

**ARIV**

International Journal of Business

Paper ID: AIJB12012020

Vol1 Issue 2 2020

Effect of Safety & Welfare Measures on Quality of Work Life Among Employees of Private Limited Companies, Chennai

R. Banureka¹ & V. Gayathri²¹Asst Professor (Sl.Gr), DOMS, Easwari Engineering College, Chennai²Research Scholar, University of Madras Chennai

Abstract

The role played by human resources in an organization's success cannot be overemphasized. In today's competitive scenario, the business organizations need to ensure that the employees are provided with proper welfare & safety measures and not exposed to risk which affects their physical, emotional and mental health. These measures pave a way for satisfaction among employees towards the organization and it results in improved quality of work life. QWL plays a significant role in the economic and social welfare of an employee Employees which lies beyond the domain of Industry. The basic purpose of employee's welfare & Safety Measures is to enrich the life of employees and keep them motivated and satisfied. This study was undertaken in few Private Companies in Chennai to identify the various employee welfare activities & Safety Measures practiced and its effect on Quality of work life of the employees.

Keywords:

Safety and Welfare, Quality of work life, Satisfaction & Motivation

Introduction

Employee's welfare and safety has seen as the essential measures of performance any organization. The Quality of Work Life (QWL) has assumed significance in all the countries of the world, in the context of commitment to work, motivation and job performance. With the rapidly changing technological, socio-economic, political, and legal environment, effective management of human resources has become a challenging job. Effective utilization of human resources requires better quality of work life by providing adequate good working conditions, various welfare facilities, free from hazards, suitable opportunities for growth and development, workers participation in management and by ensuring social justice in the organization. High QWL will satisfy the needs of employees, there by fulfill the organizational goals efficiently and effectively.

Most of the quality of work life studies focus on quality of life, work life balance and work life enhancement. In this present study quality of work life is a dependent variable and safety and welfare measures are taken as two independent variable and satisfaction of employees towards the measures provided by the organization and which enhance the quality of work life of employees is considered as outcome variable. Both measures safety and welfare would result in increase the Quality of work life which leads to create a better working Environment for employees.

Review of Literature

Walton, (2005), identified the following as key constructs for QWL- adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity for continued growth and security, Opportunity to use and develop human capacities, Social integration in the work organization, Constitutionalism in theory organization, Work and total life space and Social relevance of work life. Christen, M., et al., (2006) "Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, and effort: A reexamination using agency theory", found that people spend a significant amount of their time at work either to engage in productive work regardless of compensation or for the monetary rewards that can be enjoyed at a later time frame. Madhesh. R (2011) in his study, "Quality of Work Life of Select Steel Plant Employees in Tamil Nadu studied 11 factors that influenced the quality of work life of employees. They are nature of job, compensation, working conditions, opportunity for growth and development, social integration of work, constitutionalism in the work

organization, work and total life space, occupational stress, worker's participation in management, grievance handling, and social relevance of work.

Rajagopal.K (2013), in his study "A Study on Employee Health, Safety and Welfare Measures of Chemical Industry In The View of Salem Region", found that to accomplish higher productivity, organizations needed to focus on that Labor health, safety and welfare. Kassu Jilcha (2017) in "Industrial occupational safety and health innovation for sustainable Development", studied the workplace safety & health innovation. Their findings showed that the innovation of workplace safety and health is critical. Sustainable development can be ensured through employees who are healthy, ensuring that workplaces are safe resulting in lesser accidents. Thus, it leads to cost savings as well. M. Joseph Sirgy (2018), "Work-Life Balance: An Integrative Review", analysed work-life balance involving two key dimensions: engagement in work life and non-work life and minimal conflict between social roles in work and non-work life.

Research Methodology

The research design used for this study is Descriptive Research methodology. In the descriptive research surveys on the facts are done to find about the issue and the factors prevailing in the industry regarding safety and welfare measures related to quality of work life. The sample was drawn from employees of private limited companies based in Chennai. Convenience sampling method has been used for the purpose of this study. The sample size taken for the study is 103 respondents based on their responses through questionnaires. The objectives of the study are,

- To know the employees' satisfaction level towards both the welfare & safety measures
- To understand how welfare & safety measures impact the Quality of work life of the employees.
- To find out employees' preference regarding welfare & safety measures

Research Questions

RQ1: Whether medical facilities provided by the companies affects QWL

RQ2: Whether safety measures provided by the companies affects QWL

Data Analysis

4.1: Table showing Quality of work life and medical facilities

	Sumof Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.484	2	1.742	6.773	.002
Within Groups	25.720	100	.257		
Total	29.204	102			

Anova has been used for this analysis and, as the sig. value is 0.002 (≤ 0.05) null Hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference between Quality of work life and medical facilities.

4.2: Table showing Quality of work life and safety measures

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.784	.467		8.100	.000
1 Safety measures	.170	.100	.167	1.700	.092

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of work life

Using regression, the sig. value is 0.092 (≥ 0.05) null Hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant relationship between Quality of work life and Safety Measures

4.3 Table showing Coefficients^a Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.575	.736		3.501	.001
Safety measures	.102	.101	.100	1.008	.316
External facilities	.256	.105	.249	2.426	.017
Internal facilities	.004	.106	.003	.034	.973
Medical facilities	.080	.094	.089	.847	.399

Multiple regression has been used to identify the significant factors affecting quality of work life. Based on the above table, we can interpret that external facilities are significant for employees with respect to quality of work life.

4.3 Factor Analysis

Table showing Descriptive statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Analysis N
Internal facilities	4.41	.494	103
External facilities	4.53	.520	103
Medical facilities	4.40	.600	103
Safety measures	4.63	.524	103
Quality of work life	4.57	.535	103

Table showing Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Internal facilities	1.000	.843
External facilities	1.000	.535
Medical facilities	1.000	.585
Safety measures	1.000	.420
Quality of work life	1.000	.425

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table showing Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	1.756	35.118	35.118	1.756	35.118	35.118	1.653	33.056	33.056
2	1.052	21.042	56.160	1.052	21.042	56.160	1.155	23.104	56.160
3	.855	17.110	73.270						
4	.740	14.803	88.073						
5	.596	11.927	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table showing Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
Internal facilities		.877
External facilities	.725	
Medical facilities	.721	
Safety measures		
Quality of work life	.604	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table showing Rotated Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
Internal facilities		.914
External facilities	.708	
Medical facilities	.569	
Safety measures	.629	
Quality of work life	.652	

Table showing Rotated Component Matrix Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Internal facilities		.914
External facilities	.708	
Medical facilities	.569	
Safety measures	.629	
Quality of work life	.652	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

It is inferred that Internal Facilities and External facilities are important factors for QWL.

Findings & Discussion

- The study concentrates on internal facilities such as Drinking water, Seating arrangement, availability of first aid facilities, latrines, lighting, ergonomics, canteen facilities etc.
- With respect to external facilities, recreation facilities, medical facilities, leave travel, transport and insurance facilities have been considered.
- With respect to demographic factors, gender no significant difference was found between Quality of Work life and Gender. Also, no association between marital status and Quality of work life was discerned.
- Analysis with respect to external factors showed that there is significant difference between Quality of work life and medical facilities
- Analysis with respect internal factors showed there is no significant relationship between Quality of work life and safety measures.
- Through Multiple Regression analysis, it was found that external factors are significant to quality of work life.

Conclusion

Employees are critical for an organization's growth & longevity. Among the factors critical for keeping employees satisfied is 'Quality of work life'. Organizations today are focusing on how by improving the QWL of employees, they can bring about employee retention and enhanced productivity. The present study focused on the welfare and safety factors that impact the QWL of employees in private limited companies in Chennai. The study concentrates on internal facilities such as Drinking water, Seating arrangement, availability of first aid facilities, latrines, lighting,

ergonomics, canteen facilities etc and external facilities such as recreation facilities, medical facilities, leave travel, transport and insurance facilities. From the study, it has been found that employees prefer external facilities with respect to QWL.

References

- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2011). HR interventions for work-life balance: evidences from organisations in India. *International Journal of Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 33-42.
- Chen, Q. (2004). Sustainable development of occupational health and safety management system—Active upgrading of corporate safety culture. *Int. J. Arch. Sci*, 5(4), 108-113
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 63(3), 510-531.
- Jilcha, K., & Kitaw, D. (2017). Industrial occupational safety and health innovation for sustainable development. *Engineering science and technology, an international journal*, 20(1), 372-380.
- Logasakthi, K., & Rajagopal, K. (2013). A study on employee health, safety and welfare measures of chemical industry in the view of Salem Region. *Management (IJRBM)*, 1(1), 1-10.
- Luria, G., & Rafaeli, A. (2008). Testing safety commitment in organizations through interpretations of safety artifacts. *Journal of Safety Research*, 39(5), 519-528.
- Organisations: In Contrast with Public and Private Sectors. In *Public Health and Welfare: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 809-824). IGI Global.
- Patro, C. S. (2012). Employee Welfare Activities in Private sector and their impact on Quality of work life. *International Journal of Productivity Management and Assessment Technologies (IJPMAT)*, 1(2), 19-30.
- Patro, C. S. (2017). A Study on Adoption of Employee Welfare Schemes in Industrial and Service
- Ramana, T. V., & Reddy, E. L. (2015). A study on employee welfare measures with reference to south central railways in India. *ZENITH International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research*, 5(1), 1-11.
- Sirgy, M. J., 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.