to quality of work life. This was more prominent in the case of workmen who may be attributed to the monotonous nature of jobs and lesser scope for promotion. Basheer Ahammed (2000) in his study relating to motivational factors of industrial employees observed that the industrial workers of Kerala possess medium level of efficiency. Similarly workers are moderately satisfied with the working conditions prevailing in the organization. Level of satisfaction is inversely related to the length of service. Further, the level of satisfaction depends upon different motivational factors for different companies. Also motivating factors vary with the antecedents of workers like age, caste, education, length of service etc. Gangadhar and Madhar Keswani (2001) conducted a study on the changing nature of employment and compensation. The study reveals that with today's salaries, employees are reaching the level of hygiene on the monetary compensation front. The ability of monetary rewards to attract and retain has been reduced due to similar and better opportunities available in the market and marginal utility of money. Blanche R and Elma (2004) developed a questionnaire and given to 22 social

workers in South Africa. Job satisfaction is defined before looking at the organizational factors underpinning it: work content, remuneration, promotion opportunities, working environment, leadership & management style, and group factors. Findings indicate that work content is positively experienced by respondents and they gave highest priority to adequate and fair remuneration, while attaching the greatest value to supervisor attitude and recognition of their good work. Antti and others (2004) analyzed the relationship between temporary employment and the quality of working life by focusing on findings during the late 1990's. Empirical research on job insecurity, work attitudes, and work behavior is reviewed with comparisons between temporary and permanent workers. Analysis of the psychosocial work environment of fixed-term employees in Finland illuminates differences according to age, gender, job demands and control, and work support. Findings do not demonstrate adverse consequences of temporary employment.

Materials and methods

Objectives of the study

- ◆ To assess the quality of work life and its dimensions.
- ◆ To measure the influence of selected variables on quality of work life.

Research design

Descriptive research has been done in this project; descriptive research is concerned with describing the independent characteristics the employees along with the quality of life of and its various dimensions.

Universe and Sampling

The study is intended to find the existing quality of work life among the employees in the production unit of the organization. The total size of the universe is 400 and the researcher selected 120 employees as sample for the study. The sample has been selected through lottery method by adopting simple random sampling technique.

Tools for data collection:

The researcher used standard questionnaire on quality of work life developed by, Santhosh Dhar, Upinder Dhar, Rishu Roy (2005)

Results and discussion

Findings related to socio-demographic variables:

The collected data underwent statistical analysis and it is revealed that more than 1/4th (28.3 %) of the respondents were 36 to 40 years of age; a majority (75.8 %) of the respondents was Male. It is also revealed that more than half (60.8 percent) of the respondents were Married, a little more than 1/3rd (35 percent) of the respondents were Under Graduates and a little more than 1/4th (29.2 percent) of the respondents have 7 to 8 years of work experience. It is inferred that more than 1/2 (60 percent) of the respondents were from Nuclear Family, little less than 2/5th (39.2 percent) of the respondents belonged to families of Medium size having 5 - 8 members in their family, a little more than 1/2 (52.5 percent) of the respondents were getting Rs.10001 to 15000 as salary, nearly 3/4th (72.5 percent) of the respondents were from Rural areas, nearly 1/2 (45.8 percent) of the respondents were laborers. It is also understood that more than 1/2 (69.2 percent) of the respondents Employment tenure were on Temporary basis Employees, exactly 3/5th (60 percent) of the respondents were Hindus, 63.3 percent of the respondents were living in the Rental Houses, (45.8 percent) of the respondents Mode of Transport was Two wheeler and a little more than 3/5th (65 percent) of the respondents were not Members in Trade Union

Sr. No.	Various dimension of quality of work life	No. of respondents (n=120)	Percentage (100%)
1	Proactive Low High	58	48.3
		62	51.7
2	Work-life balance Low High	42	35
		78	65
3	Human relations Low High	58	48.3
		62	51.7
4	Learning organization Low High	53	44.2
		67	55.8
	Overall Quality of work life Low High	53	44.2
		67	55.8

Table – 1
Distribution of the respondents by Quality of work life

The above table shows that more than half of the respondents were in high level Proactive (51.7%), work life balance (65 %), human relations (51.7 %) and learning organization (55.8 percent). Regarding overall quality of work life, more than half (55.8%) of the respondents had high quality of work life.

Experience	Correlation value	Statistical inference
1.Proactive	.297(**)	P<0.01 Significant
2.Work-life balance	-.110	P>0.05 Not Significant
3.Human relations	-.044	P>0.05 Not Significant
4.Learning organization	.154	P>0.05 Not Significant
Overall Quality of work life	.096	P>0.05 Not Significant
Monthly income	Correlation value	Statistical inference
1.Proactive	-.249(**)	P<0.01 Significant
2.Work-life balance	.078	P>0.05 Not Significant
3.Human relations	.030	P>0.05 Not Significant
4.Learning organization	-.075	P>0.05 Not Significant
Overall Quality of work life	-.079	P>0.05 Not Significant

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Table – 2
Karl Pearson coefficient of correlation between experience and monthly income of the respondents with regard to their quality of work life

The above table reveals that there is no significant relationship between experience of the respondents and their quality of work life and it is dimensions. Though there is no significant relationship between the experiences of the respondents with their overall quality of work life, the proactive dimension has

significant relationship with the age of the respondents. Regarding the influence of monthly income of the respondents on quality of work life revealed that there is no significant relationship between monthly income of the respondents and their quality of work life and it is dimensions except proactive dimension.

Employment Tenure	Mean	S.D	Statistical inference
1.Proactive			
Permanent (n=37)	65.27	13.428	T=-1.961 DF=118 P>0.05 Not Significant
Temporary (n=83)	69.64	10.181	
2.Work-life balance			
Permanent (n=37)	49.11	12.142	T=-1.594 DF=118 P>0.05 Not Significant
Temporary (n=83)	53.16	13.148	
3.Human relations			
Permanent (n=37)	21.70	5.016	T=2.684 DF=118 P<0.05 Significant
Temporary (n=83)	18.86	5.513	
4.Learning organization			
Permanent (n=37)	18.59	4.941	T=1.834 DF=118 P>0.05 Not Significant
Temporary (n=83)	16.83	4.831	
Overall Quality of work life			
Permanent (n=37)	154.68	26.417	T=-7.43 DF=118 P<0.05 Not Significant
Temporary (n=83)	158.48	25.681	

Table-3

T - Test between Employment Tenure of the respondents and their quality of work life

The above table reveals that there is no significant difference between employment tenure of the respondents and their quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value. Further the mean scores reveal that the respondents in the temporary employee have perceived higher level of quality of work life than others, however there is no significant difference seen between the respondents employment tenure of the respondents with regard to their quality of work life and its dimensions.

Designation	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical inference
1.Proactive						
Between Groups <i>Labours</i> (n=55) <i>Clerical</i> (n=35) <i>Managerial</i> (n=30)	70.96	11.431	1448.012	2	724.006	F=6.037 P < 0.05 Significant
	62.94	12.112				
	69.63	8.277				
Within Groups			14030.780		119.921	
2.Work-life balance						
Between Groups <i>Labours</i> (n=55) <i>Clerical</i> (n=35) <i>Managerial</i> (n=30)	50.56	13.542	526.126	2	263.063	F=1.588 P > 0.05 Not Significant
	55.17	7.637				
	50.57	16.070				
Within Groups			19375.865		165.606	

3.Human relations Between Groups <i>Labours</i> (n=55) <i>Clerical</i> (n=35) <i>Managerial</i> (n=30)	19.29 20.57 19.57	5.220 6.166 5.270	36.183 3569.284	2 117	18.092 30.507	F=.593 P > 0.05 Not Significant
4.Learning organization Between Groups <i>Labours</i> (n=55) <i>Clerical</i> (n=35) <i>Managerial</i> (n=30)	18.15 16.37 17.13	4.743 5.892 3.748	69.651 2802.474	2 117	34.825 23.953	F=1.454 P > 0.05 Not Significant
Overall Quality of work life Between Groups <i>Labours</i> (n=55) <i>Clerical</i> (n=35) <i>Managerial</i> (n=30)	158.96 155.06 156.90	27.270 24.002 25.926	333.079 79238.513	2 117	166.539 677.252	F=.246 P > 0.05 Not Significant
Within Groups						

Table-4

ANOVA between Designation of the respondents with regard to their Quality of Work Life

The above table reveals that there is no significant difference between designation of the respondents and their quality of work life. Hence, the calculated value less than table value. Further the mean scores reveal that the respondents in the labor category have perceived higher level of quality of work life than others, however there is no significant difference seen between the respondents designation of the respondents with regard to their quality of work life and its dimensions.

Suggestions: It is understood from this study that none of the selected socio-demographic variables did not have influence over the quality of work life, hence to improve the quality of work life the following general measures can be of greater use;

- ✧ The human dignity and values must be given importance for the overall efficiency of the employees of an organization. It must be given due respect at every level of the organization irrespective of departments, it turns enhances the overall productivity.
- ✧ The organization's management, unions and employees should learn to work together to bring out their better performance. It is also useful to determine for themselves what actions, changes and improvements are desirable and workable in order to achieve and win goals of an improved quality of life at work for all members of the organization. It can be of greater use for the effectiveness of both the company and the unions.

Conclusion:

From the above descriptive study it was found that more than half of the respondents perceived high level of quality of work life and its dimensions like proactive, human relations, learning organization and work life balance. Through the analysis it was revealed that there is no significant influence of monthly income, experience, designation and tenure of employment on overall quality of work life among the respondents..

REFERENCE

1.Pugalendhi, Subburethina Bharathi and M, Umaseelvi and Nakkeeran, Senthil, Quality of work life: Perception of College teachers , Indian journal of commerce & Management studies, 2(1) 2011. 47-65[23].Shalini Sheel, DR. Bhawna Khosla Sindhvani, Shashank Goel; Sunil | 2. Joseph, Zakhariya, P.J., Employees Perception of their Quality of Work Life, Apollo Tyres Ltd., Kalmassery, MBA Dissertation, Cochin University of Science and Technology, Cochin, 1999. | 3. Basheer, Ahammed, A Study of the Effect of Motivational Factors on Employees Efficiency, Ph. D. Theses, Calicut University, Kozhikode, 2000. | 4. S.M., Gangadhar, and Madhar, Keswani, "Changing Nature of Employment and Compensation", Human Capital, Vol. 5, No.1, June, 2001. | 5. Saloniemi, Antti, Virtanen, Pekka & Vahetera, Jussi, "The Work Environment in Fixed-Term Jobs: Are Poor Psychosocial Conditions Inevitable?", Work Employment and Society, Vol. 18, No.1, UK, 2004. | 6. Malherbe, Blanche, R., Hedriks, Elma, "An Investigation into the Determinants of Job Satisfaction and the Improvement of Quality of Work Life of Grassroots Social Workers", Social Work, Vol. 40, No 1, South Africa, March 2004.