An Impact of Quality of Work Life on Satisfaction of Various Employees

Sudhamsetti Naveen and Yenugula Prasadarao
Universal College of Engineering and Technology, Andhra Pradesh (AP), India

Abstract: Quality of work life is one of the key factors to increase employee morale. Quality of work life is concerned about the impact of job environment on employee's satisfaction as well as on organizational growth. The basic purpose of this study is to know about an impact of quality of work life on satisfaction of various employees in Dr. Narla Tatarao Thermal Power Station Vijayawada. To meet this objective, the well-structured questionnaire was prepared and data analysis has done with Chi-square test.

Key words: Quality of work life, cordial relationship, advancement, employee satisfaction, working conditions and commitment, objective

INTRODUCTION

"Human resources are the greatest assets of any industries. You can raise tariffs or prevent MNCs from entering but one can't stop the employees from leaving if they are dissatisfied". N.R. Narayana Murthy, Founder of Infosys Technologies. It signifies the importance of human resources in any industries. Human resources treat them as the most powerful assets and find good reason to research towards their satisfaction. The best companies in the world are those that realize the worth of their employees and continue to invest in them towards their growth and development. This is a conscious resource that shall fuel the growth of the company from within. Quality of work life refers to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement and commitment individuals experience with respect to their lives at research . It is the degree to which individuals are able to satisfy their important personal needs while employed by the firm. Companies interested in enhancing employees quality of work life generally try to instill in employees the feelings of security, equity, pride, internal democracy, ownership, autonomy, responsibility and flexibility (Shankar, 2014).

Total quality management can be viewed as strategic attempt of firm's management directed towards the harmonious and continuous improvement in all functional aspects of an organization with the aim of satisfying customer need (Ibidunni *et al.*, 2017). it is also achievement of business excellence.

Definition: According to Wheeler and Hunger that the quality of work life emphasizes improving the human dimension of research. They should they to improve QWL by introducing participative problem solving, restructuring research, introducing innovative reward systems and improving the research environment (Jerome, 2013).

Job satisfaction is described as employee's perception of obtaining pleasure from their research or their positive state of employees following their own job performance appraisal. According to fritzsce and Parrish, it is the worker's feeling about the job. Job satisfaction leads to employer's growth (Ahmad, 2017).

Employee satisfaction can be defined it depends on the balance between work role and inputs. Employee satisfaction is an important goal for organizations to achieve the profits of the company (Myint *et al.*, 2016).

Concept of QWL: QWL is a comprehensive and expanded program that increases member satisfaction, reinforces their learning with the environment and helps them to manage change. Member dissatisfaction of QWL is a problem that harms all employees without considering rank and situation. The aim of many organizations is increasing member's satisfaction in all levels. However, this is a complex problem, because the separation and determination that what factors relate to QWL is difficult.

Quality of work life refers to the level of happiness or dissatisfaction with one's career. Those who enjoy their careers are said to have a high quality of work life while those who are unhappy or whose needs are otherwise unfilled are said to have a low quality of work life. Quality of work life is viewed as an alternative to the control approach of managing people. The quality of work life approach considers people as an asset to the organization rather than as cost's. It believes that people perform better when they are allowed to participate in managing

Corresponding Author: Sudhamsetti Naveen, Universal College of Engineering and Technology, Andhra Pradesh (AP), India

their research and make decisions. This approach motivates people by satisfying not only their economic needs but also their social and psychological ones (Gurjit, 2017).

Humanised research through quality of work life: One option is to re-design jobs to have the attributes desired by people and re-design organisations to have the environment desired by the people. This approach seeks to improve QWL. There is a need to give workers more of a challenge, more of a whole task, more opportunity to use their ideas. Close attention to QWL provides a more humanised work environment. It attempts to serve the higher-order needs of workers as well as their more basic needs. It seeks to employ the higher skills of worker's and to provide an environment that encourages them to improve their skills. The idea is that human resources should be developed and not simply used. Further, the research should not have excessively negative conditions. It should not put workers under undue stress. It should not damage or degrade their humanness. It should not be threatening or unduly dangerous. Finally, it should contribute to or at least leave unimpaired, worker's abilities to perform in other life roles such as citizen, spouse and parent. That is research should contribute to general social advancement (Srivastava and Kanpur, 2014).

Importance of QWL in small scale industries: A small scale industry contributes greatly to the country is economy. It is one of the major means to overcome unemployment. It leads to improvement in job satisfaction of the employees and contributes to the overall performance of the industries. The contribution of small scale industries in total industrial output is 39.42, 35% share in exports, 6.71% in gross domestic product and provide employment to about 27.14 million percents (According to Ministry of SSI, 2004-05). The absence of QWL leads to the dissatisfaction in job lack of motivation and moral. The reason to non-performance in SSI are many like lack of finance, technology, non availability of skilled labor, turnover, absenteeism, etc. But the hidden cause for all these troubles is one and only quality of work life (Sharma and Verma, 2013).

Objectives of the study: The main aim of this study is to know an impact of quality of work life on satisfaction of various employees in Dr. Narla Tatarao Thermal Power Station Vijayawada and other objectives are like:

- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding current job

- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding salary package
- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding QWL
- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding cordial relationship between the employees and superiors
- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding safety and healthy working conditions
- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding job security
- To know the association between experience and satisfying level regarding casual leave policy
- To know association between experience and satisfying level regarding performance appraisal methods

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The following methodology has been adopted to carry out the present study to assess the quality of research life and employee commitment in Dr. Narlatatarao Thermal Power Station Vijayawada, AP. The sample size for the proposed topic has been restricted to 100 of the total employees. All the sample respondents who work in different departments have been intervened by using stratified sampling methods. The data analysis has been done with chi square test.

Both primary data and secondary data have been used to carry out the present study. In case of primary data, structured questionnaires have been administrated to elicit the opinions of sample employees on the quality of work life. Secondary data will be collected from the relevant internal records of the power plant as well as journals and magazines plus internet. At last both the data have been integrated to make the project exact and relevant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis:
- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding current job (Table 1)
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding current job (Table 2)

Analysis: From Table 3 and 4, it is observed that calculated value $X_1 = 1.620^a$ tabular value p = 0.655, so, $\chi > p$, therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted.

Table 1: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| Parameters | Opinions | | | | |
	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	10	25	7	8	50
Within experience (%)	20.0	50.0	14.0	16.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	8	21	9	12	50
Within experience (%)	16.0	42.0	18.0	24.0	100.0
Total					
Count	18	46	16	20	100
Within experience (%)	18.0	46.0	16.0	20.0	100.0

H_1: There is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding current job

Table 2: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	1.620[a]	3	0.655
Likelihood ratio	1.627	3	0.653
Linear-by-linear association	1.432	1	0.231
N of valid cases	100	-	-

[a]0 cells (0.0%) have expected count <5; The minimum expected count is 8.00

Table 3: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| Parameters | Opinions | | | | |
	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	15	20	5	10	50
Within experience (%)	30.0	40.0	10.0	20.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	25	10	7	8	50
Within experience (%)	50.0	20.0	14.0	16.0	100.0
Total					
Count	40	30	12	18	100
Within experience (%)	40.0	30.0	12.0	18.0	100.0

Table 4: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson chi-square	6.389[a]	3	0.094
Likelihood ratio	6.482	3	0.090
Linear-by-linear association	1.156	1	0.282
N of valid cases	100	-	-

[a]0 cells (0.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 6.00

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding salary package
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding salary package

Analysis: From Table 5 and 6, it is observed that calculated value X_1 = 6.389[a] tabular value p = 0.094, so, $\chi > p$ therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted:

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding QWL
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding QWL

Table 5: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| Parameters | Opinions | | | | |
	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	20	15	3	12	50
Within experience (%)	40.0	30.0	6.0	24.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	30	15	0	5	50
Within experience (%)	60.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	100.0
Total					
Count	50	30	3	17	100
Within experience (%)	50.0	30.0	3.0	17.0	100.0

Table 6: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	7.882[a]	3	0.049
Likelihood ratio	9.142	3	0.027
Linear-by-linear association	6.049	1	0.014
N of valid cases	100	-	-

[a]2 cells (25.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 1.50

Table 7: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| Parameters | Opinions | | | | |
	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	30	10	2	8	50
Within experience (%)	60.0	20.0	4.0	16.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	22	17	4	7	50
Within experience (%)	44.0	34.0	8.0	14.0	100.0
Total					
Count	52	27	6	15	100
Within experience (%)	52.0	27.0	6.0	15.0	100.0

Table 8: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	3.779[a]	3	0.286
Likelihood ratio	3.818	3	0.282
Linear-by-linear association	0.549	1	0.459
N of valid cases	100	-	-

[a]2 cells (25.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 3.00

Analysis: From Table 7 and 8, it is observed that calculated value X_1 = 7.882[a] tabular value p = 0.049, so, $\chi > p$ therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted;

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding Cordial Relationship between the employees and superiors
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding Cordial Relationship between the employees and superiors

Analysis: From Table 9 and 10, it is observed that calculated value X_1 = 3.779[a] tabular value p = 0.286, so, $\chi > p$, therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted:

Table 9: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| | Opinions | | | | |
Parameters	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	20	15	4	11	50
Within experience (%)	40.0	30.0	8.0	22.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	25	12	3	10	50
Within experience (%)	50.0	24.0	6.0	20.0	100.0
Total					
Count	45	27	7	21	100
Within experience (%)	45.0	27.0	7.0	21.0	100.0

Table 10: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	1.079[a]	3	0.782
Likelihood ratio	1.082	3	0.781
Linear-by-linear association	0.466	1	0.495
N of valid cases	100		

[a]2 cells (25.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 3.50

Table 11: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| | Opinions | | | | |
Parameters	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	10	16	9	15	50
Within experience (%)	20.0	32.0	18.0	30.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	14	18	8	10	50
Within experience (%)	28.0	36.0	16.0	20.0	100.0
Total					
Count	24	34	17	25	100
Within experience (%)	24.0	34.0	17.0	25.0	100.0

Table 12: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	1.843[a]	3	0.606
Likelihood ratio	1.853	3	0.603
Linear-by-linear association	1.818	1	0.178
N of valid cases	100		

[a]0 cells (0.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 8.50

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding safety and healthy Working conditions
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding safety and healthy Working conditions

Analysis: From Table 11 and 12, it is observed that calculated value $X_1 = 1.079$[a] tabular value p = 0.782, so, χ>p, therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted:

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding job security

Table 13: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| | Opinions | | | | |
Parameters	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 year)					
Count	30	10	3	7	50
Within experience (%)	60.0%	20.0%	6.0%	14.0%	100.0%
Experience (>2 year)					
Count	35	8	3	4	50
Within experience (%)	70.0%	16.0%	6.0%	8.0%	100.0%
Total					
Count	65	18	6	11	100
Within experience (%)	65.0%	18.0%	6.0%	11.0%	100.0%

Table 14: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	1.425[a]	3	0.700
Likelihood ratio	1.436	3	0.697
Linear-by-linear association	1.182	1	0.277
N of valid cases	100		

[a]2 cells (25.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 3.00

Table15: Cross tabulation of experience and opininos

| | Opinions | | | | |
Parameters	Highly satisfied	Partially satisfied	Highly dissatisfied	Partially dissatisfied	Total
Experience (<2 years)					
Count	10	12	13	15	50
Within experience (%)	20.0	24.0	26.0	30.0	100.0
Experience (>2 years)					
Count	12	13	11	14	50
Within experience (%)	24.0	26.0	22.0	28.0	100.0
Total					
Count	22	25	24	29	100
Within experience (%)	22.0	25.0	24.0	29.0	100.0

Table 16: Chi-square test results

Parameters	Values	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-square	0.423[a]	3	0.935
Likelihood ratio	0.423	3	0.935
Linear-by-linear association	0.283	1	0.595
N of valid cases	100		

[a]0 cells (0.0%) have expected count <5. The minimum expected count is 11.00

- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding job security

Analysis: From Table 13 and 14, it is observed that calculated value $X_1 = 1.843$[a] tabular value p = 0.0.606, so, χ>p, therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted:

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding casual leave policy
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding casual leave policy

Analysis: From Table 15, it is observed that calculated value $X_1 = 1.425^a$ tabular value p = 0.7, so, $\chi > p$, therefore, alternative hypothesis H_1 is accepted:

- H_0: there is a association between experience and satisfying level regarding performance appraisal methods
- H_1: there is no association between experience and satisfying level regarding performance appraisal methods

Analysis: From Table 16, it is observed that calculated value $X_1 = 0.423^a$ tabular value p = 0.935, so, $\chi < p$, therefore, null hypothesis H_0 is accepted.

CONCLUSION

Every company should provide some of the basic requirements and demands of their employees because the satisfied employees are one of the key factors of achieving the organizational goals. In order meet optimum utilization of the human resource, the organization should satisfy them with the upgrade quality of their working life. So, every organization should update the quality of work life of their employees. From the research, it is clear that the quality of work life of employees is good in the NTPS, Vijayawada. This research blazons some of the small gaps in employee's satisfaction towards the quality of research life.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, M.A., 2017. The impact of accounting information system on job satisfaction in SMEs industrial firms: The mediating effect of knowledge management. Intl. Bus. Manage., 11: 1213-1217.

Gurjit, S., 2017. A study of quality of work life in MNC. Intl. J. Adv. Res. Innovative Ideas Educ., 3: 2441-2445.

Ibidunni, S., O.P. Salau, H. Falola and O.F. Ifeanyi, 2017. Total quality management and performance of telecommunication firms. Intl. Bus. Manage., 11: 293-298.

Jerome, S., 2013. A study on quality of work life of employees at Jeppiaar Cement Private Ltd: Perambalur. Intl. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Sci. Manage. Stud., 1: 49-57.

Myint, S.S., N. Leadmprecha, N. Pooncharoen and W. Rurkwararuk, 2016. An analysis of employee satisfaction of private banks in Myanmar. Intl. Bus. Manage., 10: 101-114.

Shankar, J.V., 2014. A study on quality of work life and employee motivational strategies. Intl. J. Sci. Res. Manage., 2: 901-908.

Sharma, N. and D.S. Verma, 2013. Importance of quality of work life in small scale industries for employees. Intl. J. Latest Res. Sci. Technol., 2: 495-492.

Srivastava, S. and R. Kanpur, 2014. A study on quality of work life: Key elements and it's implications. IOSR. J. Bus. Manage., 16: 54-59.