



## **A STUDY ON FACTORS AFFECTING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF EMPLOYEES IN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRIAL UNITS**

**B. Shanmugam\* & Dr. R. Ganapathi\*\***

\* Ph.D (Part-Time) Research Scholar, AMET School of Business, AMET University, Kanathur, Chennai, Tamilnadu

\*\* Assistant Professor, Directorate of Distance Education, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu

---

**Cite This Article:** B. Shanmugam & Dr. R. Ganapathi, "A Study on Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees in Automobile Industrial Units", International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education, Volume 3, Issue 1, Page Number 158-162, 2017.

**Copy Right:** © IJMRME, R&D Modern Research Publication, 2017 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

---

### **Abstract:**

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is essentially the quality relationship between human resources and their work environment that encourages and increases job satisfaction. QWL comprises of different features of work place environment that assists improvement of human resources of organization effectively. The presently study reveals that working environment, compensation, carrier growth and inter-personal relations are the factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units. The results indicate that there is significant difference between socio-economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work in automobile industrial units. In addition, compensation, carrier growth, working environment and inter-personal relations are positively and significantly influencing job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units. To enhance the job satisfaction of employees, the automobile industrial units should provide better compensation and increments periodically on the basis of performance appraisal and must give equal opportunities to employees for their carrier development. In addition, the automobile industrial units must create conducive work environment and facilitate better inter-personal relationships among employees.

**Key Words:** Automobile Industrial Units, Job Satisfaction & Quality of Work Life

### **1. Introduction:**

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is essentially the quality relationship between human resources and their work environment that encourages and increases job satisfaction. QWL comprises of different features of work place environment that assists improvement of human resources of organization effectively. Even though the quality of work life is vital, its important comes into understanding during late 1960's, when different experts express their views highlighting the need for knowing the factors affecting quality of work life and its effect on job performance of employees (Elizur and Shye,1990). QWL is an all-inclusive programme helping to enhance job satisfaction of employees and motivates them to perform better in their current and future jobs efficiently. Thus, organizations are needed to take-up a plan of action to improve QWL of its employees with the intention of increasing favourable working conditions for employees with an ultimate purpose of attaining the goals of organization. Now-a-days, the idea of QWL has become increasingly important to all industrial organizations. The better QWL eventually results in high level of life satisfaction and common feel of wellbeing of employees through job satisfaction with the organizational success. QWL is very significant in the context of motivation, job performance, job satisfaction and commitment of employees (Kumar, 2012). For different industries and individuals, there are different set of factors, which influence the quality of work life and in turn satisfy or dissatisfy the employees (Danna and Griffin, 1999). Additionally, an understanding of these factors can also help in decreasing work conflict and improve persona relationship of employees. Therefore, the present research is made to study factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units in Chennai city.

### **2. Methodology:**

The Chennai city is selected for the present study. The employees of automobile industrial units are chosen by using random sampling method. The data are gathered from 300 employees of automobile industrial units through pre-tested and structured questionnaire. To examine the socio-economic status of employees, the percentage analysis is carried out. To identify the factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units, an exploratory factor analysis is done. To examine the difference between socio-economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work life in automobile industrial units, the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test is applied. To analyze the influence of factors affecting quality of work life on job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units, the multiple linear regression is used.

**3. Results and Discussion:**

**3.1 Socio-Economic Status of the Employees:**

The socio-economic status of the employees of automobile industrial units was analyzed and the results are presented in Table-1. The results indicate that 83.67 per cent of employees are males and the remaining 16.33 per cent of employees are females. It is observed that 41.00 per cent of employees are in the age group of 26 - 35 years followed by 21 - 25 years (27.33 per cent), 36 - 45 years (22.00 per cent) and 46 - 55 years (9.67 per cent). The results show that 29.33 per cent of employees have educational qualification of B.Tech., followed by B.E., (25.00 per cent), Diploma (21.33 per cent), M.E., (16.67 per cent) and M.Tech., (7.67 per cent). It is clear that 52.67 per cent of employees are working in the functional area of manufacturing followed by product development (29.33 per cent) and product design (18.00 per cent). The results reveal that 47.33 per cent of employees have work experience of 4 - 6 years followed by less than three years (24.67 per cent), 7 - 9 years (13.67 per cent), 10 - 12 years (11.00 per cent) and more than 12 years (3.33 per cent). It is apparent that 39.67 employees have monthly income of Rs.20,001 - Rs.30,000 followed by less than Rs.20,000 (26.33 per cent), Rs.30,001 - Rs.40,000 (17.33 per cent), Rs.40,001- Rs.50,000 (10.00 per cent) and more than Rs.50,000 (6.67 per cent).

Table 1: Socio-Economic Status of the Employees

Socio-Economic Status	Number of Employees	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	251	83.67
Female	49	16.33
<b>Age Group</b>		
21 - 25 years	82	27.33
26 - 35 years	123	41.00
36 - 45 years	66	22.00
46 - 55 years	29	9.67
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		
B.E.,	75	25.00
B.Tech.,	88	29.33
M.E.,	50	16.67
M.Tech.,	23	7.67
Diploma	64	21.33
<b>Functional Area</b>		
Product Development	88	29.33
Product Design	54	18.00
Manufacturing	158	52.67
<b>Work Experience</b>		
Less than 3 years	74	24.67
4 - 6 years	142	47.33
7 - 9 years	41	13.67
10 - 12 years	33	11.00
More than 12 years	10	3.33
<b>Monthly Income</b>		
Less than Rs.20,000	79	26.33
Rs.20,001- Rs.30,000	119	39.67
Rs.30,001- Rs.40,000	52	17.33
Rs.40,001- Rs.50,000	30	10.00
More than Rs.50,000	20	6.67

**3.2 Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees:**

To identify the factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units, an exploratory factor analysis is done and the results are shown in Table-2. The results of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO test) measure of sampling adequacy (KMO = 0.82) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity (Chi-square Value = 0.0029; Significance = 0.000) indicates that the factor analysis method is appropriate. Four factors that are extracted accounting for 69.72 per cent of variations on 22 variables. Each of the four factors contributes to 21.84 per cent, 19.50 per cent, 17.73 per cent and 10.65 per cent respectively.

Table 2: Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees

Factor	Item	Rotated Factor Loadings	Eigen Value	% of Variation	Factor Name
<b>I</b>	Hygienic working conditions	0.69	2.07	21.84	Working Environment
	Risk free working place	0.71			

	Healthy working atmosphere	0.68			
	Safety and security policies	0.66			
	Motivation for efficient working	0.70			
	Adequate working facilities	0.67			
	Dignity at workplace	0.63			
<b>II</b>	Good compensation	0.61	1.76	19.50	Compensation
	Pay based on experience and capability	0.68			
	Increment based on performance	0.65			
	Enough compensation for overtime	0.64			
	Rewards for best performance	0.60			
	Free transport facilities	0.62			
<b>III</b>	Opportunities for learning	0.69	1.34	17.73	Carrier Growth
	Opportunities for self improvement	0.70			
	Career advancement	0.65			
	Transparent appraisal system	0.63			
	Appreciation for good work	0.60			
<b>IV</b>	Good relationship with manager	0.66	1.03	10.65	Inter-Personal Relations
	Good relationship with supervisor	0.63			
	Good relationship with coworkers	0.67			
	Good relationship with sub ordinates	0.62			
	Cumulative % of Variation			69.72	
	Cronbach's Alpha				0.81

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

Factor - I consists of hygienic working conditions, risk free working place, healthy working atmosphere, safety and security policies, motivation for efficient working, adequate working facilities and dignity at workplace. Hence, this factor is named as Working Environment.

Factor - II includes good compensation, pay based on experience and capability, increment based on performance, enough compensation for overtime, rewards for best performance and free transport facilities. Therefore, this factor is named as Compensation.

Factor - III comprises of opportunities for learning, opportunities for self improvement, career advancement, transparent appraisal system and appreciation for good work. So, this factor is named as Carrier Growth.

Factor - IV encompasses Good relationship with manager, Good relationship with supervisor, Good relationship with coworkers and Good relationship with sub ordinates. Thus, this factor is named as Inter-Personal Relations.

Cronbach's Alpha of the scale is 0.81 showing that the internal consistency of each measure is at acceptable level. It reveals that working environment, compensation, carrier growth and inter-personal relations are the factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units.

### 3.3 Socio-Economic Status of the Employees and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life:

The difference between socio-economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work life in automobile industrial units was examined by applying Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test and the results are presented in Table-3.

Table 3: Difference between Socio-Economic Status of the Employees and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life

Particulars	F-Value	Sig.
Gender and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	23.195**	.000
Age Group and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	10.836**	.000
Educational Qualification and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	21.420**	.000
Functional Area and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	18.074**	.000
Work Experience and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	15.612**	.000
Monthly Income and Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life of Employees	25.530**	.000

\*\* Significant at one per cent level.

The results reveal that the F-values are significant at one per cent level showing that there is significant difference between socio-economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work in automobile industrial units. So, the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference between socio - economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work life in automobile industrial units is rejected.

### 3.4 Influence of Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction of Employees:

To analyze the influence of factors affecting quality of work life on job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units, the multiple linear regression is used and the results are presented in Table-4. The coefficient of multiple determination ( $R^2$ ) is 0.63 and adjusted  $R^2$  is 0.62 showing that the regression model is good fit. It revealed that 62.00 per cent of the variation in dependent variable is explained by the independent variables. The F-value of 13.892 is statistically significant at one per cent level revealing that the regression model is significant.

Table 4: Influence of Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction of Employees

Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life	Regression Co-Efficients	t-Value	Sig.
Intercept	1.109**	5.894	.000
Working Environment ( $X_1$ )	.394**	4.520	.000
Compensation ( $X_2$ )	.448**	4.752	.000
Carrier Growth ( $X_3$ )	.412**	4.576	.000
Inter-Personal Relations ( $X_4$ )	.370**	4.318	.000
$R^2$	0.63	-	-
Adjusted $R^2$	0.62	-	-
F	13.892	-	0.00

\*\* Significant at one per cent level

The results imply that compensation, carrier growth, working environment and inter-personal relations are positively and significantly influencing job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units at one per cent level. Therefore, the null hypothesis of there is no significant influence of factors affecting quality of work life on job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units is rejected.

#### 4. Conclusion:

The presently study clearly shows that working environment, compensation, carrier growth and inter-personal relations are the factors affecting quality of work life of employees in automobile industrial units. The results indicate that there is significant difference between socio-economic status of the employees and factors affecting quality of work in automobile industrial units. In addition, compensation, carrier growth, working environment and inter-personal relations are positively and significantly influencing job satisfaction of employees in automobile industrial units. To enhance the job satisfaction of employees, the automobile industrial units should provide better compensation and increments periodically on the basis of performance appraisal and must give equal opportunities to employees for their carrier development. In addition, the automobile industrial units must create conducive work environment and facilitate better inter-personal relationships among employees.

#### References:

1. Ajay Kumar, K., (2012), "Quality of Work Life - An Overview", International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research, 1(10): pp.1-10.
2. Baba, V.V. and Jamal, M., (1991), "Reutilization of Job Context and Job Content as Related to Employees Quality of Working Life: A Study of Canadian Nurses", Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 12(5): pp.379-386.
3. Chan, Ka Wai and Wyatt, Thomas A., (2007), "Quality of Work Life: A Study of Employees in Shanghai", China. Asia Pacific Business Review, 13(4): pp.501-517.
4. Danna, K. and Griffin, R.W., (1999), "Health and Well-Being in the Work Place: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature", Journal of Management, 25 (3): pp.357-384.
5. Elizur, D. and Shye, S., (1990), "Quality of Work Life and its Relation to Quality of Life" Applied Psychology, 39 (3): pp.275-291.
6. Gayathiri, R. and Lalitha Ramakrishnan, (2013), "Quality of Work Life – Linkage with Job Satisfaction and Performance", International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(1): pp.1-8.
7. Haque. Abmz., (1992), "Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction of Industrial Workers in Relation to Size of the Organization", Bangladesh Journal of Psychological Studies, 2 (1): pp.43- 45.
8. Kameswara Rao. P. and Venugopal. P., (2009), "Perceptual Factors in Quality of Work Life of Indian Employees", Paradigm, 13(1): pp.104-116.
9. Mesut Akdere, (2006), "Improving Quality of Work Life: Implications for Human Resource", The Business Review Cambridge, 6(1):pp.173 - 177.
10. Noor, S. M., and Abdullah, M. A., (2013), "Quality Work Life among Factory Workers in Malaysia", Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, 3(5): pp.739-745
11. Rao, P.K. and Mohan, A.C., (2008), "Perceptual Factors in Quality of Work Life of Indian Employees", Management and Labour Studies, 33(3): pp.373-383.
12. Sadique, Z., (2003), "Quality of Work Life among White Collar and Blue Collar Employees", Journal of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies, 26(2): pp. 169-174.

13. Sarang Shanker Bhola, (2006), "A Study of Quality of Working Life in Casting and Machine Shop Industry in Kolhapur", Finance India, 20(1): pp. 202 – 208.
14. Tarek Hassan Abdeen, (2002), "Company Performance: Does Quality of Work Life Really Matter?", Management Research News, 25(8/9/10): pp. 8-11.