

# A STUDY ON EMPLOYEE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN SUPREME COATED BOARD MILLS PRIVATE LIMITED, SIVAKASI

<sup>1</sup>Mrs.P.Karthika @ Nanthini, M.H.R.M.,

<sup>2</sup>Dr(Ms.)M.S.Yasmeen Beevi, M.Com., M.Phil., MBA.,Ph.D.,

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Administration <sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration

<sup>1</sup>The Standard Fireworks Rajaratnam College for Women, Sivakasi, Tamil Nadu

**Abstract:** *Quality of Work Life (QWL) has emerged as one of the most important aspect of job that ensures long term association of employees with the organisation. It is a process of joint decision-making, collaboration and building mutual respect between management and employees. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organisation and improved quality of life at work for employees. Quality of Work Life and employee satisfaction at Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited is considered to be the most critical aspect. It is found that there are few facilities which are unsatisfactory, and few facilities are provided by the organisation in order to maintain, retain the employees as well as the high productivity of the organisation. To identify and implement alternative programs to improve the quality of professional as well as personal life of an organizational employees. This study aims at knowing the effectiveness of quality of work life in Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited, Sivakasi.*

**Index Terms—** Mutual Respect, decision making and

## Introduction

The world is moving with very high speed and managing an organisation has become more complex than ever before. There is a competition going on between companies to attract and retain quality human resource in order to be ahead of its competitors in a particular industry. At this backdrop, Quality of Work Life (QWL) has emerged as one of the most important aspect of job that ensures long term association of employees with the organisation. Quality of Work Life defined as “a process of joint decision-making, collaboration and building mutual respect between management and employees”. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organisation and improved quality of life at work for employees. Quality of Work Life and employee satisfaction at Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited (SCBMPL) is considered to be the most critical aspect. It is found that there are few facilities which are unsatisfactory, and few facilities are provided by the organisation in order to maintain, retain the employees as well as the high productivity of the organisation. Hence the management has to look up the facilities that are not available and is the points where employees are dissatisfaction with unavailability of the facility. Because of the facilities that are unavailable will lead for low productivity, stress, and dissatisfaction etc., at the same time it is observed that when employees are provided with inter personal, physical spiritual working environment will lead for higher productivity of the organisation. This study is attempted to understand the impact of QWL on employee satisfaction and organisational productivity with special reference to Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited at Sivakasi.

## Literature Review

G. Nasl Saraji, and H. Dargahi., (March 2008) in his article “The Quality of Work Life Movement Training” identified QWL is a comprehensive, department wide program designated to improve employee satisfaction, strengthening workplace learning and helping employees had better manage change and transition by conducting descriptive and analytical study they showed that the majority of employees were dissatisfied with occupational health and safety, intermediate and senior managers, their income, balance between the time they spent working and with family and also indicated that their work was not interesting and satisfying.

Hackman and Oldhams., (August 1980) in his book “Human Resource Development” stated that the constructs of QWL in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. The work environment that is able to fulfill employees’ personal needs is considered to provide a positive interaction effect, which will lead to an excellent QWL. They emphasized that the personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organisation, such as compensation, promotion, recognition and development meet their expectations.

Seyed Mehdi Hosseini (2010) in his book Human Resource Development stated that career satisfaction, career achievement and career balance are not only the significant variables to achieve good quality of work life but quality of work life (QWL) or the quality of work system as one of the most interesting methods creating motivation and is a major way to have job enrichment which has its roots in staff and managers’ attitude as motivation category that is more attention to fair pay, growth opportunities and continuing promotion improves staff’s performance which in turn increases.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- ◆ To examine the factor influencing the quality of work life
- ◆ To know the working environment of the organisation
- ◆ To analyse the inter relationship between workers, supervisors and management
- ◆ To know the overall employee satisfaction towards Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited

## SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study covers the quality of work life among the employees in Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited, Sivakasi. It covers the factors influencing the quality of work life, working condition, grievance handling and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis**

- There is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and the factor motivates in the organisation.
- There is no significant relationship between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.

**Research Methodology**

The survey has been undertaken to analyze the effectiveness of quality of work life in Supreme Coated Board Mills Private Limited, Sivakasi. The study adopts descriptive research method. It is based on both primary and secondary data. The data collected are classified and analyzed keeping in view the objectives of the study. The researcher has taken 150 samples. The Statistical tools used for analysis in this study are

- Percentage
- Weighted Arithmetic Mean
- Chi- square Test
- Garrett-Ranking Technique

**Results and Discussions:-**

The demographic profile of the respondents was obtained by using five parameters namely gender, age, educational qualification, Monthly income and Experience. The same is presented in the Table 1

**Table: 1 - Demographic Profile**

Descriptive Statistics	Particulars	No. of Respondents	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	Male	146	97
	Female	4	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Age</b>	Below 20 years	29	18
	20-40 years	45	30
	41-60 years	41	26
	60 years and Above	25	16
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	Illiterate	32	22
	Up to 5 <sup>th</sup> Std	41	27
	SSLC	38	25
	HSC	18	12
	Diploma	21	14
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Monthly Income</b>	Up to Rs.5000	14	9
	Rs.5,001 – Rs.10,000	62	41
	Rs.10,001 – Rs. 15,000	63	42
	Rs.15001 and above	11	8
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Experience</b>	Below 5 years	34	23
	5-10 years	45	30
	10-15 years	41	27
	15 years above	30	20
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

It is seen from Table 1 that male (97%) constituted majority of the respondents in the sample data when compared to female (3%). Most of the respondents belong to the age group of 20- 40 years (30%) while respondents 60 & above years of age were the least (16%). Majority of the respondent's educational qualification is up to 5<sup>th</sup> std (27%) and the least educational qualification is HSC (12%). It is also observed that majority of the respondents in the sample had a monthly income of Rs.10001 – 15000 (42%). While the least monthly income is Rs.1500 & above (8%). Most of the respondents having 5 - 10 years of experience (27%) and the respondents 15and above years of experience with the least (20%)

**Table 2  
Respondents' Satisfaction Level towards the Infrastructure Facilities**

S.No.	particulars	S.A		A		N		D.A		S.D		Total	Average	Rank
		NR	Score	NR	Score	NR	Score	NR	Score	NR	Score			
1	Canteen	17	85	35	140	70	210	23	46	5	5	486	31	4
2	Rest room	9	45	32	128	50	150	45	90	14	14	427	28	6

3	Lighting facilities	61	305	49	196	29	87	6	12	5	5	605	40	2
4	Latrines & urinals	60	300	50	200	25	75	10	20	5	5	600	40	2
5	First aid	16	80	45	180	50	150	25	50	14	14	474	32	5
6	Drinking water	65	325	47	188	25	75	8	16	5	5	609	41	1

Source: Primary Data

Note: NR – Number of Respondents, S.A – Strongly Agree, A – Agree, N – Neutral, D.A – Disagree, S.D – Strongly Disagree

The researcher has assigned the following points as per the informers rating proposal. They are Strongly Agree - 5 Points, Agree - 4 Points, Neutral - 3 Points, Disagree - 2 Points, Strongly Disagree - 1 Points

It is inferred from the table 2 that, drinking water facility has top the list with the value of 40.6; both lighting and latrines & urinals facilities obtained the second rank with the mean value of 40; canteen has occupied IV rank with the mean value of 32; first aid has got V rank with mean value of 32 and rest room facilities obtained VI rank with the mean value of 28

**Table 3**  
**Garrett's Ranking**  
**Health Affecting Factor**

The researcher has used the Garrett Ranking method for ranking the health affecting factors.

**Table I**

S. No	Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
1	Heat	48	26	12	25	11	8	20	150
2	Noise	45	12	12	18	24	15	24	150
3	Cold	15	13	19	21	21	23	38	150
4	Inadequate ventilation	16	20	19	22	20	35	18	150
5	Dirtiness of work environment	4	32	26	17	27	21	23	150
6	Heavy lifting	10	19	24	35	31	21	10	150
7	Lack of space	12	28	38	12	16	27	17	150
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>150</b>

Respondents are asked to rank the factors affecting health on that rank the respondents awarded, the researcher has found that the number of responses placed in each rank.

### Ranking Factors Affecting Health

#### Garrett's Score

The Garrett's Ranks are calculated by using appropriate Garrett's ranking formula. Then based on the Garrett's Table Value is ascertained. The Garrett's Values and scores of each rank in the following table. Finally by adding each row table Garrett's Score is obtained.

#### Find out the percentage Position and Garrett Value

Percentage Position =  $100(R_{ij} - 0.5) / N_{ij}$

Where  $N_{ij}$  = Number of Ranks

$R_{ij}$  = Rank

**Table II**

S.No	$100(R_{ij} - 0.5) / N_{ij}$	Calculated Value	Garrett Value
1	$100(1 - 0.5) / 7$	7.14	78
2	$100(2 - 0.5) / 7$	21.43	66
3	$100(3 - 0.5) / 7$	35.71	58
4	$100(4 - 0.5) / 7$	50.00	50
5	$100(5 - 0.5) / 7$	64.28	43
6	$100(6 - 0.5) / 7$	78.57	34
7	$100(7 - 0.5) / 7$	92.86	22

Garret's Mean Score =  $\sum_{fx} / \sum_r$

To find out the score, the following steps are followed:

- 1) Find the score (X) for each percentage position from the Garrett's Ranking table.
- 2) Multiply the frequency (f) with the score for each problem result will be (fx).
- 3) Calculate the sum of (fx).
- 4) Divide the sum of (fx) by the number of respondents.
- 5) Result will be Garrett's Mean Score

**Table IV**

S.No	Factors	Garrett Value	Average Score	Garrett Rank
1	Heat	8591	57.27	I
2	Noise	7968	53.12	II
3	Cold	6701	44.67	VII
4	Inadequate ventilation	7216	48.11	V
5	Dirtiness of work environment	7163	47.75	VI
6	Heavy lifting	7753	51.69	III
7	Lack of space	7568	50.45	IV

It is the above Table IV that, Heat factor has got the I rank with the highest mean value of 57.27; Noise has secured II rank with the mean value of 53.12; Heavy lifting has occupied III rank with the mean value of 51.69; Lack of space has secured IV rank with the mean value of 50.45; Inadequate ventilation has obtained V rank with the mean value of 48.11; Dirtiness of work environment has occupied VI rank with mean value of 47.75 and Cold factor has got the least mean value of 44.67.

**Table 4**

**Chi – Square Test between age of the respondents and the factor motivates in the organisation.**

**Hypothetical Statement**

To test the significant relationship between age of the respondents and the factor motivates in the organisation.

**Null Hypothesis**

There is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and the factor motivates in the organisation.

**Alternative Hypothesis**

There is significant relationship between age of the respondents and the factor motivates in the organisation.

**Expected Frequency Table**

Age (in years)	Frequency				Total
	Salary increase	Promotion	Leave	Motivational talk	
Below 20 years	5.22	9.67	5.03	7.15	29
20-40 years	8.1	15	10.8	11.1	45
41-60 years	7.38	13.67	9.84	10.11	41
60 and above	6.3	11.67	8.4	8.63	35
Total	27	50	36	37	150

$$\chi^2 = \sum (O_i - E_i)^2 / E$$

$$E_i = \text{Row total} * \text{Column total} / \text{Grand Total}$$

O <sub>i</sub>	E <sub>i</sub>	O <sub>i</sub> - E <sub>i</sub>	(O <sub>i</sub> - E <sub>i</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	χ <sup>2</sup>
5	5.22	- 0.22	0.05	0.01
6	9.67	- 3.67	13.47	1.39
5	5.03	- 0.03	0.00	0
13	7.15	5.83	33.99	4.75
6	8.1	- 2.1	4.41	0.54
18	15	3	9	0.6
13	10.8	3.8	14.44	1.34
8	11.1	- 3.1	9.61	0.87
9	7.38	1.62	2.62	0.36
13	13.67	- 0.67	0.45	0.03
13	9.84	3.16	9.99	1.02
6	10.11	-4.11	16.89	1.67
7	6.3	0.7	0.49	0.08
13	11.67	1.33	1.77	0.15
5	8.4	-3.4	11.56	1.38
10	8.63	1.37	1.88	0.22
Total				14.41

Source: Computed Data

**Computation of Table Value**

- Level of Significance = 5%  
= 0.05
- Degree of Freedom = (R - 1) (C - 1)  
= (4 - 1) (4 - 1)  
= 3 \* 3  
= 9

Table Value = 16.92

**Inference**

Since  $\chi^2 O > \chi^2 E$ , the Null hypothesis is accepted. So there is no significant relationship between age of the respondents and factor motivates in the organisation.

**Table 5**

**Chi Square Test between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.**

**Hypothetical Statement**

To test the significant relationship between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.

**Null Hypothesis**



There is no significant relationship between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.

### Alternative Hypothesis

There is significant relationship between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.

### Expected Frequency Table

Experience (in years)	Frequency					Total
	Highly Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied	
Below 5 years	6.8	7.9	5.67	7.03	6.57	34
5-10 years	9	10.5	7.5	9.3	8.7	45
10-15 years	8.2	9.57	6.83	8.47	7.93	41
15 years above	6	7	5	6.2	5.8	30
Total	30	35	25	31	29	150

$$\chi^2 = \sum (O_i - E_i)^2 / E$$

$$E_i = \text{Row total} * \text{Column total} / \text{Grand Total}$$

O <sub>i</sub>	E <sub>i</sub>	O <sub>i</sub> - E <sub>i</sub>	(O <sub>i</sub> - E <sub>i</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	χ <sup>2</sup>
6	6.8	- 0.8	0.64	0.09
5	7.93	- 2.93	8.58	1.08
6	5.67	0.33	0.11	0.02
6	7.03	- 1.03	1.06	0.15
11	6.57	4.43	19.62	2.99
8	9	1	1	0.11
15	5	10	100	20
7	5	2	4	0.8
7	3	4	16	5.33
8	7	1	1	0.14
8	8.2	- 0.2	0.04	0.00
8	9.57	- 1.57	2.46	0.26
7	6.83	0.17	0.03	0.00
13	8.47	4.53	20.52	2.42
5	7.93	- 2.93	8.58	1.08
8	6	2	4	0.67
7	7	0	0	0
5	5	0	0	0
5	6.2	- 1.2	1.44	0.23
5	5.8	- 0.8	0.64	0.11
Total				35.48

### Source: Computed Data

### Computation of Table Value

- Level of Significance = 5%  
= 0.05
- Degree of Freedom = (R - 1) (C - 1)  
= (4 - 1) (5 - 1)  
= 3 \* 4  
= 12  
Table Value = 35.48

### Inference

Since  $X^2O < X^2E$ , the Null hypothesis is rejected. So there is a significant relationship between experience of the respondents and level of satisfaction towards their work environment.

### Suggestion

- ∅ To satisfy the workers, the Grievance Redressed Committee should find out the solution to the problems within stipulated time without any delay.
- ∅ Employees facing health problems in their workplace, because of heat, noise, inadequate ventilation and lack of space etc so the management should take proper measures for reducing their problems.
- ∅ Organisation should provide good infrastructure facilities to the employees for their effective performance.

### CONCLUSION

The quality of worklife is the degree of excellence brought about work and working conditions which contributes to the overall satisfaction at the individual level and the organisation level. A management practice that manifests concern about the employee's job security, conducive working conditions, fair and equitable wages and participation of the worker representatives from the formal association in decision making process will lead a harmonious industrial relation in the working place. To improve the balancing of worklife and productivity the companies have tested and skill experimented on their quality of work life policies. The development programme of quality of work life of the employee leads to better work environment and increased productivity.

**References**

- [1] Tapomoy Deb, Human Resource Development – Theory and Practice, Ane Books India, New Delhi, 2008.
- [2] D. Skrovan: “A Brief Report from the ASTD Quality of Work Life Task Force,” Training and Development Journal, No. 3, Vol. 34, 1980, p.29.
- [3] D.S. Cohan: “The Quality of Work Life Movement Training,” HRD, Jan.1979, p.24.

