

**THE IMPACT OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE ON
EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO 10 MANAGEMENT
INSTITUTIONS AT BANGALORE**

PROF. VEENA SHENOY*

PROF. SUNIL RASHINKAR*

Abstract

Quality is one of the most important aspects of Job that ensures long term association of the employees with the organization. Qualities of work life in Management Institutions are considered to be the most critical aspects. It is found that there are few facilities which are unsatisfactory and few facilities are to be provided by the institutions in order to maintain, retain the employees as well the high productivity of the organization. Hence Management has to look into the facilities that are not available and is the points where employees are unsatisfied with unavailability of the facilities. Because of the facilities that are unavailable will lead for low productivity, stress and dissatisfaction etc. At the same time when good culture and work environment leads to high productivity of the organization.

This study is attempted to understand the impact of QWL on employee satisfaction and organizational productivity with special reference to 10 Management Institutions at Bangalore.

Keywords: Bangalore, Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, Productivity, Management Institutions

* Associate Professor, Community Institute of Management Studies, Affiliated to Bangalore University, Bangalore- 560011, Karnataka State, India.

INTRODUCTION

The term “Quality of Work Life” (QWL) has different meanings of different meanings of different people. Some consider it industrial democracy or co-determination with increased employee participation in the decision making process. Others take a broader view of changing the entire organizational climate by humanizing work, individualizing organizations and changing the structural and managerial systems.

In general terms QWL refers to the favorable or unfavorable of a job environment for people. It refers to the quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment. It can be defined as “A process joint decision making, collaboration and building mutual respect between management and employees”.

The concept of QWL is based on the assumptions that are more than just a job. It is the center of a person’s life. In recent years there has been increasing concern for QWL due to several factors:

- Increase in the education level and consequently job aspirations of employees.
- Association of workers.
- Significance of human resource management.
- Widespread industrial unrest.
- Growing of knowledge in human behavior.

Objectives of QWL:

The main objectives of QWL programs are to:

- Improve employees’ satisfaction;
- Improve physical and psychological health of employees which creates positive feelings;
- Enhance productivity of employees;
- Reinforce workplace learning;
- Improved management of the on-going change and transition; and
- Build the image of the company as best in recruitment, retention, and in general motivation of employees.

Definitions:

Robbins (1989) has defined Quality of Work Life as process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.

Johnson and Stephens (1999), have defined Quality of Work Life as “the favourable conditions and environments of a workplace that supports and promote employee satisfaction by providing them with rewards, job security, and growth opportunities”.

From the above definitions, it is clear that Quality of Work Life is not a distinct concept, but can be associated with aspects such as autonomy, opportunity for career growth, skills, development, job satisfaction, job stress, and the overall well-being of the workers.

Literature Review:

Lynda and Edgur(2003), found that four main hassles of nurses in quality of work life, i.e., social or environmental hassles, operational hassles, administrative hassles, and nurse hassles. Social or environmental hassles represent that influence the physical environment of nurses’ work and relationships with other groups. Operational hassles influence how nurses’ work is organized. Administrative hassles regulated by the institutions (organization) that influence nurses’ work. Nurse hassles say that personally affect the nurses and that influence their work.¹

Singh (2007) carried out a study of job satisfaction of 250 teacher educators from 20 colleges of education affiliated to various universities of Punjab in relation to their attitude towards teaching. The objectives of the study were: (1) To compare the job satisfaction of teacher educators with their attitude towards teaching; (2) To compare the job satisfaction of male teacher educators with their attitude towards teaching; (3) To compare the job satisfaction of female teacher educators with their attitude towards teaching. The result of the study indicated that job satisfaction of teacher educators was positive, but not significantly related to their

¹Lynda, EgglefieldBeaudoin. andEdgur, Linda. (2003) Hassles: Their Importance to Nurses’ Quality of Work Life.*Nursing Economics*.**21** (3), 106-113.

attitude towards teaching. The job satisfaction of male and female teacher educators was also positive but not significantly related to their attitude towards teaching.²

Olorunsola (2010) investigated the level of job satisfaction of male and female administrative staff in South West Nigeria Universities. The research design used was a descriptive survey type. The population consisted of all the senior administrative staff in the universities, out of which a sample of 400 respondents made up to 100 respondents from each of the state and federal universities. Two research questions were raised while one hypothesis was generated and tested at 0.05 level of significance, using t-test statistical method. The result of the analysis showed that the level of job satisfaction of administrative staff in both federal and state universities was high. It was also revealed that there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction of male and female administrative staff in the universities. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the university should provide more motivational factors that would sustain the tempo of the workers. Also, the university should design a program that would make the female workers satisfied value and their work life their male counterparts.³

Mehta (2012) investigated the job satisfaction among the teachers working in government and private senior secondary schools in Ludhiana city. The 300 convenient sampling techniques were used to data collection. This study found that government teachers were more satisfied than private teachers. It also relieved that female teachers were happier with job than their male counterparts. It consists of six dimensions to identify the job satisfaction of the teachers, i.e., job, management, on the job factor, personal adjustment, social relation, and off the job factors.⁴

Statement of Problem:

Quality of work life in education institutions is essential for smooth running success of its employees. The work life balance must be maintained effectively to ensure that all employees are running at their peak potential and free from stress and strain.

²Singh, Gurmit. (2007) Job satisfaction of teacher-educators in relation to their attitude towards teaching. *Journal of All India Association for Educational Research*. **19** (3)&(4), 86-87.

³Olorunsola, E. O. (2010) Job Satisfaction and Gender Factor of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*. **3**(10), 51-55.

⁴ Mehta, Sandhya. (2012) Job Satisfaction among Teachers, *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **11** (2), 54-66.

The quality of work life can affect such things as employees timings his or her work output, his or her available leaves etc. quality of work life helps the employees to feel secure and like they are being thoughtful of and cared by the organization in which they work. The study helps to get suitable suggestions for the institutions to take necessary steps to improve the quality of work life among its workers. This helps to understand whether they are satisfied with their present scenario and its impact to the institution

Objectives of the study:

1. To assess the elements relevant to the quality of work life.
2. To enhance balance between the personal life and work life.
3. To analyze the monetary and non-monetary benefits affecting work life among the teaching professionals.
4. To establish the right criteria for measuring quality of work life.
5. To examine the various facilities provided to the teaching professionals.
6. To identify whether teaching professionals are satisfied with quality of work life.

Scope of the study:

1. It helps to establish human dignity in the institutions.
2. It is fruitful for the growth of the institution.
3. It helps to enhance teaching professional's career path.
4. It boosts the growth of the institutions.
5. It involves in developing services.

Looking at the various situations analysis, strategic issues and constraints the sampling size was 100 respondents from 10 different institutions in Bangalore.

Limitations of the Study

1. The sample size of the study was 100 respondents.
2. Due to the time constrain the researcher was not able to get information from more colleges.
3. The study was limited to only 10 institutions.
4. There were chances of biased answer in research.
5. Study was limited to under-graduate colleges only.

Data and Methodology:

The data was gathered through Primary data; a survey through questionnaire has been conducted from educational sector among a group of 100 respondents located in the south east part of the Bangalore city.

Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was used to collect the required information. The respondents were asked to evaluate the ideas using 5 point Likert scale, where 5- strongly agree, 4- Agree, 3- neutral, 2-disagree, 1-strongly disagree. The Likert scale questionnaire provides a consistent means of obtaining data. It helps to reduce bias.

The survey of questionnaire has been sent to 150 employees working in the educational sectors in Bangalore south. In this we received response rate is 100 percent that is from 150 respondents. Out of this it was found that there were 45 female employees and 55 male employees in the institution.

The survey asked about 30 Likert scale questions relating to employees salary, working conditions, safety plans, social and individual requirements, quality of education, faculty development programs etc. In this research we have applied Mean, standard deviation and variance for interface the results. The 30 questions have been divided into six indicators.

SI Nos.	Questions	Criteria	Includes
1.1-1.10	First-Ten	Demographic Factors	Employee name, designation, name of the institution etc.
2.1-2.6	Second-Six	Monetary Factors	Comparison of salary, performance, compensation etc.
3.1-3.4	Third-Four	Facilities	canteen, ventilation, safety plans etc.
4.1-4.7	Fourth-Seven	Non-Monetary Factors	Employee treatment, self improvement etc.
5.1-5.6	Fifth-Six	Quality Of Work Life	Welfare, relationship, social and individual requirements etc.
6.1-6.7	Sixth-Seven	Job Satisfaction	Selection of lecturers, time for research, faculty development programs etc.

In order to make difference in the criteria different types of charts have been used in the analysis and interpretation part. In overall this study helps to understand employee quality of work life and their by job satisfaction towards their professional life.

Table showing the institutions selected for the research.

Sl. No	COLLEGES
1	New Horizon College (NHC)
2	City College (CC)
3	SSMRV College (SSMRV C)
4	National Degree College (NDC)
5	Patel College (PC)
6	Krupanidhi College (KC)
7	Vijaya College (VC)
8	Community Institution of Management Studies
9	Reddy Jana Sangha College (RJS C)
10	Oxford College (OC)

Demographic analysis: Designation of lecturers:

Nos.	Positions	No Of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Associate Professor	44	44
2	Jr. Assistant Professor	3	3
3	Lecturer	41	41
4	HOD	1	1
5	Professor	11	11
	Total	100	100

Table showing the gender of the lecturers.

Nos.	Gender	No Of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Male	45	45
2	Female	55	55
	Total	100	100

Results:**A. Evaluation of criteria and results:**

Sl. No.	Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Ranking Of Criteria
A.	Monetary Aspects				
2.1	I feel my institution is giving fair salary in comparison with cost of living.	3.48	1.0394	1.0804	4
2.2	I feel compensation provided by my institution is better than other institution.	3.53	0.8927	0.7970	3
2.3	I feel monetary benefits match my performance.	3.46	1.0290	1.0589	5
2.4	I feel satisfied with gratuity and group insurance scheme.	2.98	1.2551	1.5753	6
2.5	In my institution the salary is credited to my account without any delay in every month.	4.06	0.9515	0.9515	1
2.6	I feel about continuing my present job, regardless of pay received from the institution.	3.66	1.0657	1.1357	2
B.	Facilities				
3.1	My institution provides hygiene canteen facility for staff.	3.5	1.0871	1.1818	4
3.2	I am provided with more spacious staff room with good ventilation.	4.13	0.7608	0.5788	1
3.3	My institution has good safety plans and displayed in all corridors.	3.67	0.8768	0.7687	2
3.4	I feel normal health after a day's work with less stress.	3.65	1.0087	1.0176	3
C.	Non-Monetary Aspects				
4.1	I get an opportunity to participate in semester planning of academic work more often.	3.75	0.8804	0.7752	4
4.2	My institution encourages on self improvement with respect to teaching as profession.	3.87	0.8721	0.7607	1
4.3	My institution treats all employees at equitable.	3.79	0.9459	0.8948	3
4.4	My work in institution is well appreciated.	3.69	0.8609	0.7413	6

4.5	I feel satisfied with the promotion opportunity in my institution.	3.7	0.8468	0.1717	5
4.6	My job is assigned on the basis of my work, skill competence.	3.8	0.8164	0.6666	2
4.7	My appraisal is based on my objective assessment.	3.59	0.8656	0.7493	7
D.	Quality Of Work Life				
5.1	I feel the relationship between faculty members is good.	3.83	0.8652	0.7485	3
5.2	I feel junior and senior professors get along very well.	3.88	0.5611	0.7329	2
5.3	I feel my institution takes care for the welfare of lecturers of all ages.	3.66	0.9014	0.8125	6
5.4	I feel management will ensure that privacy regarding personal matters.	3.76	0.8423	0.7094	4
5.5	I feel social and individual requirements are not neglected in the institution.	3.71	0.8323	0.6928	5
5.6	My institution gives due importance to quality education.	4.04	0.8277	0.6852	1
E.	Job Satisfaction				
6.1	I have adequate time to devote to my research pursuit.	3.7	0.9692	0.9393	7
6.2	The college management, principal, and the faculty members appreciate my academic achievement.	3.86	0.8878	0.7882	6
6.3	My college management, principal motivates me to attend faculty development program (FDP).	3.93	0.8072	0.6516	4
6.4	I am happy with the academic environment of my college.	3.94	0.8624	0.7438	3
6.5	Teaching is undoubtedly the best profession.	4.23	0.8391	0.7041	1
6.6	Teaching profession provides me lot of opportunities to display my talent and skills.	4.13	0.8721	0.7607	2
6.7	In my institution selection of lecturers are made on the basis of merit.	3.88	0.9669	0.9349	5

B. Main groups criteria and results:

Sl no.	Main groups criteria and results	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
A.	Monetary Aspects	4.06	0.9515	0.9515
B.	Facilities	4.13	0.7608	0.5788
C.	Non-Monetary Aspects	3.87	0.8721	0.7607
D.	Quality Of Work Life	4.04	0.8277	0.6852
E.	Job Satisfaction	4.23	0.8391	0.7041

C. Top 5 evaluation criteria's and results:

Sl No.	Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Ranking Of Criteria
1.	In my institution the salary is credited to my account without any delay in every month.	4.06	0.9515	0.9515	3
2.	I am provided with more spacious staff room with good ventilation.	4.13	0.7608	0.5788	2
3.	My institution encourages on self improvement with respect to teaching as profession.	3.87	0.8721	0.7607	5
4.	My institution gives due importance to quality education.	4.04	0.8277	0.6852	4
5.	Teaching is undoubtedly the best profession.	4.23	0.8391	0.7041	1

Finding:

- 1) 57% of respondents are satisfied when their salary is compared with cost of living. Another 43% are not satisfied the benefits with respect to cost of living.
- 2) 55% of employees are satisfied when compensation compared with other institution.
- 3) 47% respondents do not agree that monetary benefits match their performance.
- 4) 16% of respondents are not satisfied with the gratuity and group insurance scheme provided with by the institution.
- 5) 24% of respondent's salaries are not credited on time.
- 6) 39% of respondents are not ready to work if institution does not provide proper pay to the employees.
- 7) 43% of respondents are satisfied with the hygiene canteen facilities.
- 8) 84% of respondents are well satisfied with the spacious staff with good ventilation provided by the institution.
- 9) 65% of respondents are satisfied with the having good safety plans and displayed in the corridors.
- 10) 38% of respondents are feeling stressed after day's work and they don't feel better.
- 11) 65% of respondents are provided with the semester planning.
- 12) 29% of respondents are not encouraged with any kind of self improvement of the employees.
- 13) 68% of employees are treated equitable.
- 14) 62% of respondents are appreciated for the work done in the institution.
- 15) 36% of respondents are not satisfied because these employees are not provided with the promotional opportunities.
- 16) 70% of respondents are satisfied and agree that job is assigned on their skill and competence.
- 17) 62% of respondents are satisfied on the appraisal system that is done on the basis of respondent's objective.
- 18) 70% of respondents are satisfied with relationship between faculty members.
- 19) 27% of respondents are not satisfied so the institution should get along with senior and junior professors.

- 20) 46% of respondents agree that welfare of employees is taken care for all the ages.
- 21) 29% of respondents feel that personal matters of the individuals are discussed and it is not kept privately.
- 22) 67% of respondents feel that social and individual requirements in the institutions are neglected.
- 23) 21% of respondents feel that their institution is does not give any kind of importance to quality education.
- 24) More than 50% of respondents are provided adequate time pursue their research in the institution.
- 25) 24% of respondents do not feel they are appreciated on their academic achievement.
- 26) 71% of respondents are satisfied with the faculty development program.
- 27) 26% of respondents are not satisfied with academic environment of the institutions.
- 28) 85% of employees feel that teaching profession is the best profession.
- 29) 87% of respondents are satisfied with the opportunities provided for the employees to exhibit their talents.
- 30) 51% of respondents are selected on the basis of merit.

Suggestion:

- 1) Institution should provide basic living facilities to the employees then they will be motivated and they retain in the institution for more time.
- 2) Institutions should provide compensations based on employees performance, talent, skills, and recognition etc.
- 3) Evaluation of performance should be conducted on periodic basis.
- 4) Institution should come out with better scheme for those employees with less than 5 years experience in same institution and employees with more than 5 years in same institution should follow up with gratuity as well as group insurance scheme.
- 5) Salary should be credited to the employees account properly.

Further scope of study:

This survey takes consideration employees working in service sectors like teaching institutions only considering Management colleges. Further research can be continued in the field by taking consideration into other Institutions like Professional Courses like C.A, ICWA etc, under graduate colleges, Pre- University etc.

Conclusion: Any institution with wide management that focuses on quality as a over-arching goal. This would help to understand all employees. Quality of work life is an important concept which brings change in the entire institution climate by humanizing work changing the structural and managerial systems. This would enable the institution to work harmoniously to satisfy the employees.

Quality can be established in an institution if the management invests in employees with the requisite qualifications and this would help to establish a work life balance between personal and organizational goals.

References:

- Wolins, M., Wozner, Y. and Shye, S. (1980). Rejuvenating the asylum: A field study. *Social Work Research and Abstracts* 16:17-25.
- Shye, S. (1982). Compiling expert opinions on the impact on environmental quality of a nuclear power plant: An application of a systemic life quality model. *International Review of Applied Psychology* 31: 285-302.
- Wozner, Y. (1982). Assessing the quality of internat life. *Human Relations*, vol. 35 (11): 1059-1072.
- Shye, S. (1988). Life Quality and environmental conditions in a distress neighborhood: evaluation by the systemic quality of life model. *Megamot*, 31, 439-449.
- Shye, S. (1989). The systemic quality life Model : A basis for Urnan Renewal Evaluation: *Social Indicators Research* 21:343-378.
- Elizur, D. (1990). Quality circles and quality of work life. *International Journal of Manpower* 11 (6):3-7.
- Elizur, D. and Shye, S. (1990). Quality of work life and its relation to Quality of life. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 39 (3):275-291.
- Wozner, Y. (1991). Organizing institutions for goal attainment. *Hevra Urvaha (Society and Welfare)* 11 (2):156-175 (Hebrew).
- Wozner, Y., Golan, M., Davidson-Arad, B., Dekel, R. (1997). The quality of life of institutions for youth. *International Journal of Child & Family Welfare*, 2, 127-143.
- Shye, S. (1998). The systemic life quality model: a comparative analysis of concepts and scales. *Megamot*, 39, (1-2) 149-169.
- Davidson-Arad, B., Wozner, Y. (2001). The least detrimental alternative: Deciding whether to remove children at risk from their homes. *International Social Work*, 44(2); 229-239.
- Davidson-Arad, B. (2001). Predicted changes in children's Quality of Life in decisions regarding the removal of children at risk from their homes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23(2); 127-143.
- Davidson-Arad, B. (2001). Parental features and Quality of Life in the decision to remove children at risk from home. *Child abuse and Neglect*, 25; 47-64.
- Lichtentritt, R.D., Davidson-Arad, B., Wozner, Y. (2002).The social work mission and its implementation in the socialization process: First and second-year students' perspectives. *Social Work Education*, 21(6); 671-683.

Davidson-Arad, B., Cohen, O., and Wozner, Y. (In press). Social workers custody recommendations: Contributions of child's expected Quality of Life and parental features. *Journal of Divorce and the Marriage*.

Englechin-Segal, D., and Wozner, Y., and Gabriel, R. (In press). Why social workers do not implement their decision to remove children at risk from home. *Child Abuse & Neglect*.

Wozner, Y. (2003). Short Term Follow-Up of Children at Risk: Comparison of the Quality of Life of Children Removed from Home And Children Remaining at Home. *Child Abuse & Neglect*.

Lynda, EgglefieldBeaudoin. andEdgur, Linda. (2003) Hassles: Their Importance to Nurses' Quality of Work Life. *Nursing Economics*.**21** (3), 106-113.

Singh, Gurmit. (2007) Job satisfaction of teacher-educators in relation to their attitude towards teaching. *Journal of All India Association for Educational Research*.**19** (3)&(4), 86-87.

Olorunsola, E. O. (2010) Job Satisfaction and Gender Factor of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*.**3**(10), 51-55

