

NEED SATISFACTION AND QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE IN CHENNAI AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIES

Elamparuthi, D 

Dept of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, India

reedamn@gmail.com

Jambulingam, S

Dept of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, India

Abstract

Each organization wants to retain their experienced and talented human resources, to be a successful organization in the long run. Organizations are using Quality of Work Life (QWL) as a tool to retain talents. Need satisfaction theory was adopted in this study to understand the QWL practices of auto motive industries in Chennai. The questionnaire was administered with experts and validated with reliability test. The sample size for this study was 378. Regression analysis was done by need satisfaction as independent variables with QWL. Regression analysis indicate that the six variables Health & Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need were explaining 65.7% of quality of work life. By concentrating these six needs organizations can improve sixty five percent of quality of work life.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life, Need Satisfaction, Human Resource

INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is one of the tools for an organization to enhance its employees' productivity to gain competitive advantage. For any organization wants to achieve competitive advantage in the market place; they have to take care of one of their most precious asset, i.e., human resources. It is important that employees have to be getting satisfied in their working life. Work occupies a vital place in many people's lives; it is affecting their physical and psychological well being. In today's business scenario the organization has to maintain high quality personnel to get competitive advantage. Employees are the soft assets for the company. The productive work force will increase the productivity with efficient. This is the only way for any business organization to get the competitive advantage. Organization has to carryout regular assessments on Quality of Working Life to know their employees job satisfaction level, stress level, work related problems and home-work interface.

Quality of Work Life refers favorable or unfavorable of a total work environment and working conditions that excels people and the organization (Newstrom & Davis, 2005). An organization wants to attain effectiveness; it must enhance the QWL by job satisfaction through job involvement and commitment of their employees (Wilkinson 2006). QWL accentuates importance of providing opportunities to employees for contributing to their jobs and to receive more from their jobs. It can be considered as alternative approach to control and manage employees. In this approach employees are considered as asset to the organization. If the employees are allowed to participate in work related decision making, their performance will be better. An organization with high degree of QWL results in increased profits, accentuates demands in market and able to provide higher employment opportunities. QWL is providing satisfying working environment through collaborative efforts between employees and management. It also associated with job satisfaction, life satisfaction, morale, and effectiveness. It is concerned with the overall climate of work (Luthans 2005).

This study was carried out in automobile industry at Chennai city. This study was tried to explore the level of influence of the six need satisfaction variables Health & Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need on QWL.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Walton (1973) experienced and given eight important contributing indicators towards Quality of Work Life. They are fair and appropriate compensation, working conditions, utilizing and development of capacities, chance for growth and security, social integration in the organization, constitutionalism, work and the total life space, social and relevance of work. Mirvis & Lawler (1984) found that Quality of working life was related with satisfaction with wages, working conditions and working hours. Described the essentials of a good quality of work life was, safe work environment, equitable employment opportunities, equal wages and opportunities for advancement.

Baba & Jamal (1991) suggested the determinants of quality of work life and reasoned out that monotonous job and routine working activities were affecting the quality of working life negatively. The determinants of quality of work life were, job satisfaction, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, job involvement, job stress, work role overload, organizational commitment and turn-over intentions. Bearfield, (2003) adopted different approach and putting all 16 questions together while examining quality of working life, his observations and findings were clearly indicated that the causes of dissatisfaction in professionals were varied in different levels and suggested that different concerns might have to be addressed based on different parameters.

Sirgyet et al., (2001) numerous factors were affecting quality of working life. The important factors were, Need satisfaction based on job requirements, Supervisory behavior,

Work environment, Organizational commitment and Ancillary programmes. It is observed that quality of working life as fulfillment of all the key needs through resources and activities. Loscocco & Roschelle (1991) observed that, factors of work-related stress and balancing of work and non-work life domains were affects Quality of Work Life significantly and conceptually these were considered as determinant of Quality of Working Life.

Daud (2010) determined that Quality of Work Life was important for achieve employee job satisfaction and investigated the relationship between organizational commitment and quality work life was highly correlated. Also examined seven QWL variables namely participation, growth and development, supervision, physical environment, social relevance and pay and benefits. Identified quality work life was the key factor to achieve organizational commitment. Mohan & Ashok (2011) analyzed the drastic role of quality work life on employee's work performance. Many advantages were derived from Quality of Work Life. They examined variables related to Quality of Work Life such as adequate and fair pay, personal health, social well-being, job security, job satisfaction, interpersonal relations, growth opportunities, interpersonal relations with work and non-work life balance.

Emadzadeh (2012) Quality of work life directly affects the employees' job satisfaction and also influences in other than work life such as family, social needs and leisure. When the needs of employees do not met, feeling lot of work stress that will impact in employee welfare and job satisfaction. Zohir (2007) has been identified that financial benefit, security, social welfare, and leave provisions had impact on firm performance that lead to a positive impact on worker quality of work life. Also found that non-financial benefits were helped to achieve workers quality of wok life and improves firm performance. Examples were canteen facilities, attendance bonus, transport facilities, wage increment and festival bonus.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objectives for this study were,

1. To study the employees satisfaction level on their needs.
2. To study QWL practices in the automobile industries in Chennai.
3. To study the level of need satisfaction influences in QWL.

The need satisfaction theory is adopted in this study to measure QWL. The need satisfaction approach is based on theories of Maslow (1943), Herzberg (1966) and Alderfer (1972). This study assumes that the organization was fulfilling needs of the employees to sense the job satisfaction. Workers will get satisfaction towards their basic needs to the extent of their jobs meet their needs.

For this study the QWL construct was adopted from Sirgy et al. (2001), the six needs are conceptualized and termed as Health & Safety need, Economic need, Esteem need, Social need, Actualization need and Knowledge need.

In the questionnaire 14 items are related to overall work environment, supervisory behaviour and job requirements. The respondents are requested to respond each item by checking 5 point Likert scaling ranging from 1 represents Strongly Disagree to 5 represents Strongly Agree.

The six need satisfactions are measured using 42 items relating to the dimensions of need satisfactions. In this 42 items, 9 items are related to health and safety need, 9 items are related to economic need, 6 items are related to social need, 6 items are related to esteem need, 6 items are related to actualization need and 6 items are related to knowledge need. Each item is constructed in 5 point Likert scaling ranging from 1 represents Strongly Disagree to 5 represents Strongly Agree.

A total of 378 subjects from automobile industry employees from Chennai were participated in this study. Each questionnaire was carrying a covering letter mentioning objectives of the study and the confidentiality of their response. The participation in this study was made as voluntary. The questionnaire were distributed and collected personally.

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The details of the important demographic variables of respondents were shown in the table.1.

Table 1 - important demographic variable

		No of Respondents	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Employment Status	Permanent	147	38.9	38.9
	Internal Temporary	69	18.3	57.2
	External Temporary	92	24.3	81.5
	Apprentice	70	18.5	100
	Less than 1 year	47	12.4	12.4
Years of Experience	1 to 4 years	121	32.1	44.5
	4 – 8 years	137	36.2	80.7
	More than 8 years	73	19.3	100
Highest Educational qualification	ITI	70	18.5	18.5
	Diploma	132	34.9	53.4
	Under Graduate	141	37.3	90.7
	Master's degree	35	9.3	100

38.9 percent of employees were permanent, 42.6 percent of the employees were temporary. It is inferred that almost equal percent of employees were permanent and temporary. 32.1 percent of the employees were working in the same organization for 1-4 years and 36.2 employees were working in the same organization for 4- 8 years. The subjects were in a better position to give their sense of satisfaction on different needs. The subject respondents were considered as fair level of educated. The different education level shows the ease of knowledge transformation.

Table: 2 Mean, S.D, alpha for study variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha
QWL	2.83	0.42	0.83
Health & Safety need	2.93	0.38	0.73
Economic need	2.68	0.62	0.74
Social need	2.72	0.43	0.76
Esteem need	2.62	0.64	0.72
Actualization need	2.57	0.67	0.67
Knowledge need	2.53	0.68	0.73

N=378

Table-2 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 priority. Social need was at the second position and Economic need was at the third position. The standardized alpha values shown that the reliability of the questionnaire and has used to capture data for the study. The mean values are showing that all the companies were providing similar level facilities and maintaining above average. It is positive sign for organizational practices in the automobile industries.

Table 3 - Regression result of quality of work life with factors

Model	Standardized coefficient	T	Sig	Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1.523	1.743	0.003*		
Health & Safety need	0.763	6.324	0.001*	0.547	1.265
Economic need	0.864	6.572	0.000*	0.583	1.287
Social need	0.792	5.852	0.014*	0.632	1.843
Esteem need	0.841	7.352	0.004*	0.651	1.375
Actualization need	0.834	7.964	0.013*	0.597	1.749
Knowledge need	0.813	8.327	0.002*	0.594	1.648

*N=378 *significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

To get more understanding on the relationship Health & Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need with QWL, a regression analysis was run on the data. From table -3, as VIF is less than 5.3 and tolerance value is more than 0.19, the variables are acceptable as there are no multi collinearity issues.

From table-3, the standardized coefficient for Health & Safety need is 0.763, Economic need is 0.864, social need is 0.792, Esteem need is 0.841, actualization need is 0.834 and knowledge need is 0.813. The beta coefficients indicates the relative importance of each individual variables, thus it shows that economic need explains more of quality of work life. The test is carried at 5 percent significance level and for all the study variables P-value is greater than 0.05, so it is said to be that the factors influence was statistically validated.

Table 4 - Model summary of the regression analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std Error of the estimate
1	0.827	0.684	0.657	0.2374

- a. *Predictors: (Constant), Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need*
- b. *Dependant Variable: Quality of Work Life (QWL).*

The Model summary shows that these six variables Health & Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need were explaining 65.7% of quality of work life. Hence, by concentrating these six needs organizations can improve sixty five percent of quality of work life.

CONCLUSIONS

The above results were indicating that there is a significant relationship between Health & Safety need, Economic need, Social need, Esteem need, Actualization need and Knowledge need with quality of work life. Economic need is highly influencing for explaining the relationship among the six study variables with QWL. Employees having secured jobs and pay were feeling comfortable at the work place and this helps to sense their satisfaction with quality of life. Understanding workers feeling is crucial for management. A satisfied employee is contributing more and willing to participate well in any modifications and improvements proposed by the firm.

In this study, six types of needs were explaining 65.7% of quality of work life. It is important to find the other factors influencing quality of work life. Further studies can be carried for identifying the other factors, which are accounting for 34.3% of quality of work life. Quality of Working Life includes work life factors, life satisfaction and general wellbeing. Further studies

can be made to identify the influences of work related and non work life factors on quality of work life.

REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C. (1972) *Existence, Relatedness and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings* (New York: Free Press).
- Baba, VV and Jamal, M (1991) Reutilizations of job context and job content as related to employee's quality of working life: a study of psychiatric nurses. *Journal of organizational behavior*. 12. 379-386.
- Bearfield, S (2003) *Quality of Working Life*. Acirt Working paper 86. University of Sydney. www.acirt.com.
- Daud Normala , 2010, "Investigating the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms", *IJBM Vol.05, No.10*, (2010).
- Emadzadeh, Mohammad kazem, Khorasani, Mahnaz and Nematizadeh, Fateme. Assessing the quality of work life of primary school teachers in Isfahan city, *Interdisciplinary Journal of contemporary Research in Business*, January, 3(9), 2012, 438-448.
- Herzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the Nature of Man* (Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company).
- Loscocco, K. A. & Roschelle, A. N. (1991). Influences on the Quality of Work and Nonwork Life: Two Decades in Review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 182-225.
- Luthans, Fred. "Organizational Behavior", 9th edition, New York: McGraw Hill Co., 2005.
- Maslow, A. (1943) A theory of human motivation, *Psychological Review*, 50, pp. 370–396.
- Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984) Accounting for the Quality of Work Life. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*. 5. 197-212.
- Mohan N and Ashok J, 2001, "Measuring of Quality of Work Life in Textile industries – an integration of conceptual relationship with productivity", *IJRCM Vol.02, Issue 4*, (2001).
- Newstrom, John W. and Keith Davis. "Organizational Behavior at Work." New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 2005
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P & Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QoWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55, 241-302.
- Walton, R. (1973), — *Quality of Work life Indicators- Prospects and Problems- A Portigal Measuring the Quality of working life*, pp- 57-70, Ottawa.
- Wilkinson, A. "Empowerment: Issues and Debates", New Jersey: Heinemann, 2006.
- Zohir, S. C., (2007), "Role of Dhaka Export Processing Zone: Employment and Empowerment", Research Report, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka.