

EMPLOYEES PERCEPTION ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN MICRO SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT

M. Charles Dayana

Asst. Prof. in Commerce, Holy Cross College (Autonomous),
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District, Tamil Nadu, India

Dr. S. Nadarajan

Asso. Prof. in Commerce, St. Jude's College,
Thoothoor, Kanyakumari District, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

The employees perception on the QWL in micro small and medium enterprises have been measured with the help of ten important Quality of work life factors. These are related to wages and salary, Training and development, career development, Recognition. Security, safety measures, work schedule, inter-personal relation ship, job content and working environment The employees are asked to rate the about said variables in each important QWL factors at 5 point scale from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied. The assigned score on these scales are from 5 to 1 respectively.

Key words: Quality of work life. MSMEs, perception., organizational performance discriminant QWL factors.

Cite this Article: M. Charles Dayana, Dr. S. Nadarajan. Employees Perception on Quality of Work Life in Micro Small and Medium Enterprises in Kanyakumari District. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management*, 8(3), 2017, pp. 08–14.

<http://www.iaeme.com/IJARM/issues.asp?JType=IJARM&VType=8&IType=3>

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life is a multifaceted concept, implying the concern for the members of the organisation irrespective of the level they belong to. It covers the employees perception or feeling above every dimension of work including economic rewards and benefits, security, working conditions, organizational and inter-personal relationships and intrinsic meaning in the persons life. Only the organisation with the high perception on QWL among the employees can achieve the organizational performance by two ways. One is related to increase in the productivity of the employees and an another one is to avail the economies of expertisation among the existing employees. QWL trend is triggered by the number of projects and programmes initiated with the primary aim of getting employees and

management work collaboratively to improve the QWL. In the case of small medium and micro enterprises, majority of the enterprises are suffered by high labour turnover and absenteeism among the employees. Eventhough the economic development of our nation rest on the development of MSMEs in Nation, only few enterprises are focusing on the QWL at their organisation. It is the time to understand the need of QWL, evaluation of existing QWL practices and employees' perception on QWL at the enterprises for future policy implications.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The winds of liberalization, privatization and globalization are blowing in our country. Competencies and proficiencies of a person that were essential yesterday may lose significance today and may become extinct tomorrow. To sustain and progress in such an environment, skills and competencies of the employees should be multifaceted, upgraded and attuned to specific needs. The development of human resource management practices at the organisation is the need the hour for better performance. In order to attain the organizational performance, the quality of work life at the organisation have to be properly and periodically reviewed by the owners even the organisation may be at the micro level.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To evaluate the factors influencing the Quality of work life in MSMEs in the perception of employees.
- To analysis the association between the profile of the employees and their perception on QWL factors.

4. METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on primary data. Primary data were collected through a well structured Questionnaire.

4.1. Tools of Analysis

The 't' test have been administered to find out the significant difference among the two groups of employees. [small and medium enterprises as one and micro enterprises as two). Regarding their view on QWL factors. In order to analysis the association between the profile of the employees and their perception on QWL factors, one way ANOVA have been administered.

4.2. Employees View on QWL Factors

The employees perception on QWL factors at this units have been analysed with the help of their perception score on ten QWL factors. In order to analyse the significant difference among the two group employees regarding their perception on QWL factors, the 't' test have been executed. The result of the analysis is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Employees View on QWL factors at MSMEs

| Sl. No. | Quality work life factors | Mean score among employees in | | Total |
|---------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|---------|
| | | SM | Micro | |
| 1. | Wages and salary | 3.0675 | 3.0983 | 0.2144 |
| 2. | Training and development | 2.7953 | 2.3560 | 2.1997* |
| 3. | Career development | 2.6946 | 2.4231 | 0.9667 |
| 4. | Recognition | 3.1242 | 2.7051 | 1.5884 |
| 5. | Security | 3.2383 | 2.8589 | 2.2791* |
| 6. | Safety measures | 3.7081 | 2.9786 | 3.1173* |
| 7. | Work schedule | 3.2114 | 2.7137 | 2.5044* |
| 8. | Inter-personal relationship | 3.0973 | 2.9017 | 0.3841 |
| 9. | Job content | 3.3859 | 2.7136 | 2.8188* |
| 10. | Working environment | 3.2584 | 2.6881 | 2.7044* |

*Significant at five per cent level.

The highly perceived QWL factors among the employees in micro enterprises are wages and salary; and safety measures since their respective mean scores are 3.0983 and 2.9786. The highly perceived QWL factors among the employees in SMs are safety measures and job content since their respective mean scores are 3.7081 and 3.3859. Regarding the employees perception on QWL factors, the significant difference among the employees in SM and micro enterprises have been seen in the case of training and development, security, safety measures, work schedule, job content and working environment since their respective 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level.

4.3. Discriminant QWL factors among the Employees in SMs and Micro Enterprises

It is imperative to examine the important discriminant QWL factors among the employees in SMs and micro enterprises. The two group discriminant analysis have been executed to identify the factors. Initially, the mean difference in QWL factor among the two group of respondents have been estimated along with its statistical significance. The discriminant power of each QWL has been estimated with the help of Wilk's Lambda. The score of the 10 QWL factors have been included for the analysis. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Mean Differences and Discriminant Power of QWL Factors among Employees in SM and Micro Enterprises

| Sl. No. | Quality work life factors | Mean score among employees in | | Mean Difference | 't' statistics | Wilk's Lambda |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | SMs | Micro | | | |
| 1. | Wages and salary | 3.0675 | 3.0983 | -0.0308 | -0.2144 | 0.4511 |
| 2. | Training and development | 2.7953 | 2.3560 | 0.4393 | 2.1997* | 0.1841 |
| 3. | Career development | 2.6946 | 2.4231 | 0.2715 | 0.9667 | 0.3033 |
| 4. | Recognition | 3.1242 | 2.7051 | 0.4191 | 1.5884 | 0.2172 |
| 5. | Security | 3.2383 | 2.8509 | 0.3794 | 2.2791* | 0.1788 |
| 6. | Safety measures | 3.7081 | 2.9786 | 0.7295 | 3.1173* | 0.1011 |
| 7. | Work schedule | 3.2114 | 2.7137 | 0.4977 | 2.8044* | 0.1459 |
| 8. | Inter-personal relationships | 3.0973 | 2.9017 | 0.1956 | 0.3841 | 0.3996 |
| 9. | Job constant | 3.3859 | 2.7136 | 0.6723 | 2.8188* | 0.1303 |
| 10. | Working environment | 3.2584 | 2.6881 | 0.5703 | 2.7044* | 0.1462 |

Employees Perception on Quality of Work Life in Micro Small and Medium Enterprises in
Kanyakumari District

* Significant at five per cent level

The significant mean differences are noticed in the case of six out of 10 QWL factors since their respective 't' statistics are significant at five per cent level. The higher mean differences are noticed in the case of safety measures and job content. Since it's mean differences are 0.7295 and 0.6723 respectively. The higher discriminant power is noticed in the case of safety measures and job content since it's Wilk's Lambda are 0.1011 and 0.1303 respectively. The significant QWL factors have been included for the estimation of two group discriminant function. The unstandardized procedure has been followed to estimate the function. The estimated function is:

$$Z = 0.4517 + 0.1173 X_2 + 0.1088 X_5 + 0.0896 X_6 + 0.1973 X_7 + 0.1902 X_9 + 0.1884 X_{10}$$

The relative contribution of QWL factors in Total Discriminant Score is computed by the product of discriminant co-efficient and the mean difference of the respective QWL factors. The results are given in Table 3.

Table 3 Relative Contribution of QWL Factors in Total Discriminant Score (TDS)

| Sl. No. | Quality work life factors | Discriminant co-efficient | Mean difference | Product | Relative Contribution in Total Discriminant Score |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---------|---|
| 1. | Training and development | 0.1173 | 0.4393 | 0.0515 | 10.48 |
| 2. | Security | 0.1088 | 0.3794 | 0.0413 | 8.40 |
| 3. | Safety measures | 0.0896 | 0.7295 | 0.0654 | 13.31 |
| 4. | Work schedule | 0.1973 | 0.4977 | 0.0982 | 19.97 |
| 5. | Job constant | 0.1902 | 0.6723 | 0.1278 | 25.99 |
| 6. | Working environment | 0.1884 | 0.5703 | 0.1074 | 21.85 |
| | Total | | | 0.4916 | 100.00 |
| Per cent of cases correctly classified: 78.28. | | | | | |

The higher discriminant co-efficients are noticed in the case of work schedule and job content since its co-efficients are 0.1973 and 0.1902 respectively. It shows the higher influence of above said the QWL factors in the discriminant function. The higher relative contribution in Total Discriminant Score is noticed in the case of job content and working environment since its relative contributions are 25.99 and 21.85 per cent respectively. The estimated two group discriminant function correctly classifies the cases to the extent of 78.28 per cent. The analysis reveals that the important discriminant QWL factors among the employees in SM and micro enterprises are job content and working environment which are highly at SM than that at micro enterprises.

4.4. Association between the Profile of the Employees and their Perception on QWL factors

In total, the identified QWL factors are 10 factors. The profile of the employees may be associated with their perception on these QWL factors. Hence, the present study has made an attempt to analyse these association with the help of one way analysis of variance. All the 14 profile variables are included for one way ANOVA whereas the included QWL factors are

wages and salary, training and development, career development, recognition and security. The result of one way analysis of variance are summated in Table 4.

Table 4 Association between Profile of Employees and their View on QWL Factors

| Sl. No. | Profile variables | F-Statistics | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|
| | | Wages and Salary | Training and Development | Career Development | Recognition | Security |
| 1. | Designation | 2.8961 | 2.0451 | 2.6433 | 3.9182* | 2.7576 |
| 2. | Age | 3.8088* | 2.1417 | 3.7303* | 3.7117* | 3.6541* |
| 3. | Nativity | 3.0114 | 3.7670 | 3.3969 | 3.5108 | 3.6614 |
| 4. | Marital status | 2.4511 | 2.0896 | 2.8999 | 3.4082 | 3.3341 |
| 5. | Social Class | 3.0486 | 2.5861 | 2.8029 | 3.9145* | 2.2108 |
| 6. | Education level | 3.8568* | 3.6509* | 3.7717* | 1.3848 | 2.0971 |
| 7. | Type of family | 3.1082 | 2.9881 | 2.4563 | 2.5443 | 2.8344 |
| 8. | Size of family | 2.4511 | 2.5088 | 2.7144 | 2.9089 | 2.4733 |
| 9. | Years of experience | 3.8891* | 3.9503* | 3.6869* | 3.7339* | 3.9082* |
| 10. | Occupational background | 3.7341* | 3.9099* | 2.8117 | 2.5664 | 2.7313 |
| 11. | Monthly income | 3.4517* | 3.6085* | 3.8085* | 3.8984* | 3.5086* |
| 12. | Number earning members per family | 3.6482 | 3.0889 | 3.3919 | 3.6886 | 3.7231 |
| 13. | Spouse's education | 2.3344 | 2.1242 | 2.0886 | 2.1408 | 2.3393 |
| 14. | Family income | 3.8542* | 3.6508* | 3.7078* | 3.7646* | 3.7334* |

*Significant at five per cent level.

The Table 4.36 shows the result of one-way analysis of variance. Regarding the perception on wages and salary, the significantly associating profile variables are age, nativity, education level, years of experience, occupational background, monthly income and family income since their respective 'F' statistics are significant at five per cent level. The significantly associating profile variables with the perception on training and development are level of education, years of experience, occupational background, monthly income and family income whereas in the perception on career development, these profile variables are age, level of education, years of experience, monthly income and family income. Regarding the perception on recognition, the significantly associating profile variables are designation, age, social class, years of experience, monthly income and family income whereas in the perception on security, these profile variables are age, years of experience, monthly income and family income.

The association between the profile variables of the employees and their perception on safety measures, work schedule, inter personal relationship, job content and working environment have been examined and presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Association between Profile of Employees and their View on QWL Factors

| Sl. No. | Profile variables | F-Statistics | | | | |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| | | Safety measures | Work Schedule | Inter personal relationship | Job content | Working environment |
| 1. | Designation | 2.8663 | 2.9942 | 2.9965 | 3.1447 | 2.8784 |
| 2. | Age | 3.8011* | 3.7344* | 3.8056* | 3.9662* | 2.9661 |
| 3. | Nativity | 3.1133 | 3.2949 | 3.4082 | 3.6642 | 3.6989 |
| 4. | Marital status | 2.3317 | 2.8859 | 2.6414 | 2.8342 | 2.9669 |
| 5. | Social Class | 3.6214 | 3.0844 | 3.1337 | 2.8545 | 2.6562 |
| 6. | Education level | 2.1288 | 3.8886* | 2.6844 | 3.8603* | 3.9445* |
| 7. | Type of family | 2.3097 | 2.1445 | 2.4297 | 2.5084 | 2.4037 |
| 8. | Size of family | 2.4541 | 2.7038 | 2.8084 | 2.6676 | 2.5144 |

Employees Perception on Quality of Work Life in Micro Small and Medium Enterprises in Kanyakumari District

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 9. | Years of experience | 3.8408* | 3.9149* | 3.9149* | 3.8143* | 3.9394* |
| 10. | Occupational background | 3.7141* | 3.8996 | 2.4411 | 2.7313 | 3.9776* |
| 11. | Monthly income | 3.8917 | 2.9443 | 3.9993* | 3.8882* | 2.6826 |
| 12. | Number earning members per family | 3.5088 | 3.8911* | 3.9669* | 3.1173 | 3.2471 |
| 13. | Spouse's education | 2.2082 | 2.5911 | 2.4417 | 2.3344 | 2.2144 |
| 14. | Family income | 3.8881* | 3.9093* | 3.9086* | 2.8991 | 2.6342 |

*Significant at five per cent level

The significantly associating profile variables with the perception on safety measures are age, years of experience, occupational background and family income whereas in the perception on work schedule, these profile variables are age, level of education, years of experience, occupational background, number of earning members per family and family income since their respective 'F' statistics are significant at five per cent level. Regarding the perception on inter-personal relationship, the significantly associating profile variables are age, years of experience, monthly income, number of earning members per family, and family income whereas in the perception on job content, the significantly associating profile variables are gender, age, level of education and years of experience. Regarding the perception on working environment, the significantly associating profile variables are nativity, level of education, years of experience and occupational background since their respective 'F' statistics are significant at five per cent level. The analysis reveals that the important profile variables associating with the employees' perception on QWL factors are their age, level of education, years of experience and family income.

5. FINDINGS

The highly viewed variable in wages and salary by the employees in SM and micro enterprises are 'wages and salary based on experience' and wages and salary based on education respectively. Regarding the view on variables in wages and salary, the significant difference among the two group of employees have been noticed in their view on all six variables in it. The included six variables in wages and salary explain it to a reliable extent. In total, the level of view on wages and salary is higher among the employees in SM than that among the employees in micro enterprises.

Among the employees in training and development, the highly viewed variable in SM and micro enterprises is 'wages based on training'.

The level of perception on training and development among the employees in SM is higher than that among the employees in micro enterprises.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The quality of work-life among the employees in small and medium enterprises is higher than that among the employees in micro enterprises. The important factors leading to the quality of work-life among the employees are empowerment, work climate, work-life balance and quality of process which are enriching the quality of work-life among the employees.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bhatnagar, J., (2007), "Predictors of Organisational Commitment in India: Strategic HR Rules, Organisation Learning Capability and Psychological Empowerment", The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(2), pp.1782-1812.

- [2] Bolino, M., W. Turnley and J. Bloodgood (2002), "Citizenship Behaviour and the Creation of Social Capital in Organisation", *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), pp.505-502.
- [3] Bowling, N., Watson, D., Bector, T. and Rodriguez, S., (2004), "The Quality of my work and life", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), pp.74-95.
- [4] Brown, S. and Fai, F., (2006), "Strategic Resonance between Technological and Organisational Capabilities in the Innovation Process within Firms", *Technovation*, 26(1), pp.60-75.
- [5] Cohen, A., (2007), "Commitment before and After: An Reconceptualisation of Organisational Commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(2), pp.336-354.
- [6] Daud, N., (2010), "Investigating the Relationship between Quality of Work life and Organisational Commitment amongst Employees in Malaysian Firms", *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), pp.75-82.
- [7] Dolan, L.S., Gorcia, S., Cabezas, C. and Tzafriri (2008), "Predictors of 'Quality of Work' and 'Poor', 'Health among Primary Health'-Care Personnel in California", *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 21 (2), pp.203-218.
- [8] Duncan, G., (2003), "The Quality of Work life: is Scandinavia Different", *European Sociological Review*, 19(1), pp.61-79.
- [9] Dyrbye, L.N., Thomas, M.R., Hunkington, J.C., Lawson, K.C., Norotny, P.J. and Sloan (2006), "Personal Life Events and Medical Student Burnout: A Multi Center Study", *Academy of Medicine*, 81 (4), pp.374-384.
- [10] Dr. J. Sivasubramanian and Dr. M. Velavan. An Empirical Study on Employee Perception a bout Organisational Climate and Its Impact on the Quality of Service. *International Journal of Management*, 7 (2), 2016, pp. 19-23.
- [11] Maya.M and Dr. R. Thamilselvan, Employee Perception Towards Talent Management Strategies - An Empirical Study With Reference To Software Companies In Chennai City. *International Journal of Management*, 3 (2), 2012, pp. 171-176.