



ANTECEDENTS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE DELIVERING ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP AND STRATEGIC PROFIT POSITION

Nivedhitha.K.S^{1*}, Theerthaana.P²

^{1*2}Assistant Professor, Jerusalem College of Engineering, Pallikaranai, Chennai, India

Correspondence Author: nivedhithaks@yahoo.co.in

Keywords: Quality of work life; job profile satisfaction; work stress; team cooperation

Abstract

Organizations are increasingly indulging in quality of work life policies to actualize humanized work culture and improved retention rate. Many researchers have undergone intense discussions on various intrinsic and extrinsic antecedents of the quality of work life, yet the potentiality of team dynamics has not been given primal importance. This research is hoped to bridge the gap by considering dual questionnaires to analyze the requisites of diversified workforce (team leaders and team members). The research focused on 100 employees at Larsen and Toubro Ltd-LTM Business Unit, Chennai. Calculated χ^2 is found to be 10.18 (Tabulated $\chi^2 = 5.991$) proving unquestionable significant association between the job profile satisfaction and work stress. Positive Correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks is found with $R=0.91$ and positive correlation between team's cooperation and completion of team's target is found with $R= 0.72$. These results confirm the substantial influence of team cooperation and the right job profile in inculcating a conducive quality of work life

Introduction

Humanization of work is gaining significance and momentum across the globe. Walton (2007) laid emphasis on quality of work life (QWL) as an important approach to save human and environmental values which have been ignored due to technological advancement of the economic growth and productivity. Technological innovations have led many organisations into strong market leaders, yet the attrition rate and early retirement rate is devastatingly higher. In today's business world, organization should ensure gratification of the employee needs to deliver business sustainability. Considerable theoretical researches have implied the influence of self actualization, organizational citizenship, work life balance and perceived equity on organizational well being. The quality of work life is proving its royal presence with the evidence showing direct relationship between work related behavior and work environment (Greenhaus et al., 1987). The growth of self-actualization (Maslow, 1962) refers to the need for personal growth and discovery that is present throughout a person's life. Motivators involve factors built into the job itself, such as achievement, recognition, responsibility and advancement (Herzberg, 1966). The eminence of quality of work life is therefore unparallel and unquestionable, bearing the fact that employees are the soft assets and are the hidden value of a company (Abdeen, 2002). QWL is also found to affect employees' work responses in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to quit, organizational turnover and personal alienation (Carter et al. (1990), Efraty & Sirgy (1990), Efraty et al. (1991)). The purport of the research is to analyze different elements causing a satisfied quality of work life in perspectives of team leaders and team members. The research sheds light upon current working conditions, the level of cohesiveness among the employees and the factors that needs improvement for effective performance of the employees

Literature review

Various authors and researchers have proposed models of quality of work life which includes a wide range of profound categorical views. Proposed eight major conceptual categories relating to QWL are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity for continued growth and security, opportunity to use and develop human capacities, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and total life space and social relevance of work life (Walton,2005). Several published works have addressed the constructs that make up the QWL domain and key elements of QWL programs. Hackman and Oldham (1976) described that psychological growth needs are relevant to the consideration of Quality of work life. Such needs include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. In contrast, Lawler (1984) suggested that quality of work life is associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life".

The holistic view is captured by Taylor (1979) by identifying the essential components of quality of work life as basic extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions, and the intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work itself. Baba and Jamal (1991) listed what they described as typical indicators of quality of work life, including job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment and turn-over intentions. Sirgy (2001) confirms the key factors in quality of work life as need satisfaction based on job requirements, need satisfaction based on



work environment, need satisfaction based on supervisory behavior, need satisfaction based on ancillary programmes, organizational commitment. The need to correlate leadership dynamics with quality of working life is rising due to employees focus on equitable participation in decision making. Chung-Hsiung Fang, Sue-Ting Chang and Guan-Li Chen (2009) confirms that leadership style can affect organizational commitment and work satisfaction positively and work satisfaction can affect organizational commitment and work performance positively. This vindication clearly justifies the role of a leader in individuals' job satisfaction.

LooSee Beh, in his research, from the complete list of industrial firms, multinationals (MNCs) and small-medium industries (SMIs), found that the most important determinant of quality of work life is career achievement, followed by career satisfaction and career balance. The sample consists of executives from the hub of industrial free trade zones in the Klang Valley near Kuala Lumpur, in the prime areas of the location of the E & E industry where many of the MNCs as well as the SMIs are situated and is accessible.

Cheng S has discussed four different approaches to Quality of work life and they are employee share option scheme, joint management consultation, quality circle and industrial relations circle. Hanita Sarah Saad, Ainon Jauhariah Abu Samah and Nurita Juhdi, in their research, 'Employees' Perception on Quality Work Life and Job Satisfaction', concluded that quality of work life is directly related to job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with the previous researches done by Hagedorn (1994) as well as Olsen and Near (1994) as reported in Johnsrud (2002), where work life variables such as salary, perceived support of colleagues, satisfaction with the administration, work and non work conflict have been proven to directly affect job satisfaction. Cohen, Kinnevy & Dichter (2007) and Aryee, Fields & Luk (1999) have a similar finding which confirms that job satisfaction is one of the central variables in work and is seen as an important indicator of working life quality. Miller, Kirkman, Metz, Cooper, Mirvis & Lawler, in their study on 'Singaporean Employees Development', suggested four dimensions of Quality of work life labeled as, i) favourable work environment ii) personal growth and autonomy iii) nature of job and iv) stimulating opportunities and co-workers. The term quality of work life refers to the favorableness or unfavorableness of a total job environment for people (Davis and Newstrom 1985). It is definitely a comprehensive concept of conductive organization. Mirvis and Lawler (1984) suggested that quality of work life is associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life" as safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement, but this might not be suitable for the entire hierarchy of authority.

Research gap

The cohesiveness between the supervisors and subordinates are not considered as an aspect of quality of work life by many researchers. This study explores the various dimensions to analyze the level of cohesiveness among the employees which is still an unexplored zone. Since, there is a sea level of profound variation in the cognitive dispositions and attitudinal constraints between the managers and their subordinates, dual questionnaires are prepared for the team leaders and team members. Manufacturing sector across the globe insist on technical expertise and team cohesion for a greater productivity rendition. Saying that, this cohesion will have a butterfly effect on various parameters which may also include intrinsic job satisfaction and organizational citizenship. The study also step into the extrinsic and intrinsic dynamics relating to the work environment, job security, perceived equity and recognition from team members' perspective and supervision issues, cooperation of the team and perceived equity from team leaders' perspective.

Research methodology

The research is piloted to indicate whether the quality of work life is satisfactory in the organization. The study focuses on the various antecedents of quality of work life in Larsen and Toubro Ltd-LTM Business Unit. The descriptive research design is used for the study, which involves collecting information that explains people's beliefs, knowledge, attitude and behavior Fink (1995), Sommer & Sommer (1996). Convenience sampling method is exercised according to the availability of the employees at Larsen and Toubro Ltd-LTM Business unit, Chennai. LTM business unit is pre-pensed as the sampling unit. From the total population of 500 at LTM Business Unit, 100 samples were taken and appropriated with 60 samples taken from team members and 40 samples taken from team leaders. Initial organizational study is rendered to frame an effective questionnaire. Then the reliability of the questionnaire is verified through the pilot study. In this research, the primary data is collected through survey using questionnaire method and the secondary data (collected through internal sources including company history, organizational chart, company magazines and websites, and external sources such as literatures, books and websites) is not being neglected due to significant co-existing facts. Two set of questionnaires are specifically designed for team leaders and team members, as the criteria determining the quality of work life differs for the team leaders and team members. These dual questionnaires is hoped to serve the purpose of fulfilling the diversified needs of the workforce. Percentage Analysis, Chi-Square Test, Weighted Average Method and Karl Pearson's Coefficient Of Correlation are the tools used for the analysis.



Formulation Of Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1#

Numerous works on work life thereafter proved that what happened in the workplace have significant impact on individuals and their families. (Greenhaus & Powell (2006), Kossek & Ozeki (1998) and Lewis & Cooper (1987). Having said that, work stress is a major bottle neck issue, leading to physical and psychological dissonance. Questionnaire is designed with likert five point scale and closed ended dichotomous questions for the parameters job profile satisfaction and job stress correspondingly. Chi square analysis is used to examine whether there is a significant association between job profile satisfaction and work stress for the team members.

Hypothesis 2#

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation is used to determine whether there is a correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks. Questionnaire is designed with likert five point scale. Adequate training provides a substantial effect on quality of work. This analysis is anticipated to find whether adequate training paves way to higher efficiency, when the employees are placed in diversified work groups and positioned with diversified tasks. Team training is "useful for improving cognitive outcomes, affective outcomes, teamwork processes, and performance outcomes (meta-analysis of 45 published and unpublished studies conducted by Eduardo Salas, Deborah DiazGranados, Cameron Klein, C. Shawn Burke, Kevin C. Stagl, Gerald F. Goodwin, and Stanley M. Halpin (2014).

Hypothesis 3#

Target completion is the epitome of all the responsibilities of a team leader. Hypothesis is formulated to check the correlation between team’s cooperation and target completion. Since the team’s performance come under the eye of team leader, the response was collected from the team leaders’ perspective. Shuffler (2011) claims that specific teams have interventions distinctly particular to their own team. This specificity is verified by conducting correlation analysis between the team’s cooperation with the team leader and the completion of team’s target.

Questionnaire for team leaders

Section A has five questions with initial demographic questions. Section B is provided with team leaders’ opinion on subordinate-supervisor cohesion related framework(questions 6-12) and team leaders’ individual challenges and suggestions towards better work life prospects(questions 13-16). These questions have multiple choice and Likert five point rating method. Two open ended questions were also included to ensure independent suggestions without restrictions.

Questionnaire for team members

Section A has five items with initial demographic questions. Section B has a total of 18 questions. Items from 6 to 10 have job content and context related concerns. Items 11 to 13 deciphers the team members’ perception on team leader and their team cohesiveness. Items 14 to 17 are framed to capture the team members’ perceived satisfaction on the organisation’s extrinsic facilities, motivational preferences and work stress. These questions have multiple choice and Likert five point rating method. Open ended question is provided as the last part to mine the hidden values that might be overlooked in the questionnaire.

Data analysis and interpretation

Chi-square test is used to analyze association between two attributes. Two factors taken into consideration are job profile satisfaction and work stress (questions 6 and 14 in team members questionnaire. Null hypothesis (H0) of no significant association between job profile satisfaction and work stress and alternate hypothesis (H1) of significant association between the job profile satisfaction and work stress are designated

Table 1. Association between job profile satisfaction and work stress –calculation

O _i	E _i	(O _i – E _i) ² / E _i
7	12.25	2.25
6	6.42	.0275
22	16.33	1.968
14	8.75	3.15
5	4.58	.038
6	11.66	2.75
Total		10.18



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH SCIENCE & MANAGEMENT

Degree of freedom = (no. of rows - 1)* (no. of columns - 1) = (2-1)*(3-1) =2

Level of significance= 5%, Calculated $\chi^2 = 10.18$, Tabulated $\chi^2 = 5.991$

Calculated $\chi^2 >$ Tabulated χ^2 , hence there is a significant association between the job profile satisfaction and work stress. This finding is analogous to that of the existing study that have explored the significant associations between various job features and global distress, anxiety, and well-being of employees (e.g. Barnett and Brennan 1997, Hart 1999, Wilson et al. 2004).

Karl’s Pearson method is used to measure linear relationship between two variables. The relationship lies between -1 and 1. First analysis considers the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks (questions 8 and 9 in team member questionnaire) as two variables X and Y. H0 of no correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks and H1 of correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks are formulated

Table 2. Correlation between training provided for team members and efficiency

Response	X	Y	X*Y	X^2	Y^2
Strongly agree	5	7	35	25	49
Agree	14	17	238	196	289
Neutral	6	3	18	36	9
Disagree	22	19	418	484	361
Strongly disagree	13	14	182	169	196
Total	60	60	891	910	904

$$R = \frac{(n(\sum XY) - \sum X \sum Y)}{\sqrt{(n\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2) * (n\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}}$$

R=0.91, R lies between -1 and +1 and it is positive. Therefore H0 is rejected and there is a positive correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks.

Second analysis considers the team’s cooperation with the team leader and the completion of team’s target (questions 9 and 14 in team leader questionnaire) as two variables X and Y.

Table 3. Correlation between team’s cooperation and completion of team’s target

Response	X	Y	X*Y	X^2	Y^2
Strongly agree	5	1	5	25	1
Agree	12	18	216	144	324
Neutral	3	5	15	3	25
Disagree	19	12	228	361	144
Strongly disagree	1	4	4	1	16
Total	40	40	468	540	510

$$R = \frac{(n(\sum XY) - \sum X \sum Y)}{\sqrt{(n\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2) * (n\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}}$$

R=0.72

R is positive, thus proving a positive correlation between the team’s cooperation with team leader and completion of team’s target by the team leader.

Weighted average method is performed to decipher the overall rating of the team leaders’ coordination and rating of the work/life balance



Table 4. Rating of the team leaders' coordination

choices	Excellent	Very good	Good	Average	Poor
Weight	5	4	3	2	1
No. of respondents	2	5	15	29	9

$$\text{Weighted average} = \frac{\sum (\text{Weight} * \text{No of respondents for each choice})}{\text{Total No of respondents}}$$

$$\text{Total} = (5*2) + (4*5) + (3*15) + (2*29) + (1*9) = 142$$

weighted average = 142/60 = 2.4, from the solution, it is found that the overall rating of the Team leaders' coordination with the team members is above average but below the weight of the rating 'good'.

Table 5. Rating of the work/life balance

Choices	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
Weight	5	4	3	2	1
No. of respondents	1	11	17	10	1

$$\text{Total} = (5*1) + (4*11) + (3*17) + (2*10) + (1*1) = 121$$

weighted average = 121/40 = 3, which proves the display of good work/life balance. Drew, Humphreys and Murphy point out "that personal fulfillment is important inside work and that satisfaction outside work may enhance employees' contribution to work" (2003:13).

Results and general discussion

Analysis expose the fact that majority of the team leaders (90%) are above 40 years of age and have more than 10 years of experience. On the contrast, Majority of the team members belong to the age group of 20-30 years and have 1-5 years of experience with 70% and 85% respectively. Findings decipher the datum with a clear inequity between team members' and team leaders' age and years of experience. The team leaders and the team members show a clear contrast of generation X and Y. Millennials' or Generation Y ranges from 1982 to 2004 (Strauss and Howe) and Generation X, is the generation born after the Western Post-World War II (Robert Capa). One-size- fits- all strategy will definitely be a gateway to the devil's door. The organizational agendas have to be drafted accordingly to gratify the needs of the multi-generational workforce.

The analysis splurge even more deeply since the findings from Chi square analysis says that there is a significant association between the job profile satisfaction and work stress. Moreover, majority of the team members (26.7% on likert scale) are dissatisfied with job profile. The supporting facts include 45% disagreement with the fact that the recognition is given for their performance and 55% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the career growth. 60% of the team members also perceive recognition is their motivational factor. These results clearly predict that team members blaze out with work stress if their job profile is not being satiated.

Trained employees perform well as compared to untrained employees (Partlow, 1996; Tihanyi et al., 2000; Boudreau et al., 2001). The former assertion is analyzed and the argument continues with a positive correlation between the training provided for team members and efficiency in diverse work groups with diverse tasks. 50% of the team members step in unison to approve satisfaction with tools and techniques and an average coordination in the team. 35% of the team leaders strongly agree that the subordinates are well trained to meet the job standards.

The majority of the team members reported that they are dissatisfied with salary and incentives (36.7%), canteen is excellent (46.7%), safety measures are good (51.7%), welfare measures are good (40%). Findings of the research firmly confirms that extrinsic factors too play a pivotal element in quality of work life. This is in congruence with the vindication of Mirvis and Lawler (1984).

From the team leaders' perspective, it is highly recommended that a team leader can have a team size from 2 to 10 members since most of the team leaders say their team size is sufficient. Yet, this is subject to the content and construct of the job nature.

The team's cooperation with team leader and completion of team's target by the team leaders have a significant association as per the study. Nieva, Fleishman, & Rieck (1978) and Orasanu & Salas (1993), emphasizes that team members typically have different



and unique roles, each representing critical contributions to collective action. Therefore interdependence shoots in, which has to be carefully driven by the team leader.

Communication gap is the major issue faced during supervision and monitoring is the most challenging responsibility for 65% and 37.5% of the team leaders respectively. Meetings are being held only when need arises and delegation of work is being steered only on certain conditions for 42.5% and 50% of the team leaders.

These results go in unison with team members of 46.7% stating that participative management is average. These results reflect a mediocre focus on team cohesiveness. This view of team leadership is not consistent with functional leadership theory (McGrath, 1962) which in turn, may lead to devastating effects. 35% of the team leaders feel that transparency in promotion is a very good measure when compared to equal opportunity and work life balance to enlighten team members with high morale. Skip level meetings is hoped to solve the unresolved principal-agent issues in order to maintain the status-quo and Galatea effect can be achieved by designating workers as 'THE OWNER OF THE WORK'.

The notable positive feedback are gathered with the following facts: Skill utilization and job security have been acknowledged by 48.3% and 90% of the team members, with the overall rating of the Team leaders' coordination with the team members and work life balance is above average and good respectively.

The findings of the research brings out the intrinsic and extrinsic antecedents of quality of work life with considering team members and team leaders as different individuals with different attitudinal constraints and team cohesion as one of the major indicators. Employees are the soft assets and are the hidden value of a company (Abdeen, 2002). Undeniably, the organization can deliver optimum business results, if the quality of work life is ascertained.

Managerial implications

An organization, devoid of satisfied quality of work life, will tumble as in the case of Icarus paradox, irrespective of the business credentials. The study sheds light on the various concerns of the team leaders and team members at work place and provides organizations with a keen focus on team cooperation and its significance. Quality of work life results in better outcomes, the employees tend to display a greater sense of ownership and pride in their work, which will, in turn, put the company in a stronger strategic position. Retention of employees is now an extreme focal area of research, since organizations face high attrition. It is highly recommended that the organization should indulge in delivering exclusive training, consultative management with a combination of cafeteria reward system, to enliven the team. HR managers have to play a pivotal role in inverting the organizational pyramid for greater knowledge dissemination.

Though, the research contemplates to provide suggestions for the organization, employees should also be accountable for a beneficial quality of work life. Nadler and Lawler III (1983) stated that QWL refers to "an individual's perception of, and attitudes towards, his or her work and the total working environment". By inculcating a conducive attitude among the employees, organizations can scale up their businesses enormously.

Limitation and future research

The ramification of the research should be considered in light of several constraints. Though structured questionnaire with expert review is prepared to collect the data, self-administration of the questionnaire has its one drawback over the interviews. Limited views of employees can be attained through questionnaire. The response might be inaccurate due to misinterpretation of the respondents and 100% response is not assured. The stereotyped answers and biased response may cause uncertainty. Convenience sampling method is followed which may not give a bird's view. The research drew attention only to the plight of the employees and not to the plight of the organization. Since the research put forth the profound significance of the intrinsic nature of quality of work life, future researchers can focus on building a model for psychological impact of quality of work life. The research narrows its area only to the manufacturing company due to time constraint, which can be expanded to all the sectors in the forthcoming research. Employees who have a high level of well-being more cooperative, have a low level of absenteeism, timely and efficient, and can work longer at a company (Harter, Schmid, & Keyes, 2002). It is understood that wellbeing should be intrinsic and extrinsic to create a greater inventory of retained and satisfied employees. The training effectiveness can be studied through after and before research methodology in the future research. The study paves way to implement new models to map individual competency and organizational requirements, so that, self contained productive workforce can be ensured.

References

1. Chandranshu Sinha (2012), "Factors Affecting Quality Of Work Life: Empirical Evidence From Indian Organizations", Australian Journal of Business and Management Research Vol.11 No.11, pp. 31-40.
2. Bagtasos, Rivala, Maynard (2011), "Quality of Work Life: A Review of Literature", Business and Economic Review, pp.1-8.



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH SCIENCE & MANAGEMENT

3. Abdeen, T. (2002), "Company performance: does quality of work life really matter?, *Management Research News*", No.25, pp. 8–10.
4. DR.A.Jayakumar; K.Kalaiselvi, (2012), "International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research", Vol.1, Issue 10, pp. 2-5.
5. Ahmed, N. (1981), "Quality of Work Life, A need for Understanding, *Indian Management*", Vol.20 (II), pp.29-33.
6. Rose, Raduan Che, Beh, LooSee, Uli, Jegak, Idris, Khairuddin (2006), "Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions".
7. Beer, M., Spector, B., Lawrence, P. R., Mills, D. Q. & Walton, R. E. (1985), "Human Resource Management: A General Manager's Perspective (New York: The Free Press)".
8. 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.
9. Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P., & Carayon, P. (2008), "Quality of working life and turnover intention in information technology work", *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 18, pp.409–423.
10. Van Laar, D., Edwards, J. A., & Easton, S. (2007), "The Work-related quality of life scale for healthcare workers", *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60, pp. 325–333.
11. Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). "Theory and research on leadership in organization".
12. M. D. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., vol. 3) (pp. 147 – 197). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
13. Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. (in press), "The interface of leadership and team processes", *Group and Organization Management*, Special Issue.
14. Weick, K. E. (1995), "Sense making in organizations", Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
15. Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002), "Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes", *Journal of Management*, 28(6), pp. 787–810.
16. Ingram, H. and T. Desombre (1999), "Teamwork: Comparing Academic and Practitioners Perceptions", *Team Performance Management* 5(1), pp.16-22.
17. Hian, C.C., and Einstein, W.O., (1990), "Quality of work life (QWL): What can unions do? S.A.M. *Advanced Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 17-22.
18. Eaton, A.E., Gordon, M.E., and Keefe, J.H., (1992), "The impact of quality of work life programs and grievances system effectiveness on union commitment", *International and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 591-603.
19. Datta, Tanmoy (1999), "Quality of Work Life: A Human Values Approach", *Journal of Human Values*, Vol: 5, No. 2, (Oct), pp. 135-145
20. Lawler, E.E. (1975), "Measuring the psychological quality of working life: The why and how of it", in L.E. Davis and A.B. Cherns (Ed.), *The Quality of Working Life*, New York: Free Press, Vol. 1, (pp. 123-133).