Perceived Work Life Quality: A Case Study of Sanitary Workers in an Educational Institution

Shanujas. V

Abstract- *Although the term sanitation is an indispensable obsession, the people behind hygiene get least concerns in all organizations. The work-life quality of sanitary workers is least bothered by many employers. Most of the sanitary workers are being ignored and working in miserable conditions. Protecting the interest of the employees and improving their work-life quality is critical because the stoppage of their job will affect the entire organization. Excellent quality of work life leads to the better well-being of the workers and society. The study has conducted among the women sanitary workers in one of the recognized educational institution in South India for understanding their perception towards the quality of work life programmes implemented by the organization. Out of 132 employees, 30 samples were taken for the study. The study helped in understanding the overall quality of work environment of the organization and revealed that the employees are not much satisfied with the working conditions and the existing QWL measures provided by the organization.*

Keywords— Quality of work life, work environment, employee welfare and satisfaction.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quality of Work Life (QWL) is a human resource strategy is being recognized as key for development among all the work system. QWL addresses the concerns of improving employee satisfaction (Kermansaravi et al. 2015), employee engagement (Kanten & Sadullah, 2012), employee commitment (Farid et al. 2015) and employee performance (Rubel & Kee, 2014) that strengthen workplace learning and better management of the on-going change and transition. Consequently, the organizational productivity increases and gets the opportunity for growth with better employee participation (Beauregard, 2007). Organizations are therefore required to adopt strategies to improve the Quality of Work Life of employees for satisfying both the organizational objectives and employee needs.

One of the important strategies to improve QWL is to create work rules that help in maintaining an orderly atmosphere where employees treat with dignity and respect. Organizations have to take the initiative to provide the pleasant work environment for employees to improve their efficiency and ensure that employees conduct themselves in a professional and safe manner, encouraging open communication between employer and employee.

The study attempts to adjoin to the area of QWL research in developing and enhancing human capital. Due to limited studies on QWL in the educational sector, this study will give insight to the quality of work life among the sanitary workers in the Indian context. The present study attempts to understand the perception of women sanitary workers of a recognized educational institution in South India regarding the quality of work life programmes extended by the organization.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of work-life quality was primarily thrashed out in an international labor relations conference held on 1972. The quality of work life had captured more attention when United Auto Workers and General Motors initiated a QWL program for the work reforms.

The quality of work life is a broad concept, defined in different ways by different researchers using several dimensions. Robbins (1989) defined QWL as "a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work". According to Hackman & Suttle (1977), "Quality of work life is the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organization."

QWL is a multi-dimensional concept which originates from the discipline of Industrial Labor Relationships (Hsu & Kernohan, 2006). QWL has brought about certain equivalents such as work quality, function of job content, employee's well-being, the quality of the relationship between employees, working environment, the balance between job demands and decision autonomy and the balance between control need and control capacity (Korunka et al. 2008; Lewis et al. 2001; Schouteten, 2004; Van Laar et al. 2007). QWL is thus recognized as a multi-dimensional construct, and the categorization is neither universal nor eternal.

Different researchers have come up with various categories and factors to define and measure the quality of life. Taylor (1979) more logically identified the essential components of Quality of working life as; primary extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions, and the intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work itself. He suggested that relevant Quality of working life concepts may vary according to organization and employee group. Mirvis and Lawler (1984) suggested that quality of working life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the basic elements of a good quality of work life as; safe work environment, fair wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement. Baba and Jamal (1991) listed what they described as common indicators of quality of working life, including job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Bertrand (1992) found that improvements in the quality of work life are achieved not only through external or structural modifications but more importantly through improved relations between supervisors and subordinates. Normala and Daud (2010) observed that the quality of work life of employees is an important consideration for employers interested in improving employees' job satisfaction and commitment.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To gain an insight into current quality of work-life policies and practices prevailing within the institution.
2. To find out the satisfaction level of sanitary employees on their work and working environment.
3. To suggest methods for improving QWL by highlighting employees expectations and required changes.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The research design chosen is Descriptive in nature. The population of the study comprises of 135 women sanitary workers (Supervisors – 2, Workers Incharge-1, Director's Cook-1, Director's Housekeeper-1, Director's Helper – 1, Gardener – 3 and Sweepers – 126) in a recognized educational institution in South India. A sample of 30 employees working in various sections was selected as respondents by judgment sampling. Primary data was collected through self-developed fifteen item instrument which measured the construct QWL from the dimensions of satisfaction of employees with: working condition, motivation, cooperation among employees, suggestion schemes, supervisor, compensation, wage policies, position skill match, security, work schedule, feedback system, job rotation system, and grievance redressal system. Opinions of respondents were put on 5-point scales.

V. RESULT

Length of experience of employees

Experience	Number of respondents	Percentage
Less than 1 year	3	10
1-5 years	6	20
5-10 years	11	36.7
10-15 years	6	20.0
15 years or more	4	13.3
Total	30	100.0

Satisfaction of workers on working conditions

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Highly satisfied	5	16.7
Satisfied	4	13.3
Neutral satisfied	11	36.7
Dissatisfied	2	6.7
Highly Dissatisfied	8	26.7
Total	30	100.0

Motivation derived from working environment

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Highly motivating	2	6.7
Motivating	3	10.0
Neutral motivating	14	46.7
Less motivating	3	10.0
Non motivating	8	26.7
Total	30	100.0

Co-operation among employees

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	20	66.7
Agree	7	23.3
Neutral agree	0	0
Disagree	3	10.0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total	30	100.0

Suggestion scheme implemented by the company

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Very Good	2	6.7
Good	3	10.0
Neither Good or Bad	8	26.7
Bad	3	10.0
Very Bad	14	46.7
Total	30	100.0

Relationship of workers with the supervisor

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	17	56.7
Agree	13	43.3
Total	30	100.0

Fair compensation for the work

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Agree	3	10.0
Disagree	8	26.7
Strongly Disagree	19	63.3
Total	30	100.0

Wage policies adopted by the company

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Neither Good or Bad	3	10.0
Bad	7	23.3
Very Bad	20	66.7
Total	30	100.0

Employee position match with their skills and abilities

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly agree	10	33.3
Agree	7	23.3
Disagree	10	33.3
Strongly Disagree	3	10.0
Total	30	100.0

Resources provided by the company for obtaining the stated objectives

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly Agree	6	20.0
Agree	10	33.3
Disagree	14	46.7
Total	30	100.0

Fringe benefits provided by the company

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly Agree	1	3.3
Agree	9	30.0
Disagree	20	66.7
Total	30	100.0

Sense of security for the job

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly Agree	1	3.3
Agree	3	10.0
Neutral agree	0	0
Disagree	25	83.3
Strongly Disagree	1	3.3
Total	30	100.0

Work timing of the organization

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Very Good	1	3.3
Good	3	10.0
Neither Good or Bad	5	16.7
Bad	5	16.7
Very Bad	16	53.3
Total	30	100.0

Feedback from supervisor

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Strongly Agree	13	43.3
Agree	3	10.0
Disagree	14	46.0
Total	30	100.0

Job rotation system in the company

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Very Good	23	76.7
Good	2	6.7
Neither Good or Bad	2	6.7
Bad	1	3.3
Very Bad	2	6.7
Total	30	100.0

Grievance reddressal system in the organization

Response	Number of respondents	Percentage
Good	3	10.0
Neither Good or Bad	1	3.3
Very Bad	26	86.7
Total	30	100.0

VI. FINDINGS

1. 10% of the employees are having an experience less than one year. 20% of employees are between 1-5 years, 36% of the employees are 5-10 years, and 20% of the employees are having experience of 10-15 years and remaining 13.3% having more than 15 years of experience in the organization.

2. 16.7 % of the employees are highly satisfied with job and working environment, 13.3 of the employees are satisfied, 36.7% of the employees neutral satisfied and 6.7% are dissatisfied and remaining 26% of the employees are highly dissatisfied.

3. 6.7 % of the employees opined that they are getting high motivation from working environment, 10% of the employees are motivated, 46% of the employees neutral motivated and 10% are getting less motivation and remaining 26% of the employees are not getting motivation from the working environment.

4. 66.7 % of the employees are strongly agreed that there exist a good cooperation among employees, 23.3% of the workers are accepted, no employees are neutral agree and remaining 10 % disagree, and no employees strongly disagree that there exist cooperation among employees.

5. 6.7 % of the employees rated very good about the suggestion scheme implemented by the organization, 10% of the employees rated Good, 26% of the employees rated neither good or bad and 10% rated Bad and remaining 46.7% of the employees rated very bad about the suggestion scheme.

6. 6.7 % of the employees are strongly agreed that there exist a good relationship with the supervisor, 43.3% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree, disagree and strongly disagree that there exist good relationship with the supervisor.

7. No employees are strongly agreed that they are getting fair compensation for the work do, 10% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree, and 26.7 % are disagreed and remaining 63.3% employees strongly disagree that they are getting fair compensation for the work do.

8. No employee rated very good and good about the wage policy adopted by the organization, 10% of the employees rated neither good or bad and 23.3% rated Bad and

remaining 66.7% of the employees rated very bad about wage policy.

9. 33.3% employees are strongly agreed that they are placed in a job which is the best match with their skills and abilities, 23.3% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree, and 33.3 % are disagreed and remaining 10% employees strongly disagree.

10. 20% of the employees are strongly agreed that resources are provided by the company, 33.3% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree and remaining 46.7 % are disagreed, and no employee is strongly disagreed that company provided resources to achieve goals.

11. 3.3% employees are strongly agreed that they are getting the fringe benefit, 30% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree and remaining 66.7 % are disagreed and no employee strongly disagrees that they are getting the fringe benefit.

12. 3.3% of the employees are strongly agreed that they are feeling a sense of security for the job, 10% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree and 83.3 % are disagreed and remaining 3.3% employees strongly disagree that they are feeling a sense of security for the job.

13. 3.3% of the employees rated very good and 10% rated good about the work timing of the organization, 16.7% of the employees rated neither good or bad and 16.7% rated Bad and remaining 53.3% of the employees rated very bad.

14. 43.3% of the employees are strongly agreed that they are getting feedback from their immediate supervisor, 10% of the employees are agreed, no employees are neutral agree and remaining 46.7 % are disagreed, and no employee strongly disagrees.

15. 76.7% of the employees rated very good about the job rotation system and 6.7% rated good, 6.7% of the employees rated neither good or bad and 3.3% rated Bad and remaining 6.7% of the employees rated very bad.

16. No employee rated very good about the grievance redressal system and 10% rated good, 3.3% of the employees rated neither good or bad and remaining 86.7% of the employees rated very bad about the grievance redressal system in the institution.

VII. SUGGESTIONS

Employees will be more satisfied and committed to improving employee's compensation and fringe benefits. There is no systematic procedure for salary increment in the organization. So the institution must implement a particular system for the salary increase. An excellent grievance redressal system needs to be developed in the organization. Good welfare measures should be taken. Festival bonus, paid leave, etc. should be given. Management should be more aware of the health and safety of the employees who are working in hygiene section. Gloves, Mask, etc. should be provided. The management can arrange for transport facilities to the employees as a part of non-statutory welfare measures. Periodic feedback from the employees regarding the Quality of Work Life could be carried out by the company. The management could conduct entertainment programmes for improving the satisfaction of employees in the organization. The training programmes need to be provided by the organization. Working dresses should be distributed by the organization.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The study conducted among the women sanitary workers of a recognized educational institution in South India, which has helped in understanding the various factors that mainly affect the Quality of Work Life of employees in the organization. The study helped in analyzing the overall quality of work environment of the organization and revealed that the employees are not much satisfied with the workplace and the current QWL measures provided by the organization. Organization needs to implement and improve some areas like compensation, training programmes, welfare measures, etc. Thus the organization can make the work environment highly satisfactory and motivate the employees by incorporating more strategies of QWL and bring improvement in those areas where the organization is lagging behind.

REFERENCES

[1] Baba, V. V., & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinization of job context and job content as related to employees' quality of working life: A study of Canadian nurses. Journal of organizational behavior, 12(5), 379-386.

[2] Beauregard, T. A. (2007). Family influences on the career life cycle. In M. Ozbilgin, & A. Malach-Pines, Career Choice in Management and Entrepreneurship: A research companion (pp. 101-126). Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Press.

[3]   Bertrand, W. S. (1992). Designing quality into work life. Quality Progress, 25(6), 29-33.

[4]   Farid, H., Izadi, Z., Ismail, I. A., & Alipour, F. (2015). Relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment among lecturers in a Malaysian public research university. The Social Science Journal, 52(1), 54-61.

[5]   Hackman, J. R., & Suttle, J. L. (1977). Improving life at work: Behavioral science approaches to organizational change.

[6]   Hsu M and Kernohan. Dimensions of Hospital Nurses' Quality of Working Life. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 54(1). 2006. 120- 131. 120–131.

[7]   Kanten, S., & Sadullah, O. (2012). An empirical research on relationship quality of work life and work engagement. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 62, 360-366.

[8]   Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., Rigi, S. N., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2015). The relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction of faculty members in Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. Global journal of health science, 7(2), 228.

[9]   Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P., & Carayon, P. Quality of working life and turnover intention in information technology work. Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries, 18, 2008, 409–423.

[10] Lewis, D., Brazil, K., Krueger, P., Lohfeld, L., & Tjam, E. Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life. Leadership in Health Services, 14, 2001, 9–15.

[11] Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler, E. E. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work life. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 5(3), 197-212.

[12] Noor, S. M., & Abdullah, M. A. (2012). Quality work life among factory workers in Malaysia. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 35, 739-745.

[13] Normala, D. (2010). Investigating the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms. International journal of business and management, 5(10), 75.

[14] Robbins, S. P. (1989). Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications (Fourth Edition ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[15] Rubel, M. R. B., & Kee, D. M. H. (2014). Quality of work life and employee performance: Antecedent and outcome of job satisfaction in Partial Least Square (PLS). World Applied Sciences Journal, 31(4), 456-467.

[16] Schouteten, R. Group work in a Dutch home care organization: Does it improve the quality of working life? The International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 19, 2004, 179–194.

[17] Taylor, John B. (1979), 'Staggered wage setting in a macro model'. American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings 69 (2), pp.10813. Reprinted in N.G. Mankiw and D. Romer, eds., (1991), New Keynesian Economics, MITPress.

[18] Van Laar, D., Edwards, J. A., & Easton, S. The Work-related quality of life scale for healthcare workers. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 60, 2007, 325–333.