

Employee's Perception about Quality of Work-life: An Insight of JKEDI

Shahid Ali

Abstract

In the recent past, Quality of Work Life is being used as a strategic tool to attract and retain the talent by the organizations. QWL policies are progressively becoming part of the business strategies and focus is on the potential of these policies to influence employee's quality of working life and more importantly to help them maintain work-life balance with equal attention on performance and commitment at work. This present study aims at investigating the quality of work life of staff members working in the Entrepreneurship Development Institute, Kashmir. The analysis has been done by classifying the teachers into various age, work-experience and education qualification categories.

Keywords: Quality of Work-life; Chi Square Analysis; JKEDI.

Introduction

Quality of work life (QWL) can be defined as an extent to which an employee is satisfied with personal and the working needs through participating in the workplace while achieving the goals of the organization. Louis and Smith (1990) [5] research identified the importance of QWL in reducing employee turnover and employee well-being impacting on the services offered. According to Harrison (1985) [1], QWL is the degree to which the working organization contributes to material and psychological well-being of its members. According to the Margolis American Society of Training and Development (1979) [6], it is a process of work organization which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organization's environment, methods and outcome. Trehan Ruchi (2004) [7] concluded that employees in service industry discharge their duties with commitment and involvement only if their quality of work life is improved. Rose et al., (2006) [4]

concludes that three exogenous variables are significant: career satisfaction, career achievement and career balance in QWL. Subrahmanian M and Anjani N (2010) [8] studied the meaning of QWL; it was found that from the research pointed out some areas with respect to the factors of Quality of Work Life in both the industries that need special attention. Hackmen and Oldham (1980) highlight the constructs of QWL in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. Putt and Springer (1980) analyzed about the nine independent variables by using bi-variant and/or multivariate analysis in assessing their impact on professional satisfaction. Normala and Daud (2010) [9,10] concluded that the quality of work life of employees is an important consideration for employers interested in improving employee's job satisfaction and commitment. Islam & Siengthai, (2009) [15] concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between QWL and employees' job satisfaction.

JKEDI has been established by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir in March 1997 to effectively enable entrepreneurship development in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. The institute started its regular activities from February 2004 and has positioned itself as a learning Centre par excellence with the art regional centers across Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. Besides, JKEDI Community Organizers are in all of the 22 districts enabling entrepreneurship and promoting development at

Author's Affiliation: Research Scholar, Dept. of Management Studies, Islamic University of Science and Technology, Jammu and Kashmir 192122, India.

Corresponding Author: Shahid Ali, Research Scholar, Dept. of Management Studies, Islamic University of Science and Technology, Jammu and Kashmir 192122, India.

E-mail: dihah7692@yahoo.com

Received on 18.10.2018, **Accepted on** 14.11.2018

the grassroots. The major schemes of Jammu and Kashmir entrepreneurship development institute are Youth start-up loan scheme (YSLs), Seed capital fund scheme (SCFS), Himayat self-employment component & National minorities development and finance corporation (NMDFC) schemes.

Swamy et al., (2015) [11] investigated the dimensions of Quality of Work Life of employees in Mechanical Manufacturing Small and Medium sized Enterprises (SMEs) in Karnataka, India. The following nine significant dimensions were identified as follows: Work environment, Organization culture and climate, Relation and co-operation, Training and development, Compensation and Rewards, Facilities, Job satisfaction and Job security, autonomy of work, adequacy of resources. The present study has focused on these dimensions to determine the QWL of staff members of JKEDI.

Objectives

1. To study the need and importance of quality of work life of employees.
2. To study the perception level of the staff members of JKEDI regarding the quality of work life (QWL).
3. To suggest the appropriate measures to improve the quality of work life of the staff members of JKEDI.

Hypothesis

H1₀: There is no significant difference between the age and quality of work life of the respondents.

H2₀: There is no significant difference between the work experience and quality of work life of the respondents.

H3₀: There is no significant difference between the education qualification and the quality of the respondents.

Methodology of the Study

On the basis of Data collection method, it is a communication study, the questions were posed to the subjects i.e., staff members and collection of their responses through Self-completion questionnaires. On the basis of time dimension, it is a Cross-sectional study, as it was carried out once and represents a snapshot of one point in time. On the basis of topical scope of study, it is a Statistical study, as it attempted to capture a

population's characteristics by making inferences from a sample's characteristics. Hypotheses were tested quantitatively. On the basis of research environment, it was a Field setting study, as it took place under actual environmental conditions. Likert five-point scale was used with "strongly disagree" as 1 and "strongly agree" as 5.

Sampling is the selection of some part of an aggregate or whole on the basis of which a judgment about the aggregate or whole is made. Simple random sampling method was used in this project. For a research study to be perfect the sample size selected should be optimal i.e. it should neither be excessively large nor too small.

Primary data was collected through questionnaires that were distributed to staff members of JKEDI. Convenience sampling method was opted to collect the primary data. The primary data was collected by means of a structured questionnaire. In the present study, the sample size for the data collection was taken 90. But the valid questionnaires received and filtered resulted in 76 valid samples and 14 invalid samples. The response rate was 84.44%. It was based on the no. of items in the questionnaire (18*5 = 90) as per Hair et al. (2010) [13]. Hair et al. (2010) [14] suggested for 5 or 10 cases for per question or item in the study. Descriptive statistics and Chi-Square analysis was used through Microsoft Excel in order to analyse the data.

Data Analysis

Table 1: Demographic Statistics

Demographic variable	No. of respondents	Percentage (%)	
Age	Upto 20 years	8	11
	21 - 30 years	20	26
	31 - 40 years	45	59
	Above 40 years	3	4
Work Experience	Less than 1 year	3	4
	1 - 5 years	39	51
	5 - 10 years	27	36
	More than 10 years	7	9
Education qualification	Upto matriculation	7	9
	Graduate	10	13
	Post Graduate	55	72
	Higher	4	5

Table 1 represents the demographic profile of the respondents (staff members). 11 percent of the respondents are Upto 20 years of age, 26 percent of the respondents are 21 - 30 years of age, 59 percent

of the respondents are 31 - 40 years of age and 4 percent of the respondents are above 40 years of age. 4 percent of the respondents have less than 1 year of experience, 51 percent of the respondents have 1 - 5 years of experience, 36 percent of the respondents have 5 - 10 years of experience and 9 percent of the respondents have more than 10 years of experience. 9 percent of the respondents have qualification up to matriculation, 13 percent of the respondents are Graduate, 72 percent of the respondents are post graduate and 5 percent of the respondents have other higher education qualification.

Chi Square Analysis

Table 2: Age

Age\QWL	1	2	3	4	5	total
Upto 20	9	25	39	45	26	144
21-30	27	60	97	100	76	360
31-40	76	166	224	214	130	810
above 41	7	10	20	13	4	54
total	119	261	380	372	236	1368

Hypothesis:

Null hypothesis H1₀: There is no significant difference between the age and quality of work life of the respondents.

Alternate hypothesis H1: There is significant difference between the age and quality of work life of the respondents.

Table 3:

Observed(O)	Expected(E)	O - E	(O-E) 2	(O-E) 2 / E
9	12.52	-3.52	-7.04	-0.56
27	31.31	-4	-8	-0.25
76	70.46	5.54	30.69	0.43
7	4.69	2.31	5.33	0.64
25	27.47	-2	-4	-0.14
60	68.68	-8	-16	-0.23
166	154.5	11.5	132.2	0.85
10	10.26	-0.26	-0.52	-0.05
39	40	-1	-2	-0.05
97	100	-3	-6	-0.06
224	225	-1	-2	-0.008
20	15	5	25	1.66
45	39.15	5.85	34.22	0.87
100	97.89	2.11	4.45	0.04
214	220.2	-6.2	-12.4	-0.05
13	14.68	-1.68	-3.36	-0.22
26	24.84	1.16	1.34	0.05
76	62.10	13.9	193.2	3.11
130	139.7	-9.7	-19.4	-0.13
4	9.31	-5.31	-10.62	-1.14
				= 5.212

The critical value for the chi-square statistic is determined by the level of significance (typically .05) and the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom for the chi-square are calculated using the following formula: $df = (r-1) (c-1)$ where r is the number of rows and c is the number of columns. Here, the calculated value is 5.212 and the table value for degree of freedom is 12 [(4-1)* (5-1)] at 5% level of significance is 21.026. Since Table value > Calculated Value, the data failed to reject Null Hypotheses and thus supports that there is no significant difference between the age and the quality of work life of the respondents.

Work Experience

Table 4:

Work Exp. \QWL	1	2	3	4	5	total
Less than 1 year	4	13	17	10	10	54
1 - 5 years	72	144	209	173	104	702
5 - 10 years	36	85	111	148	106	486
More than 10 years	7	19	43	41	16	126
total	119	261	380	372	236	1368

Hypothesis

Null hypothesis H2₀: There is no significant difference between the work experience and quality of work life of the respondents.

Alternate hypothesis H2: There is significant difference between the work experience and quality of work life of the respondents.

Table 5:

Observed(O)	Expected(E)	(O - E)	(O-E) 2	(O-E) 2 / E
4	4.69	-0.69	-1.38	-0.29
72	61.06	10.94	119	1.94
36	42.2	-6.2	12.4	0.29
7	24.03	-17.03	-34.06	-1.41
13	10.30	2.7	7.29	0.70
144	133.9	10.1	102.01	0.76
85	92.72	-7.17	-14.34	-0.15
19	24.0	-5	-10	-0.41
17	15	2	4	0.26
209	195	14	196	0.005
111	135	-24	-48	-0.35
43	35	8	64	1.82
10	14.1	-4.1	-8.2	-0.58
173	190.8	-17.8	-35.6	-0.18
148	132.1	15.9	252.8	1.91
41	34.26	6.74	45.4	1.32
10	9.31	0.69	0.47	0.05
104	121.1	-17.1	-34.2	-0.28
106	83.84	22.16	491.0	5.85
16	21.73	-5.73	-11.46	-0.52
				=11.305

The critical value for the chi-square statistic is determined by the level of significance (typically .05) and the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom for the chi-square are calculated using the following formula: $df = (r-1) (c-1)$ where r is the number of rows and c is the number of columns. Here, the calculated value is 11.305 and the table value for degree of freedom is 12 [(4-1)* (5-1)] at 5% level of significance is 21.026.

Since Table value > Calculated Value, the data failed to reject Null Hypotheses and thus supports that there is no significant difference between the work experience and quality of work life of the respondents.

Education Qualification

Table 6:

Education Qualification\QWL	1	2	3	4	5	total
Upto Matriculation	12	26	32	41	15	126
Intermediate - Graduate	14	42	48	51	25	180
Post Graduate	90	178	280	262	180	990
others	3	15	20	18	16	72
total	119	261	380	372	236	1368

Hypothesis

Null hypothesis H3₀: There is no significant difference between the education qualification and the quality of the respondents.

Alternate hypothesis H3: There is significant difference between the education qualification and the quality of the respondents.

Table 7:

Observed(O)	Expected(E)	(O - E)	(O-E) 2	(O-E) 2 / E
12	10.96	1.04	1.08	0.09
14	15.65	-1.65	-3.3	-0.21
90	86.11	3.89	15.13	0.17
3	6.26	3.26	10.62	4.36
26	24.03	1.97	3.88	0.16
42	34.34	7.66	58.67	1.70
178	188.8	-10.8	-21.6	-0.11
15	13.73	1.27	1.61	0.11
32	35	-3	-6	-0.17
48	50	-2	-4	-0.08
280	275	5	25	0.09
20	20	0	0	0
41	34.26	6.74	45.42	1.32
51	48.94	2.06	7.50	0.15
262	269.2	-7.2	-14.4	-0.05
18	19.57	-1.57	-3.14	-0.16

15	21.73	-6.73	-13.46	-0.61
25	31.05	-6.05	-12.1	-0.38
180	170.7	9.3	86.49	0.5
16	12.42	3.58	12.81	1.03
				=6.61

The critical value for the chi-square statistic is determined by the level of significance (typically .05) and the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom for the chi-square are calculated using the following formula: $df = (r-1) (c-1)$ where r is the number of rows and c is the number of columns. Here, the calculated value is 6.61 and the table value for degree of freedom is 12 [(4-1)* (5-1)] at 5% level of significance is 21.026.

Since Table value > Calculated Value, the data failed to reject Null Hypotheses and thus supports that there is no significant difference between the education qualification and the quality of the respondents.

Suggestions

1. The institute needs to make sure that proper communication flow is made between the different departments which can lead to effective and efficient working of the institution.
2. By creating a friendly circumstance within the institute, the employees would enjoy working with their colleagues not considering any difference among them.
3. Employees should be satisfied by providing their appraisal/bonus/incentives on time which will make them happy at work in turn they will lead their life happily.
4. Among many other facilities that need to be there transportation facility should be given preference and make sure its benefit reaches out to all employees.
5. The institute can come up with social benefit schemes for the employees so that in turn the workforce can get more motivated.
6. The company can provide facilities to their employees to help them to balance their scales.
7. The institute can ultimately create a more satisfied workforce that contributes to productivity and success in the work place.
8. More training programs should be conducted for the employees.

Conclusion

"A study on Employee's Perception about Quality of work life: An insight of JKEDI" focuses on analyzing the prominence of Quality of Work Life. To conclude with the study, it is found that the Quality of WorkLife among the staff members of JKEDI is moderate. By hypothesis testing, it resulted in no significant difference between the age and the quality of work life of the respondents, no significant difference between the work experience and quality of work life of the respondents & no significant difference between the education qualification and the quality of the respondents. From the research it is well identified that quality of work life is effectively among the staff members of JKEDI, yet there are certain areas that are still to be covered for better Quality of Work Life (QWL) and the management should take necessary initiatives to overcome these barriers. Based on the information collected from the employees, they are satisfied with the activities of quality of work life.

The busy work schedule of the employees and the short span of duration of communication with them was a constraint for the study. The findings were substantially based on information given by the respondents and in many cases, subjective bias cannot be completely ruled out.

References

1. Harrison TM. Communication and Participative Decision Making: An Exploratory Study; *Personnel Psychology*, 1985;1:97-116.
2. Hackman JR and Oldham, GR. *Work Redesign*, Addison-Wesley, 1980.p.90.
3. Putt AD & Springer JF. Quality of Work Life among Public Administration Professors. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 1980;2(2):225-46.
4. Rose RC, Beh L, Uli J & Idris K. Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2006;2(2):61-67.
5. Louis KS & Smith B. *Teacher working conditions. Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity*, 1990.pp.23-47.
6. Margolis J. ASTD 1979-80: A Time of Challenge. *Training and Development Journal*, 1979;33(5):41-43.
7. Trehan Ruchi. Thesis, *Quality of Working Life: A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural School Teachers in Punjab*. 2004.
8. Subrahmanian M & Anjani N. Constructs of quality of work life—a perspective of textile and engineering employees. *Asian Journal of Management Research*. 2010;1(1):299-307.
9. Normala D. Investigating the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms. *International journal of business and management*. 2010;5(10):75.
10. Daud N. Quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst academic staff: Empirical evidence from Malaysia. In *Education and Management Technology (ICEMT)*, 2010 Nov.pp. 271-275. *International Conference on IEEE*.
11. Swamy DR, Nanjundeswaraswamy TS & Rashmi S. Quality of work life: scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 2015;8(2):281.
12. JKEDI. Official website. Retrieved from <http://jkedi.org/Index.aspx>
13. Hair JF. *Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson College Division. 2010.
14. Hair JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL & Black WC. *Multivariate data analysis*, 5th. NY: Prentice Hall International. 1998.
15. Islam M Z & Siengthai S. Quality of work life and organizational performance: Empirical evidence from Dhaka Export Processing Zone. In *ILO Conference on Regulating for Decent Work*, Geneva 2009 Jul.pp.1-19.