



## Study on Impact of Quality of Work Life on Job Performance amongst Employees of Secunderabad Division of South Central Railway

Hosmani A.P. and Shambhushankar, Bindurani. R.

Department of Commerce and Management, Gulbarga University Gulbarga, INDIA

Available online at: [www.isca.in](http://www.isca.in), [www.isca.me](http://www.isca.me)

Received 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014, revised 25<sup>th</sup> October 2014, accepted 4<sup>th</sup> November 2014

### Abstract

*This paper aims to analyze the impact of Quality of work life (QWL) and Employee performance among the employees of Secunderabad division of South Central Railway. Several aspects of QWL have analyzed including working conditions, safety measures, welfare practices, career development opportunities, etc. QWL was regarded as a variable which focused on outcomes, such as job satisfaction and mental health, with their emphasis on the impact of work on the individual. Quality of Work Life programs when implemented lead to greater growth and development of the individual as a person as a productive employee of an organisation, develop trust between managers and employees, attract and keep talented staff, build strong employee commitment, strengthen work place learning and improve overall effectiveness of an organisation. The study consists of a sample of 100 employees working at different departments; the samples have chosen using randomized sampling technique. The results revealed that the employees in general were satisfied with the different measures of quality of work life programs in the organisations which enhances the employee job satisfaction which in turn enhances the employee job performance.*

**Keywords:** Quality of work life, Job performance, career development, safety measures, welfare practices, performance.

### Introduction

In the modern management tradition, satisfaction with quality of work life (QWL) was thought to be based solely on extrinsic traits of the job: salaries and other tangible benefits, and the safety and hygiene of the workplace. By contrast, the human relations approach stresses that, while extrinsic rewards are important, intrinsic rewards are key predictors of productivity, efficiency, absenteeism and turnover. These intrinsic rewards include traits specific to the work done, the task content, skill levels, autonomy and challenge<sup>1</sup>. According to Rose, Beh, Uli and Idris (2006) QWL is a philosophy or a set of principles, which holds that people are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making a valuable contribution to the organisation<sup>2</sup>. QWL is a collective responsibility of the management, employees, and union leaders, government and behavioural scientists<sup>3</sup>. Quality of work life is a process of work organisations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in sharing the organisational environment, methods and outcomes. It covers variety of programmes, techniques, theories and management styles through which organisations and jobs are designed to grant employees more autonomy, responsibility, and authority<sup>4</sup>. Human resource department of the organisation need to take up QWL programs like training and development, career planning, safety and security measures, employee welfare practices etc. which enhances the performance of employees' on their job. Different QWL approaches have ramifications within and also outside the organisation<sup>5</sup>. Management need to focus on improving areas of QWL viz., work life balance, quality circles, leadership,

workers participation in management, stress management, working environment, open communication etc<sup>6</sup>.

The quality of workers output is influenced by their total environment quality of work affects quality of life in families and communities, quality of work life reflects the relationship that exist between the workers and the environment, which is determined by how the workers are adjusted to their work<sup>7</sup>.

Performance refers to the degree of accomplishment of tasks that make up an individual job. It indicates how well an individual is fulfilling his\ her job demands. Performance is always measured in terms of results not efforts. Performance improvement seems to be a refreshing approach<sup>8</sup>. Now, it is taken for granted that training cannot exist in isolation and it has to be serving the purpose of contributing to organisational performance. It is agreed that the more satisfied employee on the job perform well on the job and show a greater commitment towards the work and the organisation<sup>9</sup>. To use full capabilities of the employees the employer should motivate them with rewards, recognition, job security, promotions, fair compensation, career development opportunities which collectively called as quality of work life measures<sup>10</sup>.

The South Central Railway is one of the 16 railway zones in India. It was created on 2 October 1966 as the ninth zone of Indian Railways. It is headquartered at Secunderabad and has six divisions namely., Secunderabad, Hyderabad, Guntakal, Vijayawada, Guntur, and Nanded<sup>11</sup>.

South Central Railway plays a pivotal role, as a catalyst for agricultural and industrial development in the Southern peninsula apart from fostering the growth of trade and commerce including import/export through ports by connecting sea ports with their hinterland and inland container depots. In its forty six years of committed service and path breaking progress has built a modern system of mass transportation fulfilling the aspirations of the passengers/ customers and carved the niche for itself in Indian Railway System.

**Review of Literature:** Raduon Che Rose et al. (2006) An empirical study was done to predict QWL in relation to career-related dimensions. The sample consists of 475 managers from the free trade zones on Malaysia for both multinational corporations (MNCs) and small and medium industries (SMIs). The results indicate that three exogenous variables are significant: career satisfaction, career achievement, and career balance, with 63 per cent of the variance in QWL<sup>13</sup>.

Indrasen Singh (2007) a study has been made to measure the job satisfaction of professional drivers. This study looks at driver's opinion about specific areas of their work and how important these areas are to their job satisfaction. Management's perceptions of drivers are also addressed and compared with driver opinions. Job satisfaction is hypothesized to measure driver productivity, turnover among current drivers, new driver attraction and the number of drivers leaving the industry. Strategies are suggested to help managers incorporate these results into a plan of action<sup>14</sup>.

Bani Kochar (2008) reveals that combination of three prominent dimensions i.e., Balance (working environment, pay, cooperation of peers) enforcement of motivation (delegation of work, authority, opportunity for growth, for advancement) and commensuration (higher rewards for higher level of stress, job security) are essential to enhance job satisfaction and performance among academics<sup>15</sup>.

Praveen M Kulkarni et., al. (2009) has observed that the organisation has a culture which is not as per the present market scenario; this fact has influenced the employee satisfaction level. Further, he advocates that organisation needs to adopt entrepreneurial organisational culture to boost employee satisfaction<sup>16</sup>.

**Objectives of the study:** i. To analyze the various factors enhancing employee performance on the job. ii. To analyze the impact of quality of work life on employee performance. iii. To analyze the perception of different categories of employees' towards different aspects of QWL.

**Limitations of the study:** i. The response in the study is the reflection of only sampling size chosen but it does not reflect the views of universe. ii. Employees were not able to give time because of their busy schedules. iii. Employees were hesitating to respond to the questionnaire.

**Hypothesis:** i. H1: There is no relation between quality of work life and employee performance. ii. H2: Employees are not satisfied with the safety measures and welfare facilities provided.

**Research Methodology**

The present study carried out is descriptive in nature and has been carried out to analyze the impact of quality of work life on employee performance. The study based mainly on the primary data collected through pre- structured questionnaire and interviewing the employees personally, the study also used the secondary data available on organization websites. Convenience sampling technique has used for collecting data. Respondents were requested to give their opinion for all the questions or statements. The study included employees working in different departments; the sample size of 100 respondents have been chosen for the study.

Analysis has made using various statistical techniques and different tests. The analyzed data have been represented diagrammatically or graphically wherever required. Chi Square test has used to test the hypothesis.

**Results and Discussion**

**Data Analysis:** Correlation and Chi-square tests have been used for testing the hypothesis, reliability of questionnaire and to find out the relationship.

**Analysis of Correlation or association of attributes:** **Attribute:** i. A. Employee Performance and B. Quality of work life (QWL) Programs. ii. A. Training and B. Improved productivity. iii. A. Welfare measures and B. Job satisfaction. iv. A. Stress and B. Work life balance

**Employee performance and Quality of work life Programs:** A-High performance. α - Low performance. B- QWL programs. β - No QWL programs

**Table-1**

**Employee performance and Quality of work life Programs**

-	A	α	Total
B	40	25	65
β	10	25	35
Total	65	35	100

Source: Field Investigation

$$Q = \frac{(AB)(\alpha\beta) - (A\beta)(\alpha B)}{(AB)(\alpha\beta) + (A\beta)(\alpha B)} Q = \frac{(40 \times 25) - (10 \times 25)}{(40 \times 25) + (10 \times 25)} Q = \frac{750}{1250} = 0.60$$

**Interpretation:** There is moderate degree of association between employee performance and QWL programs.

**Training and Improved productivity:** A- Training given. α - Training not given. B- Productivity improved. β - Productivity not improved

**Table-2**  
**Training and Improved productivity**

-	A	$\alpha$	Total
B	46	09	55
$\beta$	15	30	45
Total	61	39	100

Source: Field Investigation

$$Q = \frac{(AB)(\alpha\beta) - (A\beta)(\alpha B)}{(AB)(\alpha\beta) + (A\beta)(\alpha B)} Q = \frac{(46 \times 30) - (9 \times 15)}{(46 \times 30) + (9 \times 15)} Q = \frac{1245}{1515} = 0.821$$

**Interpretation:** There is high degree of association between Training and Improved productivity.

**Welfare facilities and Job satisfaction:** A- Welfare facilities provided.  $\alpha$  - Welfare facilities not provided. B- Job satisfaction.  $\beta$  -No Job satisfaction

**Table-3**  
**Welfare facilities and Job satisfaction**

-	A	$\alpha$	Total
B	20	25	45
$\beta$	10	45	55
Total	30	70	100

Source: Field Investigation

$$Q = \frac{(AB)(\alpha\beta) - (A\beta)(\alpha B)}{(AB)(\alpha\beta) + (A\beta)(\alpha B)} Q = \frac{(20 \times 45) - (10 \times 25)}{(20 \times 45) + (10 \times 25)} Q = \frac{650}{1150} = 0.56$$

**Interpretation:** There is moderate degree of association between Welfare facilities and Job satisfaction.

**Stress and Work life balance:** A- Stress at workplace.  $\alpha$ - Work life balance. B- No Stress at workplace.  $\beta$  - No Work life balance.

**Table-4**  
**Stress and Work life balance**

-	A	$\alpha$	Total
B	25	35	60
$\beta$	10	30	40
Total	35	65	100

Source: Field Investigation

$$Q = \frac{(AB)(\alpha\beta) - (A\beta)(\alpha B)}{(AB)(\alpha\beta) + (A\beta)(\alpha B)} Q = \frac{(30 \times 25) - (10 \times 35)}{(30 \times 25) + (10 \times 35)} Q = \frac{400}{1100} = 0.36$$

**Interpretation:** There is low degree of association between Stress and Work life balance.

**Hypothesis Testing:** Chi- Square ( $X^2$ ) have been used to test the hypothesis

H0: There is no relation between quality of work life and employee performance.

**Table-5**  
**Observed Value**

-	Yes	No	Total
A	27	13	40
B	24	36	60
Total	51	49	100

**Calculation for Chi- Square ( $X^2$ ) value**

$$X^2 = \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}} = 2.135 + 2.22 + 1.42 + 1.48 = 7.25$$

$X^2$  calculated value is 7.25 with 1 degree of freedom  
 Degree of freedom (2-1) (2-1) = 1

$X^2$  Critical value with 1 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 3.841, therefore  $X^2$  calculated >  $X^2$  critical. So H0 is rejected, and it is concluded that there is a relation between quality of work life and employee performance.

H0: Employees are not satisfied with the safety measures and welfare facilities provided.

**Table-6**  
**Observed Value**

-	Yes	No	Total
A	25	15	40
B	22	38	60
Total	47	53	100

**Calculation for  $x^2$  value**

$$X^2 = \frac{(O_{ij} - E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}} = 2.044 + 1.813 + 1.363 + 1.2 = 6.41$$

$X^2$  calculated value is 6.41 with 1 degree of freedom. Degree of freedom (2-1) (2-1) = 1

$X^2$  Critical value with 1 degree of freedom at 5% level of significance is 3.841, therefore  $X^2$  calculated >  $X^2$  critical. So H0 is rejected, and it is concluded that employees are satisfied with the safety measures and welfare facilities provided.

## Conclusion

The study reveals that there is high level of satisfaction among the employees regarding quality of work life as it enhances the employee job performance and also organisational performance. The improvement of organisational performance enables the organisation to motivate the employees through various benefits, rewards, security, which in turn results in improvement in performance and productivity thus employees remain committed to the job assigned and also to the organisation. The hypothesis testing in the study reveals that there is a positive relation between quality of work life and employee performance and employees are satisfied with the safety measures and welfare facilities provided. QWL programs must be instituted in

companies not only to enhance productivity, but also to increase employee identification and a sense of belonging and pride in their work. To survive in the competitive era many companies are using various QWL programs like flexi work schedules, flexi time, autonomous or self managed work teams, quality circles to be more productive. It has been suggested that one can determine the success of any organisation based on the satisfaction level of employees employed, their performance and productivity and also by knowing how successful the company in implementing QWL programs.

## References

1. www.oxford journals.com (2014)
2. Rethinam G.S. and Ismail M., Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A perspective of information and technology professionals, *European Journal of Social Science*, 7(1), 58-70, (2008)
3. Cummings T.G. and Molly E.S., Improving Productivity and the Quality of Work Life. New York: Praeger Publishers, (1997)
4. Coetzee S., Dispositional Factors and Quality of Work Life of members of Self – Managing work teams, (2004)
5. Walton R.E., Quality of Work Life: Indicators: Prospects and Problems Studies in Personnel Psychology, 6(1), 7-18 (1974)
6. Walton R.E and Davis L.E. Cherns, Criteria for Quality of Work Life, *A.B and Associates (Eds)*, The Free Press, New York. (1), 91-104, (1975)
7. Elizur D. and Shye S., Quality of work life and its relation to quality of life, *Applied Psychology: International Review*, 39(3), (1990)
8. Ashwatappa K., Human Resource Management and Personnel Management, Third Edition, Tata McGraw Hill publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, (2004)
9. Dipak Kumar Bhattacharya, Human Resource Management, Second edition Excel Books Publications, New Delhi, (2002)
10. Rao VSP, *Human Resource Management Text and Cases*, Second Edition, Excel Books Publications, New Delhi, (2005)
11. SCR year books (2014)
12. www.scr.in (2014)
13. Raduon cherosse, Quality of Work life: Implications of Career Dimensions, *Journal of Social Services*, 2(2), 61-67 (2006)
14. Indrasen Singh, The Measurement of Job Satisfaction of Professional Drivers, *Indian Highways*, 5-12, (2007)
15. Bani Kocher, *Job Satisfaction among Academics, ICFAI, Business School ICFAI University, Dehradun (2008)*
16. Praveen M Kulkarni, DNS Kumar and B. Janakiram, Organisational Culture are Employee Job Satisfaction?, *Indian Journal of Management*, 25-31 (2009)
17. Reisel W.D., Chia SL., Maloles C.M. and Slocum J.W., The Effects of Job Insecurity on Satisfaction and Perceived Organizational Performance, *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 14(2), 106-116
18. Davis L.E. and Trist E.L, Improving the quality of working life: Socio-technical case studies In J. O'Toole (Ed.), *Work and the quality of life: Resource papers for Work in America*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 246-284 (1974)
19. Harrison G., The measurement of quality of work life in SA companies, *People Dynamics*, 18, 23-25 (2000)
20. Serey T.T., Choosing a robust Quality of work life, *Business Forum*, 27(2), 7-10, (2006)
21. Raduon cherosse, loose bech, Quality of Work life: Implications of Career Dimensions, *Journal of Social Services*, 2(2), 61-67 (2006)
22. Sangeeta Jain, Quality of work life, New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publication, 17-18, (1991)
23. Scott Snell, George Bohlander, Human Resource Management, Sixth Edition, Baba Barkha Nath Printers, (2009)
24. Kothari C.R., Research Methodology Methods and Techniques, Second Edition, New Age International Publications, New Delhi, (2001)
25. www.emeraldinsight.com (2014)
26. www.indianjournals.com (2014)
27. www.indianrailways.com (2014)