

## Quality of Work-Life practice in chemical industries – Cuddalore (SIPCOT)

<sup>1</sup>D. Elamparuthi, <sup>2</sup>Dr. S. Jambulingam,

<sup>1,2</sup>Assistant Professor, Dept of Business Administration, Management Wing, DDE, Annamalai University.

---

**Abstract:** This study examines the relation between employees perceived Quality of Work Life (QWL) with life domains using spillover theory. For this study the subjects were employees from chemical industries at Cuddalore (SIPCOT). The QWL was measured using need satisfaction variables. The questionnaire was developed as to capture the needed information of the study variables. The sample size for this study was 227. The questionnaire was administered and reliability test was used to validate it. The regression analysis was done to find the level of influence on the dependent variables. The results showed that the employees who sensing higher level of QWL were sensing high level of job satisfaction, life satisfaction and general well-being. Fulfilling the needs of the employees by the organization can achieve higher level of QWL and organizational commitment from the employees.

**Keywords:** Quality of work Life (QWL), Job Satisfaction, Life Satisfaction, General Well-being, spill over.

---

### I. Introduction

In the fast changing global market, all organizations have to face challenges and able to grab the opportunities; the dynamic organizations are surviving in the competition by making necessary changes in the working environment and policies. The organizations need to have competent work force for constant improvement for achieving higher productivity. For any organization the success depends upon recruitment of individual, motivating and retaining of current workforce to maintain the organizational status in the competitive environment.

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is the favorable working conditions and workplace environment that enhance employee satisfaction by providing growth opportunity, job security and with rewards. QWL can be defined as the process of employees needs were addressed by an organization and the employees were included in the decision making process. QWL can be expressed as the degree to which organizational members able to satisfy their important needs through with their experiences in the organization. QWL emphasizes to identify and to improve the quality of professional and personal life of the employees.

QWL can be viewed as an individual's evaluation of working life. When the employees has positive feelings towards the job and his prospects, is motivated and performs well. Many researchers experienced and demonstrated that improvement in quality of work life will increase in productivity and overall organizational effectiveness as also reducing absenteeism, grievances and industrial accidents.

### II. Literature Review

Walton (1973) suggested eight major areas to understand Quality of Work Life (QWL). They were fair and adequate compensation, healthy and safe working conditions, human competency developments, growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism, total life space and social relevance of work life. Lawler (1982) conception was Quality of Working Life fundamentally related to well-being of employees and it was differentiated from job satisfaction. Quality of Working Life solely represents the workplace domain. Straw & Heckscher (1984) were studied factors contribute to QWL. They identified remuneration, healthy working conditions and social integration in the organization that enables individual to develop and deliver all his or her capacities; it enables the employees are the most important resources to the organization, by this they are responsible, trustworthy, and making valuable contribution and should be treated with respect and dignity.

Chander & Singh (1983) were indicating the influencing factors towards QWL from various other scholars conducted on quality of work life, which includes employment conditions, secured employment, income adequacy, sharing of profits, stock options, rewards, employee autonomy, commitment, social interaction, self-expression, self-esteem, satisfaction, democracy, involvement, career advancement, job enrichment, relationships with supervisors and peers. Danna & Griffin (1999) Quality of Working Life is a holistic concept, which considers work-based factors such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with wages and relationships with work colleagues and includes factors that predict the life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being.

Worrall & Cooper (2006) found in their recent survey showed that a lower level of well-being at work place was not good for organization. It leads to overall production loss and it increases in the long run. Muqtada

et al.,(2002) asserted that workers had their common complaints related to wage and working conditions. Management has to concentrate and make them to feel better. The major factors were such as working hours, working lunch, and late attendance. If the workers perceived that management pays them low and inadequate wages, less number of days in leave, long working hour without compensation and strict on late attendance. These issues create disputes and leads to job dissatisfaction.

Gupta & parul (2010) studied on Quality of Work Life of telecom sector employees and examined whether and how the Quality of Work Life affects the level of satisfaction of employees of telecom sector. Found that factors related to Quality of Work Life are influencing the job satisfaction and productivity. The factors has to be concentrated were fair compensation, adequate income, healthy working environment, safe working conditions, opportunity for personal development, opportunity for career growth, social integration, work force integration, social relevance of work constitutionalism in work organization and eminence of work life.

Sirgy et al., (2001) suggested spillover approach to Quality of Work Life. In this approach satisfaction on one life domain may influence in satisfaction of another life domain. Job satisfaction will affect other life domains such as financial, family, social, leisure, health and so on. There is balance of influence between and among life domains. Dissatisfaction in one domain is compensated by satisfaction in other domain. Wilensky (1960) some people's lives are more connected from one life domain to another life domains. Some people's maintaining segmented lives, some domains are not connected well. It indicated that little level of spillover from one domain to another domain.

Watson et al.,(1985) there are two kinds of moods and emotions people tend to bring in the workplace; with these while performing their jobs in the organization employees tend to experience positive affectivity and negative affectivity. Positive affectivity employees reflect enthusiastic feeling, active and alert but negative affectivity employees experiencing subjective distress and unpleasant nervousness. Nazir et al.,(2011) QWL is combination of policies, procedures, strategies and ambience relating to the workplace in order to achieve employee satisfaction by improving working conditions in the organizations. Lim (2008) Job satisfaction is important for employees as well as for the organization for its success because satisfied employees will be loyal to the organization. High level of QWL then the employees perceived high level of job satisfaction.

### **III. Research Methodology**

In this study Spill Over theory was adopted and the Research Hypothesis were,

Hypothesis 1: Perceived high level of QWL is higher the job satisfaction level

Hypothesis 2: Perceived high level of QWL is higher the life satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: Perceived high level of QWL is higher the well-being.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived high level of QWL is higher level of organizational commitment.

The measure of QWL questionnaire was having 34 items are based on the modified version developed by Sirgy et al (2001). The six major contributing needs towards QWL was taken in to this study to measure QWL. The six needs were health & safety, family need, social need, esteem need, actualization need and knowledge need. The employees were requested to respond each item by 5 point Likert scale ranging 1 be the strongly disagree to 5 be the strongly agree.

Job satisfaction was measured by 5 items adopted from Agho et al. (1992). the employees were requested to respond each item by 5 point Likert scale ranging 1 be the strongly disagree to 5 be the strongly agree.

Life satisfaction was measured by 14 items related to other life domains of the employees. The items were taken from Andrews & Withey (1976) and Efraty & Sirgy (1990). ). The employees were requested to respond each item by 5 point Likert scale ranging 1 be the strongly disagree to 5 be the strongly agree.

General well-being was measured by 12 items adopted from Goldberg (1978). The employees were requested to respond which they experienced during the previous two months by 5 point Likert scale ranging 1 be the strongly disagree to 5 be the strongly agree.

Organisational commitment was measured by 8 items used by Allen & Meyer (1990). The employees were requested to respond each item by 5 point Likert scale ranging 1 be the strongly disagree to 5 be the strongly agree.

A total of 227 subjects from chemical industries SIPCOT from cuddalore were participated in this study. A covering letter was attached with the questionnaire stating the confidentiality of their response and mentioned the objectives of the study. The participation in this study was made as voluntary. The questionnaire were distributed and collected personally.

### **IV. Data Analysis And Interpretations**

There were 18 percent of respondents age were less than 25 years, 22 percent of respondents belong to 25 – 30 age groups, 32 percent of respondents belong to 31 – 40 age groups, 17 percent of respondents belong to

41 – 50 age groups and 11percent of respondents belong to 51 years and above. 13 percent of respondent’s education was ITI, 34 percent of respondents were Diploma holders, 32 percent of respondents were Undergraduates and 21 percent of respondents were Master’s degree holders. The sample respondents were considered as fairly educated. 15 percent of the respondents were working in the current organization for less than one year, 31 percent of respondents were working in the current organization for the period of 1-3 years, 23 percent of respondents were working in the current organization for the period of 4 - 6 years, 13 percent of respondents were working in the current organization for the period of 7 - 9 years, 18 percent of respondents were working in the current organization for 10 years and above.

Table-1 presents the mean value, standard deviation and the reliability alpha value for the study variables. Among the six needs, Health and Safety need was highest on 5 point scale. Knowledge need was at the second position and Social need was at the third position. The standardized alpha values showing that the questionnaire was reliable and it has the ability to capture data for the study. The mean values for Job Satisfaction, Life satisfaction and General well-being are showing that all the companies were providing similar facilities and maintaining above average. It is a positive sign for the human resource practices in the industries.

Table:1 Mean, S.D, alpha

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standardized alpha
QWL – Needs Satisfaction (average)	2.83	0.42	0.81
Health and Safety need	2.96	0.53	0.86
Family need	2.61	0.47	0.84
Social need	2.82	0.62	0.89
Esteem need	2.64	0.67	0.84
Actualization need	2.71	0.64	0.81
Knowledge need	2.87	0.58	0.83
Job Satisfaction	2.53	0.74	0.78
Life satisfaction	2.64	0.76	0.83
General well-being	2.61	0.79	0.81
Organizational commitment	2.41	0.61	0.84

Table:2 correlation matrix of study variables

	QWL	Job Satis facti	Life satisf actio	Gene ral well-	Orga nizat ional com
QWL	1				
Job Satisfaction	0.671	1			
Life satisfaction	0.483	0.736	1		
General well-being	0.362	0.532	0.432	1	
Organizational commitment	0.381	0.421	0.374	0.286	1

\*correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N = 227

The table 2 shows that all the four variables were positively correlated with QWL. Job satisfaction is highly correlated with QWL and life satisfaction is second highest correlated with QWL. Job satisfaction and life satisfaction were showing strong positive correlation. This relationship is consistent with the previous studies by Rice et al., (1980) and Rain et al., (1991).

Table:3 Multiple regression Analysis results

Dependent Variable	Job satisfaction	Life satisfaction	General well-being	Organisational Commitment	
R square value	0.63	0.58	0.67	0.52	
F value	23.43	19.87	22.85	18.34	
Sig., (P –value)	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	0.00**	
Beta values of independent variables	Health & safety need	0.36	0.28	0.37	0.29
	Family need	0.43	0.23	-0.29	0.16
	Social need	-0.07	0.13	0.03	0.05
	Esteem need	0.08	0.42	0.63	0.07
	Actualization need	0.05	-0.16	-0.32	0.03
	Knowledge need	0.31	0.06	0.17	0.37

\*\* significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

N=227

The multiple regression analyses were present in the table-3. The six needs (as measure of QWL) were taken as independent variables, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, general well-being and organizational commitment were taken as dependent variables.

From the regression analysis, the significant predictors for job satisfaction were family need, health & safety need and Knowledge need. A high level of satisfaction on knowledge need was a strong predictor for job satisfaction. The ability to develop professional skills and job skills is an important element for employees to feel the job satisfaction. Job security, higher level of wages and family needs were strongly related to job satisfaction. The results was showing that the stated relationship, Perceived high level of QWL is higher the job satisfaction level is significant. These results are congruent with previous studies by Porter (1961), Hall et al., (1970) Danna & Griffin (1999).

From the table-3, using spillover theories the hypothesis was stated as perceived high level of QWL is higher the life satisfaction. This hypothesis was accepted and the individual who perceiving higher QWL tend to experience life satisfaction. The result shows that esteem need was the prime predictor for life satisfaction.

Results from the regression analysis supports the stated hypothesis, perceived high level of QWL is higher the well-being. The satisfaction on needs spill over in to employees sense of well-being. The major predictor health and safety need is positively associated with general well-being. But the other two major predictors, family need and actualization need are negatively associated with general well-being. This negative relationship is explained by equity theory.

The regression result supports the hypothesis of perceived high level of QWL is higher level of organizational commitment. From the table -3, knowledge need predicts most of the variance in the organizational commitment. The organization has to full fill the learning and knowledge needs to get higher level of organizational commitment.

## V. Conclusion

The analyses were supporting the stated hypotheses. It supports the spill over theory as employees satisfaction in one life domain is positively influence in other life domains. The needs are major contributor in QWL; sensing of QWL leads to sense job satisfaction, life satisfaction and general well-being. Fulfilling the needs of the employees by the organization can achieve higher level of QWL and organizational commitment from the employees.

## References

- [1]. Agho, A., Price, J. & Mueller, C. (1992) Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, pp. 185–196.
- [2]. Allen, D. & Meyer, J. (1990) The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, pp. 1–18.
- [3]. Andrews, F. & Withey, S. (1976) *Social Indicators of Well-Being* (New York: Plenum).
- [4]. Chander, Subash and Singh, parampal (1983), —Quality of work life in a University: An Empirical Investigation, *Management and Labour Studies*, Vol.18, No.2, pp. 97-101.
- [5]. Danna, K. & Griffin, R. (1999) Health and well-being in the workplace: a review and synthesis of the literature, *Journal of Management*, 25(3), pp. 357–384.
- [6]. Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 25, 357-384.
- [7]. Efraty, D. & Sirgy, M. (1990) The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioural responses, *Social Indicators Research*, 22(1), pp. 31–47.
- [8]. Goldberg, D. (1978) *Manual of the General Health Questionnaire* (Windsor: Foundation for Education Research).
- [9]. Gupta Meenakshi and Parul Sharma, 2010, “Factor credentials boosting Quality of Work Life of BSNL employees in Jammu Region”, *Sri Krishna International Research & Educational Consortium*, Vol.01, Issue02, (2010).
- [10]. Hall, D. H., Schneider, B. & Nygren, H. T. (1970) Personal factors in organizational identification, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, pp. 176–190.
- [11]. Lawler, E. (1982). Strategies for improving the quality of work life. *American Psychologist*, 37, 2005, 486-493.
- [12]. Lim, S 2008, 'Job Satisfaction of Information Technology Workers in Academic Libraries', *Library and Information Science Research*, vol 30, no. 2, pp. 115-121.
- [13]. Muqtada, M., Singh, A.M., and Rashid, M.A., (2002), “Bangladesh: Economic and Social Challenges of Globalization” *The University Press Limited, Dhaka, Bangladesh*. [A study prepared for the International Labor Office, Geneva].
- [14]. Nazir, U., Qureshi, T.M., Shafaat, T., & I. A., (2011). Office harassment: A negative influence on quality of work life. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(25), 10276-10285.
- [15]. Porter, L. (1961) A study of perceived need satisfaction in bottom and middle management jobs, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, pp. 1–10.
- [16]. Rain, J., Lane, I. & Steiner, D. (1991) A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: review and future considerations, *Human Relations*, 44(3), pp. 287–307.
- [17]. Rice, R., Janet, P. & Hunt, R. (1980) The job-satisfaction/life-satisfaction relationship: a review of empirical research, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 1, pp. 37–64.
- [18]. Sirgy, M., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. & Lee, Dong-Jin (2001) A new measure of quality of working life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories, *Social Indicators Research*, 55, pp. 241–302.
- [19]. Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher, 1984. QWL: New working relationships in the communication industry. *Labor Studies J.*, Vol. 9: 261-274.
- [20]. Walton, R. (1973), — Quality of Work life Indicators- Prospects and Problems- A Portigal Measuring the Quality of working life, pp-57-70, Ottawa
- [21]. Watson, D. & Tellegen, A. (1985) Toward a consensual structure of mood, *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, pp. 219–233.
- [22]. Wilensky, H. (1960) Work, careers and social integration, *International Social Science*, 12, pp. 543–560.
- [23]. Worrall, L. & Cooper, C. L. (2006). *The Quality of Working Life: Managers health and well-being*. Executive Report, Chartered Management Institute.