

Impact of Quality of Work Life Balance on Employee Performance in Education Sector of Rayalaseema Region

Dr. A. Srinivasan¹, Professor & Principal, Sanskrithi School of Business, Puttaparthi.

Dr.M. Rama Kumari², Assistant professor, Sanskrithi School of Business, Puttaparthi.

ABSTRACT

The term Quality of Work Life (QWL) aims at changing entire organizational climate by humanizing work, individualizing the organization and changing the structural and managerial system. It seeks to create culture of work commitment in the organization which will ensure higher productivity for the company and greater job satisfaction for the employees, it is as important to acknowledge that there are certain concerns that all people have in common, at least to some degree. Quality of Work Life policies are increasingly becoming part of the business strategies and focus is on the potential of these policies to influence employee's quality of working life and more importantly to help them maintain work-life balance with equal attention on performance and commitment at work. One of the most important determinants of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is the career growth opportunities as supported by various researches done in past.

Key words: Compensation, Employee Performance, Career Growth, Job Satisfaction, Quality of Work Life Balance.

Introduction

The term Quality of Work Life gained importance in the late 1960s as a way of concerns about effects of job/work on health and general well-being and ways to positively influence the quality of a person's work experience. Up until the mid-1970s, employers concern was on work design and working conditions improvement. However, in the next decade of 1980s, the concept of QWL included other aspects that affect employees' job satisfaction and productivity and these aspects are, reward systems, physical work environment, employee involvement, rights and esteem needs (Cummings and Worley, 2005).

However, the radical changes in the world of business, like factors such as globalization, information technology, world business competitiveness, and scarcity of natural resources have changed employee's outlook of how a good company is defined. The trend in past was to include, financial figures in defining "a good company". Latest trends like, ethics, quality of work life (QWL) and job satisfaction are now considered important predictors of sustainability and viability of business organizations.

According to the **American Society of Training and Development**, “QWL Is a process of work organization which enables its members at all levels to participate actively and effectively in shaping the organization’s environment, methods and outcome”.

Richard E Walton states a much broader concept of QWL proposing eight conceptual categories viz. adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capacities, future opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work place, social relevance of work, balanced role of work in the total life space and Constitutionalism in the Work Organization etc. it is rare to find work-life situations that satisfy all eight criteria.

Quality of Work Life denotes all the organizational inputs which aim at employee satisfaction and enhancing organizational effectiveness. Quality of Work Life is a process by which an organization responds to employee needs for developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work. The term refers to the favorableness or un-favorableness of a total job environment for people. QWL programs are another way in which organizations recognize their responsibility to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for people as well as for economic health of the organization. The elements in a typical QWL program include – open communications, equitable reward systems, a concern for employee job security and satisfying careers and participation in decision making. Many early QWL efforts focus on job enrichment. In addition to improving the work system, QWL programs usually emphasize development of employee skills, the reduction of occupational stress and the development of more co-operative labor-management relations.

1. QWL is a comprehensive, department- wide program designated to improve employee satisfaction, strengthening workplace learning and helping employees had better manage change and transition.
2. Dissatisfaction with quality work of life is a problem, which affects almost all workers regardless of position or status. Many managers seek to reduce dissatisfaction in all organizational levels, including their own. This is a complex problem, however, because it is difficult to isolate and identify all of attributes, which affect the quality of work life.
3. Sometimes abbreviated QWL, quality of work life is quick phrase that encompasses a lot, because it refers to the thing an employer does that adds to the lives of employees. Those “things” are some combination of benefits explicit and implied tangible and intangible that make somewhere a good place to work. Implied in the area of QWL is the notion that to be a good employer, a business or institution must recognize that employees have lives before and after work (and, for that matter, during work as well). That recognition, in turn, creates trust and loyalty among employees, everybody benefits, and the world is a better place.
4. QWL has also been viewed in a variety of ways including:
 - As a movement;
 - As a set of organizational interventions and

- A type of work life by employees
5. QWL is a dynamic multidimensional construct that currently includes such concepts as job security, reward systems, training and career advancements opportunities, and participation in decision making.
 6. As such quality of work life has been defined as the workplace strategies, operations and environment that promote and maintain employee satisfaction with an aim to improving working conditions for employees and organizational effectiveness for employers. The basic purpose is to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for people as well as for the economic health of the organization. It seeks to employ the higher skills of workers and to provide an environment that encourages improving their skills.

Essential things to improve the work life of employees in the organization

- Q - Quest of excellence
- U - Understanding
- A - Action
- L - Leadership
- I - Involvement of the people
- T - Team Sprit
- Y - Yardstick to measure progress

Review of Literature

R. Geetha and Dr. R. S. Mani (2016) studied in his article after the literature review on quality of work life, it is clear that an organization cannot get efficient and effective outcomes from the employees' without Quality of work life. QWL is important for employees' as well as for the organizations to achieve the overall growth and profit in the market. The literature also reveals the contribution of the nine important components of QWL which are positively associated with the employee satisfaction and employees' opinion on QWL in different sectors. Perception plays a vital role in QWL. Sometimes it gives a positive as well as negative relation with QWL. 4 out of 20 literatures have positive relationship with QWL and 3 out of 20 literatures show a negative relationship with QWL. The other factor which affects the QWL is work experience. Employees consider the appreciation of their efforts as more valuable than the rewards and compensations in terms of allowance and peeks. Given good salary, the employees are happy to develop their skills and work for the progress of the organization and summarily their own promotion.

Giang Thuy Phan and Trung Quang Vo (2016) studied in his article that QWL is concerned more and more in order to improve quality and productivity of working in organizations. Moreover, the study reveals some factors affecting the QWL such as job satisfaction, homework interface, working conditions, compensation, human relations, management personnel relations and support to be better manager change and transition. They are so important to recognize and access the advantages and disadvantages of environmental working to get the appropriate solution addressing limiting factors and improve QWL.

S. Khodadadi et al. (2014) investigated the QWL dimensions effect on the employees' job satisfaction. In this study independent variables were permanent security providing, salary and benefits payment policies, development and promotion opportunity, and job independence, job satisfaction as the dependent variables. 114 employees selected randomly for this study and two questionnaires of "quality of work life" and "job satisfaction" was used for data collection and Data analysis was done by using SPSS and LISREL software. The results of the study showed that the salary and benefits' policies have a significant and positive effect on Shuhstar's Shohola Hospital employees' job satisfaction

H. Mohammadia and M. A. Shahrabib (2013) conducted a research on relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction, it is an empirical investigation. Questionnaire in likert scales format and distributed among 86 full time employees of two governmental agencies in Iran, Supreme Audit Court and Interior Ministry and t-test used to examine the hypothesis. The results indicated that different working components have significantly influenced on job satisfaction.

J. Gnanayudam and Ajantha Dharmasiri (2008) studied Influence of quality of work life on organizational commitment by investigated on unsatisfactory level of commitment among workers in medium and large organizations in the apparel industry in Sri Lanka. A convenient sampling technique was adopted for the research. The sample size was limited to 87 workers and Pearson correlation used for data analysis. The result showed that QWL has a positively significant relation with the commitment and moderator effect of HRDC on the relationship between QWL and Commitment.

Linda K. Johnsrud (2006) studied on Quality of faculty work life: The University of Hawaii to describe the changes in QWL from 1998 to now. The objective of the study was to find out the current level of satisfaction. Variables were used Relations with the department chair, campus service, community service, faculty relation, salary and demographic factor. The study included all 3,490 members of the UH faculty and /marks the first time that this survey was conducted entirely online and yielded 1,340 responses for a 38% return rate and to analyze the data T- test was used by the researcher. The result showed that salary was the main variable for satisfaction from year 1998 to 2006. Faculty relations and community services is the most positive elements in faculty work life and other finding was campuses' faculty are generally more satisfied than others.

David Lewis et al., (2001) studied on the extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life. The objective of the research was to test whether extrinsic or intrinsic or prior traits test predict satisfaction with QWL in health care. The variables used extrinsic traits: salary or other tangible, intrinsic traits: skills, level, autonomy and challenge, prior traits: gender and employment traits, co-workers, support, supervisor, treatment and communication. Survey was conducted in 7 different health care and respondents was 1,819/5486 staff (33%). Data was gathered from the circulate questionnaire and test applied for data analysis was regression method and factor analysis. The findings showed pay, supervisor style, commitment and

discretion, all play a role in determining QWL. Female employees were less satisfied with these traits than male.

Statement of the Problem

For the present study, the term Quality of Work Life refers to values and attitudes contained in working life of any employee. The “working life concept” consists of many factors such as, Pay, Promotion, Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, Benefits, Contingent Rewards, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Operating Procedures, Coworkers and Supervision, Nature of Work, Social Integration in the Work Organization, Constitutionalism in Work Organization, Work and Total Life Space, and Social Relevance of Working Life; each of which plays its role in evaluating working life. Maintaining organizational health as well as the employee’s satisfaction on a regular basis is one of key factor for achieving organizational success and also for the organizational sustainability. If quality of life at work could be improved, it would benefit and reward the individual employee and the organization, its employees and society as a whole. As employers try to address employee turnover and job satisfaction issues, they must first determine what the issues are. As more companies start to realize that a happy employee is a productive employee, they have started to look for ways to improve the work environment. Many have implemented various work-life programs to help employees, including alternate work arrangements. It cannot be defined or connoted in a few terms or sentences as it is the convergence of various factors like nature of the job, nature of the individual employee and employer, work environment, social condition, job facilities, objectives and goals of the organization, qualification, experience and visions of the human elements involved etc.

Objectives of the study

1. To identify the key factors of Quality of Work Life of employees.
2. To measure the impact of major factors on quality of work life.

Hypothesis of the study

H₀: There is no significant relationship between key factors and QWL.

H₁: There is significant relationship between key factors and QWL.

Research Methodology

Research is an intensive study in a particular field to achieve at an improved conclusion of a problem. Research Methodology is a systematic way of solving the problem. The methodologies followed for this study are as follows.

Research Design

The research design is the basic framework or a plan for a study that guides the collection of data and analysis of data. Employees satisfaction and opinion about this study is used Descriptive Research Design in nature. The main purpose of descriptive research is description of state of affairs, as it exists at present. The information is collected from the employees in Engineering Colleges of Rayalaseema region and analyzed with the help of different statistical tools, for describing the relationship between various variables, pertaining the job satisfaction and quality of work life. Moreover, cross table analysis has been done for processing the data and information is derived to attain the objectives of the study.

Method of Data Collection

Among the various methods, which can be used to collect the primary data, the researcher has adopted structured questionnaire model which contains multiple choice questions. The respondent's opinions are gathered with regard to the problem with the help of the questionnaires.

Sampling Design

A sample is a smaller representation of a larger whole. When some of the elements are selected with the intention of finding out something about the population from which they are taken, that group of elements is referred as a sample, and the process of selection is called Sampling.

Sampling Unit

The respondents of the study are part of population of employees in engineering colleges of Rayalaseema region. Each employee is considered to be the sampling unit.

Sample Size

Autonomous Engineering College employees in Rayalaseema region strength is identified the entire universe; meanwhile the sampling size is confined only for 150 employees for among various cadre of position in their jobs. Convenient sampling is adopted to get insight about the study.

Statistical Tools

The collected data is consolidated, tabulated and analyzed by using statistical tools like KMO & Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, Factor analysis, Multiple Regression and ANOVA test.

Period of the Study

The study was conducted for a period of 3 months from January to March 2019 and collected data through online mode.

Data Analysis and Results

The Data analyzing using tools is SPSS20.0 version

Description of Demographic Data

| Demographic Variable | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------|
| Gender | Male | 95 | 63.3 |
| | Female | 55 | 36.7 |
| | Total | 150 | 100 |
| Age | 20-30 | 27 | 18.0 |
| | 31-40 | 81 | 54.0 |
| | 41-50 | 24 | 16.0 |
| | >50 | 18 | 12.0 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.0 |
| Marital Status | Married | 89 | 59.3 |
| | Unmarried | 61 | 40.7 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.0 |
| Occupation | Professor | 13 | 8.7 |
| | Associate Professor | 46 | 30.7 |
| | Assistant Professor | 71 | 47.3 |
| | Others | 20 | 13.3 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.0 |
| Qualification | Ph. D | 32 | 21.3 |
| | PG | 76 | 50.7 |
| | Others | 42 | 28.0 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.0 |
| Income | <25000 | 35 | 23.3 |
| | 25000-50000 | 36 | 24.0 |
| | 50001-75000 | 35 | 23.3 |
| | 75001-1 Lakh | 37 | 24.7 |
| | > Lakh | 7 | 4.7 |
| | Total | 150 | 100.0 |

Source: Primary data through questionnaire.

Gender

From the above table it can be inferred that, out of 150 respondents, 63.3 % of the respondents were male and the remaining 36.7% were female respondents. It is observed that the majority of respondents are male.

Age

From the above table it can be inferred that, out of 150 respondents, 54.0% of the respondents belong to age group of 31- 40 years and 18.0% of the respondents belong to age group of 20-30, 16.0% of the respondents belong to age group of 41-50 years. The remaining 12.0% of the respondents are above the age of 50 years. This indicates that majority of the respondents are youngsters and adults.

Marital Status

The above table it can be inferred that, out of 150 respondents, out of which 40.7% were unmarried and the remaining 59.3% are “Married”. This shows the more participation from married respondents.

Occupation

The above table it can be inferred that out of 150 respondents, out of which 47.3% of the total respondents were Assistant Professors, 30.7% were Associate Professors, 13.3% were others 8.7% were Professors.

Qualification

The above table is can be inferred that, out of 150 respondents, out of which 50.7% respondents belongs to Postgraduates, 28.0% respondents belongs to Other categories, 21.3% respondents belonged Ph.Ds. Hence, this study comprises of majority of the respondents of Postgraduates.

Income

The above table is can be inferred that, out of 259 respondents, 27.4% of the respondents reported to have income range of Rs. 75001-1 Lakh, 24.0% reported their income range should be Rs. 25000-50000. 23.3% reported their income range should be Rs. 50001-75000 and Rs. 25000 below. 4.7 % reported their income range is Rs. 1 Lakh above.

Table 2: KMO & Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity

| | | |
|--|--------------------|---------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .769 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 608.893 |
| | Df | 45 |
| | Significance | .000 |

Data set was then subjected to another round of Principal Component Analysis and Varimax rotation. Communalities for all nineteen variables were higher than 0.5 (Annexure I) indicating it to be an optimum solution. Final solution explained **67.118%** of total variance associated with the problem (Annexure II). Factor output comprised of three factors based on ten variables (Annexure III). Relevant factor loadings for each variable indicated that all the variables were adequately explained by derived factors. Factor output comprised of three factors representing specific forces quality of work life in Autonomous Engineering colleges in Rayalaseema district, Andhra Pradesh. These are presented in the table given below.

Table 3: Name of the Factors

| Statements | Component | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| | Compensation | Superior Relationship | Level of job Satisfaction |
| Employee's opinion regarding the Quality of Work Life | .830 | | |
| Employees' satisfaction with current Job | .825 | | |
| Employees' opinion regarding the Cordial Relationship between the employees and superiors | .698 | | |
| Employees' opinion regarding the safety and healthy Working conditions | .696 | | |
| Employees' satisfaction with Salary package | .618 | | |
| Employees' opinion regarding the job security in the organization | | .880 | |
| Employees' satisfaction with the grievance redresses | | .850 | |
| Employees' opinion regarding the Performance Appraisal methods | | .838 | |
| Main satisfactions in employee life come from their work. | | | .898 |
| Levels of satisfaction | | | .614 |
| Source: Primary data through questionnaire. | | | |

Multiple Regression

Table 4: Regression Model-Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Standard Error of the estimates | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|--------------|
| | | | | | R Square change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig F Change |
| 1 | .479 ^a | .229 | .213 | .728 | .229 | 14.463 | 3 | 146 | .000 |

Source: Primary data through questionnaire.

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level of job Satisfaction, Superior Relationship, Compensation

b. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life

Inference

Model summary (Table) shows the value of R as 0.696, R Square as 0.484 and adjusted R square value as 0.474 which indicates that this regression model explains about % of variation of dependent variable (Quality of work life) due to independent variable (Compensations, Superior Relationship & Level of job Satisfaction).

Table 5: ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean square | F | Significance |
|--------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1 Regression | 22.978 | 3 | 7.659 | 14.463 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 77.316 | 146 | .530 | | |
| Total | 100.293 | 149 | | | |

Source: Primary data through questionnaire.

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation, Superior Relationship & Level of job Satisfaction.

Inference

The ANOVA (Table) reveals that the F statistics of the regression model is statically significant at 0.05 levels implying the goodness of fit of the regression equation. (Model is statistically significant).

Table 6: Coefficient

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|----------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 2.640 | .289 | | 9.123 | .000 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|------|-------|--------|------|
| Compensation | .192 | .060 | .258 | 3.191 | .002 |
| Superior Relationship | -.179 | .090 | -.155 | -1.994 | .048 |
| Level of job Satisfaction | .167 | .053 | .240 | 3.127 | .002 |

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life.

Source: Primary data through questionnaire.

Inference

Table represents standardized regression coefficients which show the strength of impact and its positive/negative direction. It also comprises of 'T' and significant values to validate the hypothesis framed to measure the significant impact of dimensions of key factors on quality of work life.

Suggestions

- Adequate training and development programs should be provided to the employees for an effective increase in the performance and attitude levels.
- More recreational facilities and welfare measures should be provided by the company to reduce work stress and to enhance the satisfaction of their working environment.
- Superiors and the subordinates should try to create friendly relations with their subordinates so as to motivate the performance of the employees and workmen.
- Career development programs in the college should be improved in continues way and should be improving the functioning of the quality circle.
- The Performance Appraisal was to be conduct frequently and analyze the employee's recital which should lead to satisfy their monetary and non-monetary terms.
- Management must need to adopt the regular system to assess the grievances and problem of the employees

Conclusion

The study found that there is a high level of satisfaction among the employees regarding the Quality of Work life. The factors determining the satisfaction with the quality of work life in the organization were "Adequate Income and Fair Compensation, Safe and healthy working conditions, Opportunities to use & develop human capacity, Opportunity for career growth, Social integration in the work force, Constitutionalism in work organization, Eminence of Work Life and Social relevance of work, Cordial relationship with employees and superiors, and remedy for the grievance and performance appraisal. All these factors are positively correlated with the quality of work life in Autonomous Engineering colleges of Rayalaseema Region. Adequate training and development programs should be provided to the employees for an effective increase in the performance and attitude levels.

Reference

1. Allenspach, H., Flexible Working Hours, Geneva, International Labour Office, 1975, pp-64.
2. Aswathappa. K, Human Resource and Personnel Management, second edition (2002), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company, New Delhi, pp (390,391,523).
3. Bhatia, S. K. and G. K. Valecha, A Review of Research Findings on Absenteeism, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, October, 1981, Vol. 17(2), pp 1234.
4. Biswanath Ghosh, Human Resource Development and Management (2000), Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Page (26 -27).
5. Dolan, L.S, Garcia, S. Cabezas, C. and Tzafrir, S.S., Predictors of "Quality of Work" and "Poor Health" Among Primary Health-Care Personnel in Catalonia. International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance. 21(2); Pp. 203-218, 2008.
6. Feuer, D., Quality of work life: a cure for all ills? Training: The Magazine of Human Resources Development, 26: 65-66, 1989.
7. Gilgeous, V., (1998), "Manufacturing managers: their quality of working life", Integrated Manufacturing System, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.173-181.
8. Goode, D. A. 'Quality of Life, Quality of Work Life' in W. E. Kiernan and R. L. Schalock (eds.), Economics, Industry and Disability: A Look Ahead (Paul H. Brookes, Baltimore), pp.337-349, 1989.
9. Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R., (1980), "Work redesign", Redings, M.A: Addison-Wesley.
10. Hair, J. F; Anderson, R. E and Tatham, R.L. 1999.Multivariate Data Analysis. 2nd edition. Macmillan publishing company, New York. PP 111-114.
11. Hart, P.M., Teacher Quality of Work Life: Integrating Work Experiences, Psychological Distress psychological distress, Occupational Organizational Psychology 67:109-132, 1994.
12. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. (1959), "The Motivation to Work" (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.
13. Hian, C.C., and Einstein, W.O., (1990), "Quality of Work Life (QWL): What can unions do? S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, Vol. 55, No. 2, p. 17-22.
14. Karasek, R.A. "Control in the Workplace and its Health-Related Aspects", in Sauter.
15. Kohl, M. L and Schooler, C., 'Job conditions and personality: A Longitudinal Running in the direction of the long axis of the body or any of its parts. Assessment of Reciprocal Effects', American Journal of Sociology 87: 1257-1286, 1982.
16. Koonmee, K. A. Singhapakdi, B. Virakul and D. J. Lee, Ethics institutionalization, Quality of Work Life and employee job related outcomes: A survey of human resource managers in Thailand, Journal of Business Research, 2010, 1-7, 20-26.
17. Lau, R.S.M and May, B.E., (1998), "A win-win paradigm for Quality of Work Life and business performance", Human Resource Development Quarterly, fall 1998, Vol 9, No. 3.

18. Lee, J.D., Singhapakdi, A. and Sirgy, J.A., Further Validation of a Need-based Quality-of-work-life (QWL) Measure: Evidence from Marketing Practitioners. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*.2 (4), 273-287, 2007.
19. Robert Half Management Resources; Investment Weekly News. Atlanta: Jan 8, 2011. pg. 675.
20. Royuela, V., Tamayo, J and Surinach, J. The Institutional vs. the Academic Definition of the Quality of Work Life. What is the Focus of the European Commission? *Research Institute of Applied Economics* 2007.
21. S.L., Hurrell, J.J., Cooper, C.L. (Eds), *Job Control and Worker Health*, Wiley, New York, NY, pp.129-59, 1989.
22. Sinha P, Sayeed OB. Measuring Quality of Working Life: Development of an Inventory. *Indian Journal of Social Work*.41; 219-226, 1980.
23. Sirgy, J.M, Efraty, D, Siegel, P and Lee, J.D. A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover *Social Indicators Research* 55:241-302, 2001.

