



Quality of work life and job satisfaction of employees in steel authority of India Ltd, Salem

¹ K Thirumalvalavan, ² Dr. AA Ananth

¹ Ph.D, Research Scholar, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India

² Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

The study aims at the relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction of employees. 453 employees in the steel plant participated in this study. There are two variables to measure quality work life are examined namely support from organization, working condition and compensation. These two variables are tested the relationship with job satisfaction and level of employees. The test indicated that each of the quality work life variables on its own is a salient predictor of Job Satisfaction. The researcher used correlation and cluster analysis in this study. It is found that quality of work life has a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. From the findings the researchers conclude that the Quality of work life is positively influence the job satisfaction.

Keywords: quality of work life, job satisfaction, working condition, compensation

Introduction

India is slow in adopting socio-technical system and improving quality of work life. The reasons are: the people in India generally are an adaptive to anything which is new. Initial resistance is evident in adopting anything is new, no matter how it improves the ability of the organization. The management tends to stick on to the traditional methods of getting work done from the employees. As such they did not take any measures to improve quality of work life for a long time. The employees of the workers in India are also not educated in general. They do not have much logical power. There is also a tendency as said earlier to stick on to the old rather than adapt to something new. Some of the unions even felt the measures for improving quality of work life by the management is nothing but getting more work done by the workers with no major costs. Improving quality of work life also involves considerable amount to be spent by the management. For example, Lahiri and Srivastava (1976) had found out from their study in one of the industries that extrinsic rewards are more important to the workers, whereas Dayal and Sharma (1975) in another similar study carried out in another industry concluded that intrinsic rewards are more important to the workers. In another-study, Dayal says that Indian labour prefer paternalistic approach of management while srivastava contradictorily says that workers would like to participate in decision making given an opportunity, based on one of his studies.

Job satisfaction with regard to one's feeling or state of mind is to regard the nature of their work. Job can be influenced by variety of factors like quality of one's relationship with their supervisor, quality of physical environment in which they work degree of fulfillment in their work, etc. positive attitude towards job is equivalent to job satisfaction whereas negative attitude towards job has been defined variously from time to time. In short, job satisfaction is a person's attitude towards

job. Job satisfaction is an attitude which results from balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job their evaluation may rest largely upon one's success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon perceived combination of the job and combination towards these ends.

Robbins (1989) defined quality of work life as a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decision that design their lives at work. Sinha (1974) defined job satisfaction as a "Reintegration of effect produced by individual's perception of fulfillment of his needs in relation to his work and the situations surrounding it.

Review of literature

Hanita Sarah Saad *et al.*, (2008) ^[4] analyzed the employees perception on quality of work life significantly influenced their job satisfaction. 251 employees in the university participated in this study. Ten variables to measure quality work life are examined namely support from organization, work-family conflict, relationship with peers, self-competence, impact on job, meaningfulness of job, optimism on organizational change, autonomy, access to resources and time control. All these variables are tested the relationship with job satisfaction. The test indicated that each of the quality work life variables on its own is a salient predictor of Job Satisfaction. However, Quality work Life variables are no longer significant predictors for job satisfaction when all the quality work life variables are entered into the regression equation. It is observed that meaningfulness of job, optimism on organizational change and autonomy are significantly related to job satisfaction.

Akinyele Samuel Taiwo (2010) ^[2] analyzed the impact of work environment on future worker's productivity. Primary data were used for this study that was generated through

structured questionnaires with close ended questions. T-test was used to test the research hypotheses. The respondents were randomly chosen from four selected oil and gas industry in Lagos metropolis. The results of T-test indicate that employee productivity problems are within the work environment. Conducive work environment stimulates creativity of workers. Improvement in work environment and bad working conditions contribute to low productivity and job satisfactions of employees.

Jeyarathnam and Malarvizhi (2011) [5] evaluated the quality of work life of sugar mill employees and analyzed the relationship between the productivity and quality of work life. The results of the study showed the intensity of working conditions and the behavioral aspects of the employees in the study area. It concludes that the basic strategy for improving the quality of work life is to identify employees' important needs and to satisfy those needs. The study also indicated that dissatisfaction might happen due to lack of recognition, employees grievances, tedious work, unhealthy peer relations, poor working conditions, low self-esteem, occupational stress, heavy work load, monotony, fatigue, time pressures, job insecurity, instability of job.

Shiney Chib (2012) [7] how quality of work life leads to high job satisfaction and the factors related to organizational performance. The study concluded that quality of work life has significant relationship with organizational performance. The quality of work life variables included company health and safety policy, worker free lunch, workers transport facility, maternal leave with salary for female workers, providing job related training, availability of leave, family life, living accommodation by employer, living in own hire house, and healthy & hygienic living accommodation. Thus the hypothesis on the positive relationship between Quality of Work Life and organizational performance is accepted.

Sorab Sadri and Conrad Goveas (2013) identified important quality of work life factors by studying employee perceptions on satisfaction towards certain quality of work life parameters. It is found that organizational success is highly dependent on attracting, recruiting, motivating, and retaining its workforce. The quality of work life pertains to favorable or unfavorable work environment in keeping employees motivated so as to enable increase per capita productivity. It aims at achieving an effective work place environment that satisfies both the organizational and personal needs and values of employees, promoting well-being by job security, job satisfaction, development and thereby helping to maintain a better balance between work and non-work life.

Ashwini and Anand (2014) [1] examined the influence of quality of work life dimensions on the overall satisfaction of the employees with the organization. Qualities of work life factors were examined to study the relationship with the overall satisfaction of the employees. Commitment to the organisation was considered the most important factor among the dimensions. Pearson's correlation analysis showed that all the factors were positively correlated to overall satisfaction. The recommendations provided in their study can be used by the organisations to rework on their policies to enhance quality of work life for employees that would have a positive impact on the attainment of business goals.

Ganapathi (2016) [3] investigated the Impact of factors

affecting quality of work life of workers and job satisfaction. The results show that salary, work environment, job security and personal growth are having positive impact on job satisfaction of workers in construction industry and there is no significant impact of factors affecting quality of work life of workers on job satisfaction.

Venkatesh and Arun kumar (2016) [8] examined the relationship between the variables of quality of work life, job satisfaction, and compensation. The instrument has been framed by using 8 parameters of the quality work life namely motivation, culture, Team participation, compensation, job security, comfort and satisfaction and performance based pay. The multiple regression analysis is used here to find out the Relationship between the overall dependent variable and independent variables. It is inferred that the variables namely motivation, culture, team participation, compensation, job security and satisfaction are highly Influencing variables to the overall quality of work life.

Scope of the study

This study aims at analyzing the quality of work life and job satisfaction of employees among steel industry in Salem. Salem is the most important places in the history of steel industry with maximum number of steel companies. Many men and women work there. The study is conducted in Salem steel company. Though these places are hub of steel industry, the culture, language, and perception of values and beliefs differs among people. So conducting this type of research and comparing it becomes the need of the day to add to the knowledge base of quality of work life concept.

This study emphasis in the following scope to identify the employee's level of satisfaction based on quality of work life and helps to organisation for conducting research. It is helpful to identify the employer's level of satisfaction towards welfare measure provided by the company and identifying the area of dissatisfaction of job of the employees in the organization.

Statement of the problem

Most research conducted in the field of quality of work life has focused on increasing employees motivation to work harder and produce more, fostering loyalty and creating more effective organizations. Studies have concentrated on reducing or eliminating cost involved in absenteeism and subsequent loss in revenue, for the benefit of the organization. At the same time, investigations have given attention to guaranteeing better remuneration and safer work environment for employees.

More value has been placed on the quality of work life in recent years. This is because it is believed that people deserve it that a satisfying work-life is good in and on itself (Stein, 1983). This views greater productivity versus quality as a value pursued for its own merit, which do not have to be in conflict. It is important to provide people with the highest quality of work life possible, whether or not it makes them more productive. So focusing on the quality of work life is the need of the day. This forms the base for this research. This research will specifically focus on the quality of work life experienced by the employees in the steel industry. This is intended to indicate areas that could cause job satisfaction among the employees.

Objectives

1. To find out the influence of quality of work life on the overall job satisfaction of employees.
2. To identified the overall level of quality of work life in the steel plant.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This research study is descriptive in nature and the technique were applied in this study is survey research. So, the researcher chooses the survey research technique for this study. The major strength of survey research is its wide scope and ability to collect detailed information form the respondents.

Sample Size

The aim of this study is to identify the perceptions on quality of work life and job satisfaction of employees. The target population for this research will be the Employees of Salem Steel Authority of India Ltd., Salem, Tamil Nadu. The sample size of the study is 453.

Data Collection

Primary Data

Primary data were collected from the original sources. Collection of primary data for current study was achieved through distribution of questionnaires to the Employees of Salem Steel Authority of India Ltd., Salem.

Secondary Data

Secondary data are already collected information that does not require direct access to the respondents. These data refers previous research works available in journals, articles from various printing Medias, websites, and other periodicals from libraries.

Data Analysis Tools

A detailed discussion of the data analysis procedure is presented here. At this stage, data analysis procedure is conducted thorough survey measure. Responses are coded and data entered and then analyzed using a computer program called statistical package for social science (SPSS). Statistical analyses of the data performed have used the following methods, cluster analysis and correlation.

Data Analysis

Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis was used to group the sample on the basis of their perception as high, moderate and low level in quality of work life and job satisfaction. K-means cluster is used to group sample on the basis of scores on the perceptions of employees to the independent and dependent variables. Followed by the cluster analysis, discriminant analysis has been adopted to validate the categorized cluster is really different or not.

Level of quality of work life

The responses of the steel plant employees about their quality of work life are grouped based on three levels such as high,

moderate and low using cluster analysis.

Table 1: Cluster analysis – Quality of work life

Determinants of Quality of work Life	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Working Condition	4.37	3.02	2.12
Compensation	4.18	3.09	2.68
Welfare and Social Security	4.21	3.85	2.03
Career Development	4.16	3.49	2.75
Job Security	3.86	3.21	3.69
Mean	4.156	3.322	2.654
Number of cases	287	62	104

The above table 1 shows the result of cluster analysis done to group the sample on the basis of opinions of employees. The cluster analysis classified the responses into 3 groups. These groups are named accordingly. The first group is named as 'High quality of work life group' as the mean (4.156) is higher than other two clusters. The second group is named as 'Moderate quality of work life group' with the mean value as 3.322. The final group is named as 'Low quality of work life group' as the mean (2.654) is lower than other two clusters.

Table 2: Discriminant analyses

Test of Function(s)	Wilks' lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1 through 2	0.098	1039.292	10	0.000
2	0.397	414.210	4	0.000

The reliability of cluster classification is verified using discriminant analysis. The five variables are taken as independent variables and the cluster classification is taken as groping variable. The above table 2 shows the discriminant functions of the three clusters. The Wilks' lambda for the first function is 0.098 and for the second function is 0.397. Wilks' lambda is the ratio of within-groups sum of squares to the total sum of squares. From the above table it is established that the two functions are distinct and they are significant at 0.001 levels.

Table 3: Level of Quality of work life

	Frequency	Percent
High quality of work life	287	63.35
Moderate quality of work life	62	13.69
Low quality of work life	104	22.96
Total	453	100.00

From the above table 3 there are 287 respondents showed high opinion with their quality of work life; followed 62 were perceived moderate opinion towards the quality of work life. About 23 percentage, there are 104 participants are not happy about their low quality of work life.

Level of job satisfaction

The opinions of the employees about their job satisfaction are grouped based on three levels such as high, moderate and low using cluster analysis.

Table 4: Cluster analysis – Job satisfaction

Determinants of Job Satisfaction	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Supervision	3.97	4.10	3.24
Amount of Work	3.31	4.18	2.01
Co-Workers	3.51	4.17	3.17
Financial Reward	3.44	4.85	2.41
Mean	3.55	4.325	2.707
Number of cases	74	315	64

The above table 4 presents the result of cluster analysis on the basis of level of job satisfaction. The cluster analysis classified the responses into 3 groups. These groups are named accordingly. The first group is named as ‘Moderate level of job satisfaction’ as the mean value as 3.55, the second group is named as ‘High level of job satisfaction’ as the mean (4.325) is higher than other two clusters. The third group is named as ‘Low level job satisfaction’ as the mean (2.707) is lower than other two clusters.

Table 5: Discriminant analyses

Test of Function (s)	Wilks’ lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1 through 2	0.737	137.078	8	0.000
2	0.086	6.533	3	0.000

The reliability of cluster classification is verified using discriminant analysis. The four variables are taken as independent variables and the cluster classification is taken as grouping variable. The above table 5 shows the discriminant functions of the three clusters. The Wilks’ lambda for the first function is 0.737 and for the second function is 0.086. Wilks’ lambda is the ratio of within-groups sum of squares to the total sum of squares. From the above table it is established that the two functions are distinct and they are significant at 0.001 levels.

Table 6: Level of Job satisfaction

	Frequency	Percent
High level of job satisfaction	315	69.54
Moderate level of job satisfaction	74	16.34
Low level of job satisfaction	64	14.12
Total	453	100.00

From the above table 6 there are 315 respondents showed high level of job satisfaction; followed by 74 respondents were perceived moderate level of job satisfaction. About 14 percentage, there are 64 participants are not satisfy about their job satisfaction.

Correlation Analysis

In order to find out the correlation between the overall quality of work life and overall job satisfaction and to test the following hypothesis Pearson’s Correlation test were used. Table 7 shows the correlation values between quality of work life and job satisfaction.

H0: There is no significant relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction.

Table 7: Correlation Analyses

		QWL	JS
QWL	Pearson Correlation	1	0.480**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000
	N	453	453
JS	Pearson Correlation	0.480**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	
	N	453	453

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above table 7 provides the correlation matrix of quality of work life (QWL) and job satisfaction (JS). Along with the significant value of the relation and the sample size (N) are displayed. It is evident from the table quality of work life is positively related to the level of satisfaction with the coefficient of $r=0.48$, which is significant at $p<0.001$. So the hypothesis (H0) is rejected and there is a significant positive relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction.

Findings

- It is found from the cluster analysis, there are 287 respondents showed high opinion with their quality of work life; followed 62 were perceived moderate opinion towards the quality of work life. About 23 percentage, there are 104 participants are not happy about their low quality of work life.
- Regarding the level of job satisfaction, cluster analysis revealed that there are 315 respondents showed high level of job satisfaction; followed by 74 respondents were perceived moderate level of job satisfaction. About 14 percentage, there are 64 participants are not satisfy about their job satisfaction. At overall majority of the respondents is shown high job satisfaction on their organization.
- Correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between the overall quality of work life and overall job satisfaction. It is found that quality of work life has a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction.

Suggestion

The organization should focus on taking appropriate measures to improve the quality of work life level of employees by providing safety equipment and conducting safety and first aid training programmes periodically. Since it is a steel plant there is a possible to have unfortunate situations, thus safety equipment and knowledge on first aid will help to influence employees’ job attitude. It gives a safety and confident work environment in that it increases the productivity.

Conclusion

This research aimed at examining the relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction of employees. Both quality of work life and job satisfaction is highly important for all kind of employees to achieve high productivity. Hence, the management should take necessary steps to improve both quality of work life and job satisfaction of the employees. The study concluded that the overall quality of work life is positively influenced job satisfaction of the employees.

References

1. Ashwini J, Anand D. Quality of Work Life Evaluation among Service Sector Employees. *Journal of Business and Management*. 2014; 16(9):01-12.
2. Akinyele Samuel Taiwo. The influence of work environment on workers' productivity: A case of selected oil and gas industry in Lagos, Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*. 2010; 4(3):299-307.
3. Ganapathi R. A study on quality of work life of workers in construction industry in Madurai district. *Journal of Management Research and Analysis*, 2016.
4. Hanita Sarah Saad, Ainon Jauhariah Abu Samah and Nurita Juhdi. Employees' Perception on Quality Work Life and Job Satisfaction in a Private Higher Learning Institution. *International Review of Business Research Papers*. 2008; 4(3).
5. Jayarathnam M, Malarvizhi VR. Quality of work life among sugar mill employees, a study in Tamilnadu, *ZENITH International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research*. 2011; 1(3).
6. Sinha D, Agarwal VJ. Job satisfaction and general adjustment of Indian. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relation*. 1974; 10(1):3-14.
7. Shiney Chib. Quality of work life and organizational performance parameters at workplace, *SEGi Review*. ISSN1985-5672. 2012; 5(2):36-47.
8. Venkatesh S, Arun kumar S. a comparative study on quality of work life in it, banking and psusectors in tamil nadu, *International Journal of Business and General Management (IJBGM)*, ISSN(P): 2319-2267; ISSN(E): 2319-2275. 2016; 5(6).
9. Walton RE. Quality of Work Life, What Is It? *Sloan Management Review Journal*. 1973, 11-21.