IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

"An Field Works On Quality Of Work Life At PIMS Private Hospital Kalapet, Puducherry."

[1] Divya. S,[2] Krishnapriya. J

[1] Nursing Officer, [2] Nursing officer

[1] Department of Psychiatry

[1] Pondicherry Institute Of Medical Sciences, Puducherry, India

Abstract: This study reveals at the quality of work life is mostly significant with the organization, Quality of work life is more important for the organization. Quality of work life programs when implemented lead to greater growth and development of the individual as a person as a productive employee of an Organization, develop trust between managers and employees, attract and keep talented staff, build strong employee commitment, strengthen work place learning and improve overall effectiveness of an Organization.

Index Terms - Quality of work life, organization, employees.

I. INTRODUCTION

In current scenario every organization wants more output in comparison of less input; it can be possible when working employee find its working place comfortable as per the job requirement. So it's very important for an organization to make a quality relationship between its employees and working environment. Now-a-days, there is no balance between the family and work life due to job pressure and conflicting interests and over-socialization that lead to too much of interest about the co-workers for satisfaction of their ego, creating problems in the minds of neighbors. The work-norms impose on workers too much of burden and control by their bosses. And the rules are for workers or employees. They have to follow, and the employer has right to layoff the worker due to marketing and technological factors. The indian workers and their unions are now on the defensive. They are now more interested in the question of how to retain their jobs than in the question of how to improve their quality of life in the work place. It is therefore not difficult to understand why the question of improving quality of work life has lost its importance in our country. The quality of work life movement which draws "attention to workers" need for meaningful and satisfying work and for participation in decisions that affect their work situation. And work.

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Health Care Centers (or) Hospital success fully depends on the employees. It happens only when the employees work effectively, while the organization provides a better working climate. Quality of work life affects the services of Health Care Centers (or) Hospital. Hence this study on quality of work life is done. This study focuses on employee perception on various welfare measures provided by the Health Care Centers (or) Hospital.

III. OBJECTIVES

1) To study the Quality of Work life at PIMS Private Hospital.
2) To identify the factors that influences quality of work life.
3) To know the most affecting factor that influences quality of work life.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Quantitative approach with descriptive design was used and the study was conducted in, Pondicherry Institute of Medical Sciences, Puducherry.

4.1. Population and Sample

The analysis has been made mainly used on the primary data was collected from the employees through well-structured questionnaire. Respondent has filled the questionnaire and secondary data was used mainly to support primary data. The simple random sampling without replacement methods were used to collect samples. Sample size is calculated using the formula $n= (Z^2 S^2)/e^2$ (C.R.Kothari). where „n" is sample, „Z" is confident limited, „S" is sample size and „e" error. Using this formula the sample size should be around 100. The tools used for data analysis are factor analysis, cluster analysis and regression. Percentage analysis is used for demographic factor such as age, gender, marital status, designation, experience and income. The data collected are analyzed using the statistical software SPSS 16.0 and the study reveals that there is Quality of work life, then factors has been divided into six factors such as Rewards & Safety, Work related factor, Supervision, Authority & Relationship, Compensation & Rewards, and Job Satisfaction and the factors has been ranked as based on variables such as Quality of work life. The sample is collected from the Workers of Pims private hospital.

4.2 Data and Sources of Data

SOURCES OF DATA

In this study both primary data and secondary data are used.

Primary data

The data which is collected afresh for the first time and thus happen to be original in character is called primary data. These data are collected directly from the employees of Pims Private Hospital Kalapet, Puducherry.

Secondary data

The secondary data on the other hand are those which have already been collected by someone else and which have already been passed through the statistical process. Secondary data has been collected from the Company websites, Profiles magazines, articles were used.

V. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The tools used for Data analysis are Descriptive analysis, Factor analysis, Chi-square, Cluster analysis and ANOVA. The Data collected are analyzed using the statistical software SPSS 16.0.

ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTOR

Table 5.1.1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to age

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Below30	8	8
2	30-40	43	43
3	40-50	49	49
Total		100	100

Table 5.1.1 reveals that 8% of respondents belong to the age group of below 30, 43% of respondents are between 30-40 age groups, 49% of respondents are between 40-50 age groups. The Major respondent age is 40-50.

Table 5.1.2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to gender

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Male	65	65
2	Female	35	35
Total		100	100

Table 5.1.2 reveals that, 65% of the respondents belong to the category of male and 35% of the respondents belong to the category of female. Most of the respondents are male

Table 5.1.3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to marital status

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	Married	93	93
2	Unmarried	7	7
Total		100	100

Table 5.1.3 reveals that 93% of the respondents are married and 7% of the respondents are unmarried. Most of the respondents are married.

Table 5.1.4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to experience

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	1-3yrs	9	9
2	3-5yrs	36	36
3	5-8yrs	28	28
4	8-10yrs	27	27
Total		100	100

The above table and chart infers that 9% of the respondents are between 1-3 years" experience, 36% of the respondents are between 3-5 years" experience, 28% of the respondents are between 5-8 years" experience and 27% of the respondents are between 8-10 years" experience. Most of the respondents are between 3-5 years" experiences.

Table 5.1.5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to designation.

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	M D	2	2
2	Doctors	2	2
3	Lab Technician	18	18
4	Nurse	42	42
5	Others	36	36
Total		100	100

The above chart and table infers that 2% of the respondents are works MD of the Hospital, 2% of the respondents are works as Doctors, 18% of the respondents are Lab technician in the hospital, 42% of the respondents are Nurse in the hospital, and 36% of the respondents are others in the hospital. Most of the respondents are workers in the hospital.

Table 5.1.6: Frequency and Percentage Distribution according to income.

n=100

Sl.No	Options	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1	5000-10000	55	55
2	10000-15000	34	34
3	15000-20000	9	9
4	Above20000	2	2
Total		100	100

The above table and chart infers that 55% respondents income is between 5000- 10000, 34% respondents income is between 10000-15000, 9% respondents income is between 15000-20000, and another 2% respondents income is above 20000. Most of the respondents income is 10000-15000.

ANALYSIS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE VARIABLES

This section deals with the analysis of quality of work life by using tools like factor analysis, mean, cluster, chi-square and ANOVA.

FACTORISATION OF ITEMS IN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

` The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test for sphericity is used to test the sample adequacy for applying factor analysis. Kaiser recommends values greater than 0.5 as acceptable. Since the value is 0.715, it is a good value and hence we are confident that factor analysis could be appropriate for these data. The Bartlett's test for sphericity is significant hence R-matrix is not an identity matrix. It reveals that there is some relationship between variables and therefore factor analysis is appropriate for these data.

Table 5.2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.715
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1.752
	Df	378
	Sig.	.000

The above table KMO value is 0.715 which indicates that the factor analysis is useful with the data. The chi-square value is 1.752, degree of freedom is 378 and the significant value is 0.000 which is significant at more than 99% level of confidence.

RANKING FOR FACTORS INVOLVED IN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Respondents were asked to give rating between 1(Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree) to find out the perception of Quality of work life related variable identified for studying employees work life process.

Table 5.3: Ranking for factors involved in quality of work life

FACTORS	MEAN	RANK
Rewards & Safety	4.029	III
Work related factor	4.322	II
Supervision	3.193	VI
Authority & Relationship	3.917	IV
Compensation & Rewards	4.520	I
Job Satisfaction	3.460	V

The highest mean score of the variable is 4.520 and the lowest mean is 3.193.

When we rank to the factors compensation & rewards is in the first rank. The organization gives more compensation &rewards to the employees. Work related factor is in the second rank. Organization gives enough work to relate for its work. Rewards & Safety is in the third rank. Organization gives some safety to employees. Authority & Relationship is in the fourth rank. It gives some authority and relationship with employees. Job satisfaction is in the fifth rank. The employees are less satisfies for its job, then finally Supervision got last rank, here there is no proper supervision provided to the employees so it got last in the Quality of work life.

FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS

Based on convenience the five point scale of different factor can be classified into six groups easy interpretations of data. Number of employee fall under each category is shown in.

Table 5.4: Frequency analysis of the factors

FACTORS	SCALE 1-2.5		SCALE 2.6-3.5		SCALE 3.6-5	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Rewards & Safety	-	-	14	14	86	86
Work related factor	1	1	10	10	89	89
Supervision	36	36	9	9	55	55
Authority & Relationship[	5	5	11	11	84	84
Compensation & Rewards	-	-	4	4	86	86
Job Satisfaction	1	1	61	61	38	38

From the frequency analysis it is inferred that the scale 3.6-5 has the highest percentage (89%) of respondents gives their opinion under the Work related factor. In the scale 2.6-3.5 has the highest percentage (14%) of respondents gives their opinion under the Rewards and Safety factor and the scale 1-2.5 has the highest percentage (36%) of respondents gives their opinion under the Supervision factor. From the entire table it is found that the factor Work related from the scale 3.6-5 have the highest percentage (89%) and the lowest percentage is both the factors Reward and Safety.

SEGMENTATION OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

K-means cluster analysis is used to categorize Quality of work life into three clusters. The following table is the final clusters; numbers have been given ranking with the cluster.

Table 5.4: FINAL CLUSTER CENTRES

FACTORS	1	2	3
Reward & Safety	4.02(III)	4.15(IV)	3.40(III)
Work related factor	4.37(II)	4.40(II)	3.50(II)
Supervision	4.00(IV)	2.08(VI)	2.90(V)
Authority & Relationship	3.94(V)	4.20(III)	2.19(VI)
Compensation & Rewards	4.56(I)	4.59(I)	3.86(I)
Job Satisfaction	3.55(VI)	3.39(V)	3.10(IV)
Average	**4.07**	**3.80**	**3.16**
No. of Cases	**55**	**38**	**7**

Using the factors of quality of work life the cluster analysis is done. From the average it is found total cluster one has the highest average of 4.07, cluster three has the lowest average of 3.16. Hence cluster one can be named as high comfortable, cluster two can be moderate comfortable and cluster three can be low comfortable. No. of Cases is divided into three clusters. In these cluster, cluster one has highest value of 55, cluster three has lowest value of 7.

In cluster one the compensation & rewards 4.56 has highest value in ranking whereas the job satisfaction 3.55 has the lowest ranking. In cluster three the compensation & rewards 3.86 has the highest position in the ranking whereas 2.19 has the least in the ranking position. In cluster two the compensation & rewards 4.59 got the first position in ranking and the supervision 2.08 got the least ranking. Compare no. of cases and average the cluster one is highest value and the cluster three is lowest value. Therefore the three clusters are high comfortable, moderate comfortable and low comfortable.

TABLE 5.5: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND CLUSTERS

Factors	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Mean Square	Df	Mean Square	Df		
Reward & Safety	1.687	2	.125	97	13.472	.000
Work related factor	2.549	2	.224	97	11.395	.000
Supervision	41.781	2	.140	97	101.250	.000
Authority & Relationship	11.987	2	.187	97	64.213	.000
Compensation & Rewards	1.664	2	.118	97	14.144	.000
Job Satisfaction	.777	2	.199	97	3.908	.000

The ANOVA table indicates that there exists significant difference among all the three clusters. The significant value for all the factors is less than 0.05. This means that the all factors have significant contribution on dividing employees into 3 segments based of the quality of work life.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

TABLE 5.6: Chi-square is using with the quality of work life and demographic variables.

ɨmographic Variables	Pearson's Chi-Square Value	Significance Value	Result
Age	1.742	0.783	Not associated
Gender	0.183	0.913	Not associated
Marital Status	2.252	0.324	Not associated
Experience	7.952	0.242	Not associated
Designation	6.210	0.624	Not associated
Income	4.369	0.627	Not associated

The above table inferred that demographic variables like age (0.783), gender (0.913), marital status (0.324), experience (0.242), designation (0.624), and income (0.627) has no association with cluster.

VI. DISCUSSION

From the study it is found that majority of the respondents from the PIMS private Hospital are male. The most of the employees belong to the age category is 40 to 50 years. Most of the employees belong to the category of married employees. The most of the employees belong to the experience category is 3-5 years. The most of the employees belong to the monthly income category is Rs.5000 to 10000 as their monthly income. Most of the employees belong to the category of designation is workers and other workers.

Since there are twenty eight different statements were asked to workers in this study, it found little complicate to analyze each data. To make this study little simple factor analysis is made. Using the factor analysis method all the statements are divided into six major factors. They are Rewards & Safety, Work related factor, Supervision, Authority & Relationship, Compensation & Rewards, Job satisfaction. These factors are given rank on the basis of their mean value. From the result it is found that Compensation & Rewards is in the first rank. The Work related factor is the second rank, the factor Rewards & Safety is in the third rank, the factor Authority & Relationship is in the fourth rank, the factor Job Satisfaction is in the fifth rank and the last sixth rank goes to Supervision. These results show that the compensation & rewards factor is better in the organization.

In the frequency analysis all the factors are brought into a scale of 1-2.5, 2.6-3.5, 3.6-5. In this, the "Work related factor" got highest value (89) which lies the 3.6-5 scale and "Job Satisfaction" got least value (38). In this, the "Job Satisfaction" got highest value (61) which lies the 2.6-3.5 scale and "Compensation & Rewards" got least value (4). In this, the "Supervision" got highest value (36) and "Rewards & Safety and Compensation & Rewards" got least value.

Using the factors of Quality of work life the cluster analysis is done. The cluster divides each factor into three categories. They consider as high comfortable, medium comfortable, and low comfortable as per their average value. The highest average value is denoted as High comfortable and it has fifty five no. of cases, second highest value as Medium comfortable which have thirty eight no. of cases and least average value as Low comfortable which have seven no. of cases. From the first cluster, it is found that Compensation & Rewards got first rank and Job satisfaction got least rank. From the second cluster, it is found that Compensation & Rewards is ranked first and Supervision got least rank. From the third cluster, it is found that Compensation & Rewards got first rank and Authority & Relationship got least rank.

Using chi-square, the association between quality of work life factor and demographic factor is found. In these six quality of work life factors are not associated, they are Rewards & Safety, Work related factor, Supervision, Authority & Relationship, Compensation & Rewards, and Job satisfaction. These quality of work life factors have not significant value less than 0.05.

Using ANOVA, the significant relationship between Quality of work life factor and all demographic factors is found. In that, gender of the respondents is associated with the job satisfaction factor, experience of the respondents is associated with the compensation & rewards factor and income of the respondents is associated with the rewards & safety factor. Rest of the Quality of the work life factor is not associated with any demographic factor.

VII. REFERENCE

1. Brenner, P. (2004). Workers physical surrounding. Impact bottom line accounting: Smarts Pros.com
2. Bolweg, J.F. (1976), Job Design and Industrial Democracy, International Series of Quality of Work Life, Martinus Nijhoff Social Sciences Division, Boston, MA.
3. Bertrand, J and Scott. (1992). Designing quality into work life. Quality Progress, 12, 29- 33.
4. Buekema, L. (1987). Quality of reduction of working hour. Groningen: Karstapel, in, press.
5. Cunningham, J.B. and T. Eberle, (1990). A guide to job enrichment and redesign. Personnel, 67: 56-61.
6. Chan, C.H. and W.O. Einstein, (1990). Quality of Work Life (QWL): What can unions do? SAM Advanced Management J., 55: 17-22.
7. Chan, C. H., & Einstein, W. O. (1990). Quality of Work Life (QWL): What can unions do? SAM Advanced Management J., 55, 17-22.
8. Che Rose, R., & Beh, L. S., Uli, J., & Idris, K. (2006 B). Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions. Journal of Social Sciences, 2(2), 61-67.
9. Cascio WF. Managing human resources: productivity, quality of work life, profits. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill; (1998).
10. Cronbach (1951). ,,An examination of the independent and joint contributions of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on employee intentions to quit", Group and Organization Studies, 6, 73-82.
11. Dev Raj Adhikari, (1992).published paper "Labor legislations for improving quality of work life in Nepal".

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It is my pleasure and privilege to express my deep sense of gratitude to Almighty and to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this endeavor. First of all, I offer my humble and sincere thanks to **Almighty God** as he has done mighty things throughout this period of study in the form of abundant blessings and graces. My special thanks to all the **participants**, who enthusiastically participated in my study and for being very cooperative and also adding light to my study with their responses. I am proud to acknowledge the love, encouragement and prayer of my **grandparents**, my **parents**, my **husband**, my **brothers** and my **sisters** for their constant support in every phase of my course.