

# Management Perceptions of the Impact of Quality of Work Life on Organizational Performance

\* *Amee Agrawal*

## Abstract

The Government sector provides employment to employees on a large scale. In spite of compensating adequately, it has been found that there are issues in the quality of work life of employees working in PSUs. The research was carried out to investigate quality of work life (QWL) of employees and its impact on organizational performance in the public sector. The research was carried out with the help of cross sectional data collected from 115 employees from a public sector undertaking based in Vadodara in the state of Gujarat. The data was measured with a six dimensional scale adopted from Kantan and Sadullah (2012), which was further validated with CFA and the structural models were tested using SEM. The individual processes were further analyzed with correlation analysis. The results obtained are unique and can be used for better policy formulations in the PSUs.

**Keywords :** quality of work life, organizational performance, social integration, work occupy

**JEL Classification :** J2, J280, M540

**Paper Submission Date :** August 24, 2018 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** May 14, 2019 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** July 8, 2019

Historically, work processes have been an integral part of human beings. In the present scenario of economic growth, technological advancement, and industrial productivity, certain environment and humanistic values are compromised (Boonrod, 2009). This race for survival has created work family conflict due to confrontation between personal responsibilities and professional assignments (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005 ; Md - Sidin, Sambasivan, & Ismail, 2010). Moreover, there is a paradigm shift in the demography and work place like presence of women at the workplace, extended office hours, and increased usage of latest technological gadgets connecting you to the office 24\*7.

In order to retain their employees, organizations are intimidated to apply employee friendly policies which enable the employees to attain a fine balance between professional and personal duties. Thus, the significance of quality of work life (QWL) becomes crucial for sustaining happy, healthy, and committed employees. A humane work culture creates collective serendipity for both the employees and the management. Happy employees create happy customers and keep the profitability rigging as they are efficient, innovative, and more content.

Profitability and organizational success are outcomes of contented and happy employees, which drive superlative results. Thus, quality of work life is a sum total of all organizational inputs aimed at promoting employee satisfaction, which in turn enhances organizational performance. Kantan and Sadullah (2012) quoted eight major conceptual categories, which provided a framework for analyzing the important features of quality of

---

\* *Assistant Professor - BBA Programme, Faculty of Commerce, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Pratapgunj - 390 002, Vadodara, Gujarat. (Email id : amee.agrawal-bba@msubaroda.ac.in)*

ORCID Id : <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8676-249X>

DOI : 10.17010/pijom/2019/v12i8/146413

work life like : Constitutionalism or the “rule of law” meaning applying the fundamental rules common for everyone, equitable and just compensation, good interpersonal relationship at the workplace, being responsible, giving it back to the society, harmless and good work surroundings, and work occupy.

After gaining independence in India, the main focus of the government was upliftment of the society by developing the core sectors and generating employment. With this key objective, the government set up various PSUs. Development of these PSUs would not only enhance the growth of other ancillary industries, but also lead to overall development of the economy (Pattanayak, 2003). According to the CAG report (Goyal, 2017), one third of the PSUs were making losses. Between 2007 and 2016, sick PSUs reported losses of ₹ 19.68 lakh crore. However, looking at the dismal performance of these PSUs, the expert advisory committee of the government proposed the sale of 40 PSUs and shutting down of 26 sick PSUs. This intrigued me till no end, and a quest arose in my mind for investigating the reasons for their dismal performance, which led me to investigate the QWL of PSU employees from the perspective of organizational performance.

## Literature Review and Hypotheses

The extant literature highlights the past studies conducted on QWL and advances towards discussing the various parameters which are found to be associated with QWL. It also highlights the significance of studying QWL and its impact on organizational performance in Indian PSUs.

**(1) Organizational Performance :** It is imperative to measure organizational performance as it not only influences the work culture of the organization, but to attain quantifiable enhancement in organizational performance, it is of paramount importance for any business. Organizational performance can be quantified through financial and non - financial parameters. It is the non-financial parameters which are crucial as they are responsible for organizational success. Parameters like job satisfaction, organizational efficiency, quality benchmarks for products, and customer management are quantified and enhanced. Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser Jr., and Schlesinger (1994) established the linkages between profitability, employee satisfaction, and customer loyalty in service organizations and called it the 'service - profit chain'. Profit and growth are stimulated by customer loyalty. Loyalty is a direct result of customer satisfaction. Satisfaction is largely influenced by the value of services provided to its customers. Value is created by satisfied, loyal, and productive employees. Employee satisfaction, in turn, results from high quality support services and policies that enable employees to deliver results to customers. Thus, overall employee satisfaction is a function of QWL measures that the organization takes for its employees.

**(2) Quality of Work Life Parameters and Organizational Performance :** Excellent QWL and superlative performance are the outcomes of better place to work for, the organization itself, and a lot depends on the job profile of the employee. This was propounded in the 43<sup>rd</sup> American Assembly in the year 1972 where the term 'Quality of Work Life' was coined.

Job safety, job fulfillment, good compensation policies, good employee welfare schemes, and better employee participation were highlighted as important parameters of excellent work life (Havlovic, 1991). Thus, QWL can be defined as the management's attitude towards creating a favorable condition and environment for the well - being of employees.

Hankiss (1978) stated that 'quality of life' is not an aggregate of its elements, but is much more than just interaction, attitude, aspiration, fears, satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and thus it developed multicultural analogies and contrasts.

According to Blishe and Atkinson's (1978) study, QWL can be explained with the help of two types of indexes.

One qualitative and the other quantitative. The quantitative index is the money an employee earns ; whereas, the qualitative index are parameters like financial status, living standard, job, etc. Netto (2018) opined that QWL was strongly linked with income and education of employees - higher the income and education, higher was the QWL.

The methodology by which employees voice their opinion in the resolution making activity at the work place and when the organization retorts the same in an efficacious manner is called QWL as coined by Robins (1990). Estes and Michael (2005) validated QWL as organizational assistance given to all employees for care of their loved ones, flexi timings, and absence from work for personal reasons.

To sum up, among the various definitions, the one proposed by Serey (2006) has been found to be the most exhaustive. It includes providing an independent, worthwhile, and challenging work assignment where the individual gets to play the key role developing his/her initiativeness and self-direction, and which brings him/her a sense of pride and self-worth (as cited in Shahbazi, Shokrzadeh, Bejani, Malekinia, & Ghoroneh, 2011). As evident from the extant literature, most of the QWL studies defined the concept of QWL as per Boonrod's (2009) definition.

**(i) Adequate and Fair Compensation :** A fair and equitable compensation package is what the employees seek in an employment. Employee compensation is directly related to quality of work life (Boonrod, 2009). Employees' perception of their salary is the function of their behaviour at work. Their behaviour is governed by the fact whether their salary is equitable, sufficient in terms of their work and output, their education, previous work experience, etc. Salary and other perks were established as an important factor of QWL by Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, and Lee (2001). Kahn and Sherer (1990) opined that there was a beneficial effect of compensation on organizational performance. Tower (2003) posited that financial performance of an organization was a function of good compensation and rewards which were directed towards reduced turnover, absenteeism, and better performance attainment. Fair and just compensation must be the mantra for the organization and this was established by Antle, MacKenzie, Baines, Angell, Dawson Haber, and Paulekat (2006). Thus, to sum up, Rao and Venugopal (2009) advocated that high quality of work life environments are those work places which provide good compensation and other benefits. Based on the aforementioned discussion, it is hypothesized that :

☞ **H1 :** Adequate and fair compensation positively influences organizational performance.

**(ii) Safe and Healthy Working Conditions :** It is widely known that employees must not be vulnerable to physical situations that are dangerous to their health and well - being, which includes an environment free of odors, noises, and visual annoyances. It also includes reasonable hours enforced by a normal work period beyond which premium pay is required; work situations with zero risk of harm to the health of employees ; and not allowing young and inexperienced employees on dangerous machines. Rao and Venugopal (2009) opined that a high QWL can be measured where the organization provides a safe workplace, shows concern for solving problems at the workplace, and provides adequate time for leisure & family and no unreasonable work demands.

According to Nazir, Qureshi, Shafaat, and Ilyas (2011), the working conditions in the organization are important determinants of quality of work life. Based on the aforementioned discussion, it is hypothesized that:

☞ **H2 :** Safe and healthy working conditions positively influence organizational performance.

**(iii) Usage of Capacity and Social Integration :**

**Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities :** Due to the Industrial Revolution, the organizational tasks have been divided into a series of core activities and usually, the planning of tasks has been separated from their

implementation ; thus, jobs differ in how much they enable employees to use and hone their skills and knowledge and whether it involves the complete task or a fragment of the task. Learning opportunities at the workplace enhance employees' cognitive skills (Scully, Kirkpatrick, & Locke, 1995). It also involves full autonomy and self-control over the task at hand and enables employees to appreciate the relevance and consequences of their actions. These aspects boost the ego and self-esteem of employees (Boonrod, 2009). Netto (2018) opined that introducing the QWL programmes among employees of the private sector in Ernakulam district of Kerala led to enhancing the QWL perception among women employees.

**Social Integration at the Work Place :** Interrelationships at the workplace among employees, their peers, subordinates, and superiors influence the QWL a great deal (Tabassum, Rahman, & Jahan, 2011). Whether the employee has a satisfying identity and experiences self-esteem is governed by the attributes like freedom from any prejudices based on caste, creed, ethnicity, or physical appearance ; egalitarianism ; promotion opportunities ; and a sense of camaraderie among the employees with interpersonal openness (Boonrod, 2009). Based on the extant literature available, it is assumed that :

☞ **H3 :** Usage of capacity and social integration positively influence organizational performance.

**(iv) Constitutionalism at the Work Organization :** Employees are affected by various decisions made by the labor union and the management on their behalf and about their status. Constitutionalism at the work place includes the right to personal privacy pertaining to employees and their family members ; the right to disagree with the views of superiors ; free and fair opportunity to express their opinion ; right to equitable treatment on all matters including compensation, rewards, and job security (Boonrod, 2009). Based on the extant literature available, it is assumed that :

☞ **H4 :** Constitutionalism positively influences organizational performance.

**(v) Opportunity for Sustainable Career Advancement and Job Security :** Employees peak in their thirties, when their knowledge becomes obsolete and this leads to stagnation in their earnings. There is little opportunity for continued education or broadening of skills and capabilities. As a result, they lose interest in their professional work and do not invest in their career pursuits. Thus, opportunities must be provided to employees to expand their capabilities and use them for future work assignments and remain relevant as far as employment and income security is concerned (Boonrod, 2009). Therefore, Cascio (2003) posited that QWL is an important tool in the hands of the management to retain its employees and flourish them with opportunities for work performance by training them and rewarding them adequately.

According to Gupta and Sharma (2011) and Tabassum, Rahman, and Jahan (2011), the socially beneficial roles that organizations play in terms of community services, being socially responsible on the type of products manufactured, waste disposal, marketing techniques, employment practices, relations with underdeveloped countries, participation in political campaigns, etc. enhance the self - esteem of the employees. Based on extant literature, it is assumed that :

☞ **H5 :** Social relevance and opportunity for growth and security positively influence organizational performance.

**(vi) Work and Total Life Space :** An individual's work experience can have a positive or negative effect on other spheres of his/her life, like relations with his/her family. For example, when an employee invests enormous time and energy in work at the expense of family, it affects his/her ability to perform other life roles as a spouse or

parent. Also, when there are frequent transfers, the families of the employees bear huge psychological and social costs in terms of being uprooted from their network of friends, acquaintances, and local affiliations. Therefore, a balance needs to be achieved in terms of work schedules, career demands, and travel requirements that do not eat away leisure and family time on a regular basis. Based on the literature, it is assumed that :

✎ **H6 :** Work occupation negatively influences organizational performance.

## Research Methodology

**(1) Method :** Primary data were collected from the employees of a Vadodara based PSU during the months of February - March 2018. The reason of choosing Vadodara as the data collection hub is the availability and access to PSUs in and around Vadodara. The research specially targeted the middle level employees who actually face QWL issues. The research design selected was descriptive, using judgment sampling ; a non-probability sampling technique was used to collect the data through the research instrument - structured non - disguised questionnaires. To ensure effective data collection, the QWL concept was discussed at length with the potential respondents before administering the questionnaire to them. In total, 130 questionnaires were distributed ; of that, 120 were returned and out of 120, 115 were found to be eligible for further analysis, leading to a response rate of 88.46%.

**(2) Measures :** The measures of QWL were taken after extensive literature review. The parameters used for collecting data on QWL measures were taken from the studies of Kanten and Sadullah (2012) and Timossi, Pedroso, Francisco, and Pilatti (2008), which contained 21 items. When the employees have a great quality of work life, it is reflected as high scores in the questionnaires. Organizational performance was measured by adopting the scale from Zohurul and Sununta (2009), which contained 6 items. The options given on the scale were : 1- *strongly disagree*, 2 - *disagree*, 3 - *no opinion*, 4 - *agree*, 5 - *strongly agree*, which is also called a Likert scale.

To identify the potential respondents and to collect data, judgment sampling (a non - probability sampling technique) was used. Five demographic questions pertaining to gender, age, marital status, education, and experience were added to the questionnaire.

**Table 1. Sample Profile of the Study QWL and its Impact on OP**

Variable	Categories	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	106	92.2
	Female	09	7.8
Age		36.4 (Mean)	
Marital Status	Single	8	7
	Married	107	93
Education	High School	39	33.9
	Graduate	43	37.4
	Post-Graduate & Professional	27	23.6
Experience	2 - 4 years	8	7
	5 - 7 years	7	6
	8 - 10 years	40	34.8
	More than 10 years	60	52.2



**(3) Sample Profile :** As quoted in the Table 1, the data were obtained from 115 employees of a PSU, out of which, 93% of the respondents were male ( $n = 106$ ) and 7% were female ( $n = 9$ ). The mean age of the respondents was 36.4 years. Most of the respondents were married ( $n = 107$ , 93%) and were well educated, with  $n = 70$  (61%) having college/university degrees. It is to be noted here that majority of the employees were experienced with more than 10 years of experience ( $n = 60$ , 52.2%), and  $n = 40$ , (34.8%) employees possessed 8-10 years of experience.

## Data Analysis and Results

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is used to confirm the scale and structural equation modeling (SEM) is used to test the theoretical model and hypotheses. Before performing the relationship analysis between the dimensions, the structural framework underlying QWL dimensions was analyzed through exploratory factor analysis (EFA).

First, data of the variables related to QWL were put into factor analysis and the varimax rotation was obtained.

**Table 2. Communalities**

Factor Statements	Initial	Extraction
My organization respects the worker's rights	1.000	.701
I have the freedom of expression at work	1.000	.649
I am satisfied with the norms and rules at my work place	1.000	.756
My organization respects my individuality	1.000	.792
I use ICT and other technology related procedures in my routine workday	1.000	.684
The working environment in my organization is healthy	1.000	.731
In my organization, there is an arrangement of various safety and security equipments	1.000	.736
The workload distribution in my organization is balanced	1.000	.630
My organization believes in quality of products and services	1.000	.644
My organization has a very good image	1.000	.742
My organization believes in discharging community integration services	1.000	.859
I am extremely proud to be working for my organization	1.000	.827
I am satisfied with the salary I get	1.000	.706
There is equality in terms of salary in my organization	1.000	.751
The salary provided is a fair compensation for the performance	1.000	.589
My workload takes away my leisure time also	1.000	.867
I am not able to balance my schedule for work and rest	1.000	.908
My work commitments influence my family life and my daily routine	1.000	.893
I am satisfied with the responsibility I shoulder in my organization	1.000	.773
All the workers in my organization are committed towards their work	1.000	.896
The work and work related tasks are important for everyone here	1.000	.811
According to me, not many employees quit or leave their jobs in this organization	1.000	.747
Many employees get overtime benefits in this organization	1.000	.729
The employees get yearly profit benefits as well	1.000	.712
The employees also receive attendance bonus	1.000	.791
The employees are entitled to performance bonus	1.000	.847
The employees also receive "Yearly salary increments"	1.000	.697

In the principal component analysis, the Kaiser - Meyer - Olkin test results (KMO value : 0.685) and the result of Bartlett's test (3088.953;  $p < 0.01$ ) were significant. As a result of the varimax rotation of the data related to QWL variables, removing the items with factor loadings under 0.40 from the analysis, six factors were obtained. The emerged factors explained 26.3% of the total variance. The findings on the resultant factors, factor loadings, explained variances, and internal consistency coefficients calculated for each factor (measure) are summarized in the Table 2 and Table 3.

## (1) Measurement Model

**(i) Results of Quantitative Analysis :** With calculation of CFA, the quantitative analysis was initiated, the results of which are presented in the Table 2 and Table 3 with their corresponding factor loadings. Some items were removed as they had factor loadings of less than 0.5 and failed to fit Nunnally and Bernstein's (1994) recommended level of internal consistency for scale development. Two items were eliminated from the QWL scale having factor weightage of less than 0.5.

To check the assumed theoretical model and assumed linkages among variables, SEM is used for three main reasons: (a) the main linkages between the variables can be evaluated in a methodical, extensive, and integrated way ; (b) the data analysis performed is based on the premise of confirmation vis a vis investigation ; and (c) it takes into account direct evaluations of parameter error, whereby the fit of the conceptual model is considered

**Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix**

Statement No.	Actual Statement	Factor Loadings
C2	I have the freedom of expression at work	0.552
C3	I am satisfied with the norms and rules at my work place	0.655
C4	My organization respects my individuality	0.832
WC1	I use ICT and other technology related procedures in my routine workday	0.652
WC2	The working environment in my organization is healthy	0.787
WC3	In my organization, there is an arrangement of various safety and security equipments	0.794
SR1	My organization believes in quality of products and services	0.689
SR2	My organization has a very good image	0.826
SR3	My organization believes in discharging community integration services	0.901
SR4	I am extremely proud to be working for my organization	0.863
COMP1	I am satisfied with the salary I get	0.411
COMP2	There is equality in terms of salary in my organization	0.494
COMP3	The salary provided is a fair compensation for the performance	0.500
WO1	My workload takes away my leisure time also	0.891
WO2	I am not able to balance my schedule for work and rest	0.913
WO3	My work commitments influence my family life and my daily routine	0.900
SI1	I am satisfied with the responsibility I shoulder in my organization	0.850
SI2	All the workers in my organization are committed towards their work	0.912
SI3	The work and work related tasks are important for everyone here	0.870
OP1	According to me, not many employees quit or leave their jobs in this organization	0.734
OP2	Many employees get overtime benefits in this organization	0.819
OP3	The employees get yearly profit benefits as well	0.755

**Table 4. Reliability of Scales**

Variable	Item or Statement No.	Corrected Item-to-Total Correlation	Cronbach's $\alpha$	$\lambda$	AVE	Composite Reliability
Constitutionalism	C2	0.487	0.627	0.552	0.48	0.73
	C3	0.522		0.655		
	C4	0.442		0.832		
Working Conditions	WC1	0.485	0.672	0.652	0.56	0.79
	WC2	0.568		0.787		
	WC3	0.629		0.784		
Social Relevance	SR1	0.590	0.879	0.689	0.68	0.89
	SR2	0.742		0.862		
	SR3	0.822		0.901		
	SR4	0.821		0.863		
Compensation	COMP1	0.686	0.769	0.411	0.22	0.46
	COMP2	0.632		0.494		
	COMP3	0.519		0.500		
Work Occupy	WO1	0.883	0.952	0.891	0.81	0.93
	WO2	0.942		0.913		
	WO3	0.911		0.900		
Social Integration	SI1	0.709	0.871	0.850	0.77	0.91
	SI2	0.854		0.912		
	SI3	0.7111		0.870		
Organizational Performance	OP1	0.637	0.768	0.734	0.59	0.81
	OP2	0.698		0.819		
	OP3	0.593		0.755		

(Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). Convergent validity was ascertained when all the factor loadings in CFA were statistically outstanding ( $p < 0.001$ ). Cronbach's alpha values for scales range from 0.627 to 0.952 (refer to Table 4). As the residuals are smaller than 0.05, we can infer that the adjustment of factor analysis is acceptable in relation to goodness of fit scales (Fraj & Martinez, 2006). Thus, adequacy of the analysis can be inferred as the goodness of fit indices are within the acceptable range (Hair et al., 1995). Since the objective is to determine the causal relationship between the parameters like Constitutionalism, Compensation, Social Integration, Social Relevance, Working Conditions, and Work Occupy with Organizational Performance, I make use of SEM technique where the relationship can be tested as input variables. Thus, a structural model is established in which the relationship between the identified factors can be tested as input variables.

**(ii) Structural Model to Test the Hypotheses :** The parameters obtained after the confirmation process are considered as independent variables. The chi - square represents a significance level ( $\chi^2 = 191.91$ ;  $p \geq 0.05$ ) and according to Hair et al. (1995), when the goodness of fit parameters like CFI, GFI are  $\geq 0.9$ , we can infer that there is strong uni - dimensionality. Standardized residual values for the model are less than .05 and suggest a good model fit. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) takes into account the error of approximation in the model (Byrne, 2010). If this fit index is less than 0.08, it indicates good fit. In the current study, RMSEA = 0.027, GFI = 0.882, AGFI = 0.831, and CFI = 0.989. Overall, the results of both models provide a good fit to the data observed (Hair et al., 1995).



**(iii) Validity Tables (AVE, CR, and Discriminant validity) :** The causal relationship findings are depicted in the Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7. Based on standardized path coefficients and significance levels, the hypothesized relationship (H1) that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of adequate and fair compensation on organizational performance is accepted. Hence, H1 is supported. Since ( $\beta = -0.426$ ,  $t = -3.481$ ,  $p \leq 0.00$ ), therefore, Compensation negatively influences Organizational Performance in this organization.

H2 states that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of Constitutionalism at the work place on Organizational Performance. The  $\beta = 0.138$ , but the hypothesis H2 is not supported. H3 states that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of Social Integration at the work place on Organizational Performance. The corresponding  $\beta = 0.023$ , but the hypothesis H3 is not supported. H4 states that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of Social Relevance at the work place on Organizational Performance. The corresponding  $\beta = 0.0132$ , but the hypothesis H4 is not supported. H5 states that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of Safe and Healthy Working Conditions on Organizational Performance. The corresponding  $\beta = 0.073$ , but the hypothesis H5 is not supported. H6 states that there is a no relationship between Work Occupy on Organizational Performance. The  $\beta = -0.242$ ,  $t = -2.239$ ,  $p \leq 0.00$ . Here, the  $\beta$  value is negative as the statements were framed with a negative attitude. For example, “My workload takes away my leisure time also.” This signifies that the employees possessed optimum workload which left enough room for leisure, family life, and routine life. Thus, H6 is supported.

**Table 5. Discriminant Validity**

	Constitution- alism	Working Conditions	Social Relevance	Compensation	Work Occupy	Social Integration	Organizational Performance
<b>Constitutionalism</b>	<b>0.69</b>						
<b>Working Conditions</b>	0.014	<b>0.74</b>					
<b>Social Relevance</b>	0.030	0.09	<b>0.82</b>				
<b>Compensation</b>	0.04	0.17	0.15	<b>0.46</b>			
<b>Work Occupy</b>	0.09	0.05	0.14	0.18	<b>0.9</b>		
<b>Social Integration</b>	0.002	0.008	0.0007	0.0016	1	<b>0.87</b>	
<b>Organizational Performance</b>	0.44	0.00	0.005	0.018	0.0005	0.0005	<b>0.9</b>

**Table 6. Explanatory Power and Fit Indices of Models**

Fit Indices and $R^2$	Recommended Value
$\chi^2$	191.9
df	177
$\chi^2/df$	1.084
GFI	0.882
CFI	0.989
TLI	0.986
RMSEA	0.027
$R^2$	27.1

**Table 7. SEM Results of the Model**

<b>Paths</b>	<b>Coefficients (<math>\beta</math>)</b>	<b>t- Value</b>	<b>Direct Effect</b>	<b>Total Effect</b>	<b>Hypothesis Supported</b>
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Compensation</b>	-0.426	-3.481	-0.426	-0.426	<b>Supported</b>
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Constitutionalism</b>	0.138	1.301	0.138	0.138	Not Supported
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Social Integration</b>	0.023	0.247	0.023	0.023	Not Supported
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Social Relevance</b>	0.132	1.262	0.132	0.132	Not Supported
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Working Conditions</b>	0.073	0.672	0.073	0.073	Not Supported
<b>Organizational Performance</b> ---- <b>Work Occupy</b>	-0.242	-2.239	-0.242	-0.242	<b>Supported</b>

## Discussion

Previous studies on quality of work life have shown an impact of QWL dimensions on organizational performance (Beauregard & Henry, 2009). However, the current findings contradict these studies. The first hypothesis which links Constitutionalism with Organizational Performance is rejected. There is a high division of labor in the PSUs with stringent rules, policies, and procedures to be followed by the employees. Moreover, there is an environment of fear in the organization where the middle and lower level managers are not free to express their opinions to their higher ups.

Since a government job is the most coveted job in India, and people are so happy with the job security of a government job that they hardly voice their opinions. Moreover, they are also fearful that voicing their opinions will diminish their chances of growth and promotion. The general sentiment prevailing is to limit their work processes and work only to the extent demanded. The result is they lack initiative towards work processes and hardly show any commitment. Also, too many rules and regulations at the workplace are detrimental to the creativity and innovation at work. An optimum level of norms and procedures is required giving due respect to individuality and rights of the employees.

The hypothesis that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of Adequate and Fair Compensation on Organizational Performance is supported, but in the negative context. A lot of respondents restricted their opinion on satisfaction in terms of salary. The analysis suggests that salary does play an important role in organizational performance. However negative beta value suggests their dissatisfaction. The employees were probably more than satisfied with their salary, which makes them lethargic and non- performers. Increase in salary is again rooted through the top management, which takes a lot of time to implement. Perhaps that is the reason for negative correlation. Also, the targets set by the top management may be too high, and the increment associated with the targets may be meagre. This may create reluctance on the part of employees, and they would not want to achieve the targets rather than achieving the same. This can be one of the reasons for a negative beta value.

Social Relevance can be measured through quality consciousness, employer branding, discharging community service, and igniting a spirit of belongingness amongst the employees.

According to Stawiski, Deal, and Gentry (2010), discharging community services not only enhances employee commitment and job satisfaction, but the moral endeavors by organizations motivate employees to perform better and leads to organizational performance by building goodwill of the organization with other patrons, including

consumers, financiers, dealers, government, which creates a sense of respect for the organization. This makes the employee feel proud about his/her organization. The current findings contradict the studies, which means that it is for the corporation to think whether they are doing all these community services for namesake, because the perceptions of the employees depicts a different picture. Thus, as a suggestion to the management, the employees must be made to participate wholeheartedly so that they initiate and implement the CSR activities, and in turn, be proud about their organization. The other reason can be lack of targeted communication channels with employees, and proper marketing efforts must be initiated not only for the employees, but for all the stakeholders to know, understand, and contribute in all CSR initiatives undertaken by the organization, which may often go unnoticed. Also, based on the employees' justice perceptions, it is quite logical to presume that organizations that participate in CSR activities will nurture an efficacious relationship with their employees. So, instead of looking to do CSR outside the company, the organization must first concentrate about improving the working conditions of the employees in the organization itself.

Thus, those organizations which do a lot of community service but do not believe in fair and equitable treatment of their employees fail to ignite commitment among their employees. A lot also depends on the type of economy prevailing in the country. According to Foo (2007), CSR has no place in emerging economies. Firms engaged in CSR activities in emerging economies will have to suffer unnecessary cost burden and competitive disadvantage against their unethical or irresponsible counterparts. This may also be the perception of the employees working at this PSU.

There is a pragmatic and notable effect of Work Occupy on Organizational Performance. The statements in the Work Occupy construct were framed in a negative tone. For example, "My work takes away my leisure time also." The employees were unanimous in their opinion that the work load in the organization was not at all burdensome, and they posited that the work load had a strong and pragmatic linkage with Organizational Performance.

Social Integration at the workplace highlights the importance of prioritizing your work and shouldering responsibility at the workplace. According to Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994), when people strongly identify with their work organization, their sense of survival is tied to the organization's survival. However, the current findings do not support this hypothesis. It is a common phenomenon in public undertakings that employees shy away from taking responsibilities. They also lack superlative work culture and they make fun of an employee who puts in sincere efforts for the growth the organization.

There is a lot of red tapism in promotions in the government sector which is detrimental for employees to believe that task performance will lead to growth in the organization. When they believe that the growth chances for them are dismal, they also shy away from putting sincere efforts. Therefore, in order to motivate the employees to work hard and stay committed to the organization, the organizational processes must be improved. Also, jobs can be redesigned through job enrichment and job enlargement techniques. Fair evaluations of the work performance must be made, and promotions must be done strictly based on merit and seniority.

The hypothesis that there is a pragmatic and notable effect of safe and healthy working conditions on organizational performance is also not supported here. Being a PSU, the working conditions were poor and ill managed. The computers and other equipments used were old and outdated. The work stations were dimly lit without adequate lighting and ventilation facilities. In a PSU, buying a small item requires a lot of paper work and formalities. This demotivates the employees. Thus, the processes need an improvement in terms of purchasing new items, which facilitate the productivity of the employees.

## **Managerial Implications**

In the present dynamic business environment, the organization needs to perform well for its growth and survival. It is the HR which is the major driver for organizational success. The study focuses on how the quality of work life

dimensions impact organizational performance and helps to gear the organization towards success. The study is based on the data collected from a PSU where the results did not fully support the theory of quality of work life. It partly supports it in terms of dimensions like Compensation and Work Occupancy, which are positive ; whereas, dimensions like Constitutionalism, Working Conditions, Social Relevance, and Social Integration are not supported.

Based on these results, I would suggest the management to provide a better work atmosphere to its employees, implement fair policies, which imbibe trust amongst the employees, and make an effort to involve employees in discharging its corporate responsibility as well as simultaneously putting in efforts to make the job tasks more meaningful which enhance the job design through techniques like job enlargement and job enrichment techniques and provide more freedom to the employees regarding implementing techniques to improve the tasks at hand. This study can be advantageous for the top management to formulate better policies for organizational success.

## **Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research**

The major limitation of the present study is the sample size which is small to generalize the findings. Also, this study can be carried out in all PSUs to ascertain the findings. However, this study contributes to the human resource literature in numerous ways. According to theory, it is the quality of work dimensions that impact the organizational performance. But the present research is an eye opener in this regard. There are many factors which determine the organizational performance. The study has only examined a part of the issue. Further studies can be conducted by relating job satisfaction dimensions or work engagement dimensions with organizational performance. Also, an attitudinal survey must be conducted to decode the underlying perceptions of the employees which can be a break through study for organizational performance and achieving organizational excellence.

## **Acknowledgment**

I would like to acknowledge the sincere efforts of Prof. Jayesh Patel for mentoring me by providing valuable insights and constructive comments.

## **References**

- Antle, B., MacKenzie, D. J., Baines, D., Angell, B., Dawson Haber, M. & Paulekat, P. (2006). *OASW quality of work life survey - Final Report*. Toronto, ON : Ontario Association of Social Workers.
- Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009). Making the link between work - life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(1), 9 - 22. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.09.001
- Boonrod, W. (2009). Quality of working life: Perceptions of professional nurses at Phramongkutklao Hospital. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*. 92(Supp1), S7 - S15.
- Byrne B.M. (2001). *Structural equation modelling with AMOS*. Mahwah, NJ : Erlbaum.
- Cascio, W. F. (2003). *Managing human resources*. New York, NY : McGraw - Hill.
- Dutton J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994) Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 239 - 263.

- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980 - 2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(1), 124 - 197. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003
- Estes, S. B., & Michael, J. (2005). *Work-family policies and gender inequality at work: A Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry*. Retrived from [http://workfamily.sas.upenn.edu/search/apachesolr\\_search/estes](http://workfamily.sas.upenn.edu/search/apachesolr_search/estes)
- Foo, L. M. (2007). Stakeholder engagement in emerging economies: Considering the strategic benefits of stakeholder management in a cross - cultural and geopolitical context. *Corporate Governance*, 7(4), 379 - 387. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710820461>
- Fraj, E., & Martinez, E. (2006). Environmental values and lifestyles as determining factors of ecological consumer behaviour: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 23(3), 133 - 144. DOI :10.1108/07363760610663295
- Goyal, M. (2017, August 13). How some of India's PSUs are set for a logical evolution through disinvestment. *The Economic Times*. Retrieved from <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/policy/how-some-of-indias-psus-are-set-for-a-logical-evolution-through-disinvestment/articleshow/60039546.cms>
- Gupta, M., & Sharma, P. (2011). Factor credentials boosting quality of work life of BSNL employees in Jammu region. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research in Business Management*, 2(1), 79 - 89.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice - Hall.
- Hankiss, E (1978). Quality of life models. In, *Indicators of environmental quality and quality of life* (UNESCO Reports and Papers in the Social Sciences, No. 38, pp. 58 - 88). UNESCO : Paris.
- Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of work life and human resource outcomes. *Industrial Relations*, 30(3), 469 - 479. doi:10.1111/j.1468-232x.1991.tb00799.x
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser Jr., W.E., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1994). Putting the service - profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(2), 164 - 174.
- Islam, M. Z., & Siengthai, S. (2009). *Quality of work life and organizational performance: Empirical evidence from Dhaka Export Processing Zone*. Retrieved from <http://www.oit.org/legacy/english/protection/travail/pdf/rdwpaper37a.pdf>
- Kahn, L. M., & Sherer, P. D. (1990). Contingent pay and managerial performance. *ILR Review*, 43(3), 107–S–120–S. doi: 10.1177/001979399004300307
- 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. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.057
- Md-Sidin, S., Sambasivan, M., & Ismail, I. (2010). Relationship between work-family conflict and quality of life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(1), 58 - 81.
- Nazir, U., Qureshi, T.M., Shafaat, T., & Ilyas, A. (2011). Office harassment: A negative influence on quality of work life. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(25), 10276 - 10285.
- Netto, C. S. (2018). Quality of work life of women employees in private sector organizations in Ernakulam district of Kerala. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 11(11), 51- 62. doi: 10.17010/pijom/2018/v11i11/138209
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.



- Pattanayak, B. (2003). Towards building a better HRD climate: A study on organisational role stress and quality of work life. *International Journal of Human Resources Development and Management*, 3(4), 371 - 378. doi:10.1504/ijhrdm.2003.003401
- Rao, P. K., & Venugopal, P. (2009). Perceptual factors in quality of work life of Indian employees. *Paradigm*, 13(1), 104 - 109. doi:10.1177/0971890720090113
- Robbins, S.P. (1989). *Organizational behaviour concepts, controversies and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice - Hall.
- Scully, J. A., Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1995). Locus of knowledge as a determination of the effects of participation on performance, affect, and perceptions. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Making Process*, 61(3), 276 - 288.
- Serey, T. T. (2006). Choosing a robust quality of work life. *Business Forum*, 27(2), 7 - 10.
- Shahbazi, B., Shokrzadeh, S., Bejani, H., Malekinia, E., & Ghoroneh, D. (2011). A survey of relationship between the quality of work life and performance of Department Chairpersons of Esfahan University and Esfahan Medical Science University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1555 - 1560.
- Sirgy, M., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. - J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241 - 302.
- Stawiski, S., Deal, J. J., & Gentry, W. (2010). *Employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility: The implications for your organization*. QuickView Leadership Series, Center for Creative Leadership, U S A . Retrieved from <http://www.jenniferjdeal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/EmployeePerceptionsCSR.pdf>
- Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K. (2011). A comparative analysis of quality of work life among the employees of local private and foreign commercial banks in Bangladesh. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 17 - 33.
- Timossi, L., Pedroso, B., Francisco, A. C. D., Pilatti, L. A. (2008). *Evaluation of quality of work life: An adaptation from the Walton's QWL Model*. XIV International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, October 13 - 16, 2008. Retrieved from [http://www.abepro.org.br/biblioteca/enegep2008\\_TI\\_ST\\_072\\_509\\_12395.pdf](http://www.abepro.org.br/biblioteca/enegep2008_TI_ST_072_509_12395.pdf)
- Tower, P. (2003, January). Rewards: The not-so-secret ingredient for managing talent (retention). *HR Focus*, 80(1), 3-10.

### About the Author

**Dr. Ameet Agrawal is Assistant Professor in the Department of Commerce and Business Management, Faculty of Commerce, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodra, Gujarat. Her subjects of interest are human resource management and organizational behaviour.**