



ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE: OPTIMISTIC STEPS FOR SUPERIOR MANAGEMENT

Dr. Mallikarjuna N.L

*Chairman & Associate Professor, Commerce and Management, Karnataka State Women's University, Vijayapura,
Karnataka, India.*

Abstract

Quality of Work Life is the existence of a certain set of organizational conditions or practices. This explanation frequently argues that an elevated quality of work life exists when democratic management practices are used, employee's jobs are enriched, staff is treated with dignity and safe working conditions exist. In recent years the express Quality of life has been used with increasing frequency to describe certain ecological and humanistic values disused by industrial productivity and economic growth. Inside business organizations attention has been listening carefully on the Quality of human experience in the work place. At the same time many firms have questioned their viability in increasingly spirited world markets. These dual concerns have created a growing interest in the potential of redesigning the nature of work. Many current organizational experiments seek to improve both productivity for the organization and the quality of working life for its members. Quality of Work Life is the degree to which persons are able to satisfy their important personal needs while employed by the firm. Companies interested in enhancing employees Quality of Work Life usually try to instill in employees the feelings of security, equity, pride, internal democracy, ownership, autonomy, accountability and suppleness. It has also been associated with organizational changes aimed at increasing the levels of job widening and job enrich. Importantly, the idea is that of attaining higher levels of involvement and thereby motivation by improving the attractiveness of the work itself rather than through improving the terms and conditions of work. Quality of life phenomena explored in early studies included job satisfaction, organizational climate and the learning of new tasks.

Key Words: *Quality of Working Life, Employees, Organizations, Economic Growth.*

Introduction

The last few years have seen evidence economic change. It has made life predominantly difficult for those involved in crafting business strategy and making difficult decisions affecting all sizes of business and the people who work within them. Many long-established businesses have gone to the wall and many are stressed to keep their heads above water in variable seas. Employees at the grass root level experience a sense of frustration because of low level of wages, poor working conditions, unfavorable terms of employment, inhuman treatment by their superiors and the like whereas managerial personnel feel frustrated because of hostility over their conditions of employment, interpersonal conflicts, role conflict, job pressures, lack of liberty in work, absence of challenging work etc. Certain values were attributed to work in the past.

Being previously work was worship and people had honesty and assurance to work. But today's employee will not believe in such morals of work. He works for his salary, he works if the conditions of work are conducive and congenial and terms of employment are favorable to him. As such, the work norms have been shifting from time to time. They are dissatisfied with the strict economic functions of the job and with the social relationships in the organization consequent to the mechanization and automation of the industry. Further, disregard by others and less and less utilization of capabilities and skills also caused perturbed among the managerial personnel. Employees also knowledge alienation which may result from poor design of socio-technical system. Hostility is a feeling of powerlessness, lack of meaning, loneliness, boredom, lack of participation and lack of attachment of job. The workers at the lower level are not happy with their work due to tight agenda of work, speed of machine, close watch and supervision and less social interaction. Even the ministerial staffs complain that they are unhappy with the job due to routine nature of work and obsession of schedules and standards. Frustration would further because heart disease, joint pains etc. irritation might also be due to absence of recognition, tedious work, unsound relations with co-workers, poor working conditions, low self-esteem, occupational stress, work overload, monotony, fatigue time pressures, lack of stability, security etc., In view of the contemporary managerial problems, the present day employees are much concerned about high wages, better benefits, challenging job etc. There has been much concern today about providing employees decent wages, convenient working hours, and conducive working environment.

Literature Review

Ellis and Pompli (2002) identified a number of factors contributing to job dissatisfaction and quality of working life, including: Poor working environments, Resident aggression, Workload, inability to deliver quality of care preferred, Balance of work and family, Shift work, Lack of involvement in decision making, Professional isolation, Lack of recognition, Poor relationships with supervisor/peers, Role conflict, Lack of opportunity to learn new skill. **Sirgy (2001)** suggested that the key factors in quality of working life are: Need satisfaction based on job requirements, Need satisfaction based on work environment, Need satisfaction based on supervisory behavior, Need satisfaction based on ancillary programmes, Organizational commitment. **Walton, (2005)** He proposed eight major conceptual categories relating to QWL as adequate



and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediately opportunity for continued growth and security, Opportunity to use and develop human capacities, Social integration in the work organization, Constitutionalism in the work organization, Work and total life space and, Social relevance of work life. Several published works have addressed the constructs that make up the QWL domain and key elements of QWL programs. **Cherg,S** says in a High Quality of work life there should be a positive impact on personal life, an opportunity to be involved in decision as well as acceptable level of physical comfort. “The quality of a person’s life is in direct proportion to their commitment excellence, regardless of their chosen field of endeavor.” - Vincent Lombardi **Cohen and Rosenthal (1980)** describes QWL as an intentionally designed effort to bring out increased labour management, and co-operation to jointly solve the problem of improving organizational performance and employees satisfaction. **Taylor (1979)** suggested that relevant quality of working life concepts may vary according to organization and employee group. Taylor more pragmatically identified the essential components of quality of working life as basic extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions, and the intrinsic job factors like, Individual power, Employee participation in the management, Fairness and equity, Social support, Use of one’s present skills, Self development.

Leadership Possibly

Leadership Possibly as a result of how they manage change, senior managers tend not to be styles and well regarded in many businesses. Managers also don’t seem to compare well management internationally. A similar study we ran in Australia is a country, and continent, in few years back exposed those Australian senior behaviors managers were better regarded than their counterparts (Leinsdorf-2008). Australian senior managers were more likely to be seen as accessible and trusting and less likely to be seen as authoritative, secretive and bureaucratic. The three most common managerial styles in the United Kingdom in few years were ‘bureaucratic’, ‘reactive’ and ‘authoritarian’. In fact, the prevalence of two of these traits has become worse since 2007 and much worse since 2004 (Worrall, 2004). Unfortunately, three of the top five managerial styles which most depress employee engagement in an organization are ‘bureaucratic’, ‘reactive’ and ‘authoritarian’.

Finally our result shows that worker appointment is related with leadership styles that seem as empowering, gullible, accessible, innovative, consensual and entrepreneurial. It is deeply worrying that these are not the standard in the British and that the British norm is characterised by leadership styles that depress employee engagement. Senior managers in the British have a lot of work to do to improve how they are perceived in their organisations. More worrying still is our finding that senior managers’ view of their own leadership styles is somewhat flattering and discordant with other employees’ views. The difference between senior managers’ views of themselves and the rest of their organisation’s views of them is often marked.

Employees

The gladly employees have a propensity to boast much higher levels of trust in their immediate line success of manager than they do in the senior managers in their organization There is a very strong relationship between the quality of a worker’s relationship with his or her line manager and their level of employee commitment, their job satisfaction, their commitment to their organisation and their sense of empowerment. Reciprocal trust between a worker and their line manager and a worker’s sense of empowerment and commitment are very strongly correlated (Worrall *et al*, 2011).

The excellence of line manager relationship is needy on several building blocks. These include line managers being seen to be proactive; line managers taking a balanced view of an employee which looks at both performance and wellbeing; the existence of two-way communications channels; the support the line manager provides especially in giving constructive and developmental feedback; and the extent to which the line manager involves the worker in setting objectives that are felt to be reasonable and deliverable by both parties.

There is obviously a fine dividing line between successful management and over-management that line managers need to be aware of. One thing that clearly reduces employee engagement is the sense that staff are not in control of how they do their jobs. This intelligence of not being in control is often exacerbated by the over-enthusiastic use of performance management systems. Indeed, two of the most pronounced effects of organisational change experienced by respondents had been an increase in performance management and a sense of being less in control over how they did their job. Systematically reducing workers’ sense of control over their jobs always has long-term negative consequences.

Workload

Anxiety regarding the long-hours culture is not new: it is an issue that has been around for and work many years. What is worrying is that despite the actions of many agencies to encourage patterns and their workers to have a better work-life balance, our study shows that things have become spillover effects worse since 2013. In 2015, we calculated that the



‘average manager’ worked 1.30 hours per day over contract. Translated into days per year, this equates to roughly 46 working days for the average manager. In 2015, our average manager took 3.3 days per year absence from work. Consequently, for every day the average manager took in sickness absence, he/she provided 10 days free of charge to his/her employer. When you ask managers about the wider effect of the hours they work has on them, they will overwhelmingly acknowledge that it causes stress, that it badly affects their physical and psychological health and that it has a negative impact on their personal lives. Over the last five years, workloads have become more unmanageable.

Conclusions

Identified what we believe to be the key extent that affects the quality of working life. We argue that organisations need to improve on all these inter-related dimensions if they are to build an engaged and productive workforce. Given the scale of organisational change affecting organisations, we feel that senior managers need to become far more adept at managing change. While cost reduction might be needed, it can have huge costs of its own. In making their reorganization decisions, managers need to factor in the costs of lost productivity through employee ill-health or workforce alienation and the expenses of losing or not being able to recruit top performers. Senior managers should be less optimistic about what they can practically achieve without causing long-term, irreparable damage to their organisations. They should certainly avoid serial waves of continuous change that only serve to disorientate and demotivate the workforce and ultimately chip away at the organisation.

An additional dangerous aspect that concerns us is the growing desire to manage organisations by numbers and through performance management systems. Our analysis reveals that many employees feel that the effect of organisational change has been to strengthen the role of performance management systems and to reduce workers’ control over the jobs they do. We have already outlined some of the qualities that we believe typify effective line managers. Creating a supportive organisational culture and developing skilled line managers are critical if you want to build an engaged and productive workforce. While there is a clear need for performance to be managed, we are concerned that in too many cases servicing the performance management system is seen to be more important than the actual work that people do you can do it by understandingly administration natives.

References

1. Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 147-154.
2. Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 827-832.
3. Bhatnagar, J. (2007). Talent management strategy of employee engagement in India ITES employees: Key to retention. *Employee Relations*, 29, 640-663.
4. Lindorff M, Worrall L, & Cooper C L (2008) A comparison of the perceptions of BRITISH managers and managers in Victoria, Australia. Victoria: Australian Institute of Management. <http://www.aimvic.com.au/QualityofWorkingLife2008.pdf>
5. Luthan, F., & Peterson, S. J. (2001). Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy: Implications for managerial effectiveness and development. *Journal of Management Development*, 21, 376-387.
6. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
8. Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2008). Employee engagement: Motivating and connecting with tomorrow’s workforce. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 22(1), 48-53.
9. S. L., Rocco, T. S., & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace commitment: A conceptual model developed from integrative review of the research connections. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(3), 339-357.
10. Worrall L & Cooper C L (2007) The quality of working life: a survey of managers’ experiences of organisation. CMI: London.
11. Worrall L & Cooper C L (2008) Organisational change in the uk : employee outcomes, Chapter 29 in: J. Storey, P. Wright & D. Ulrich (Eds) *The Routledge companion to strategic human resource management*. London: Routledge.
12. Worrall L, Cooper C L, Lindorff M (2011) A picture of trust in uk business organisations. In Searle, R and Skinner, D (ed) *Trust and Human Resource Management*: London: Edward Elgar.
13. Worrall L, and Cooper C L (2012) Managers’ wellbeing, motivation and productivity. *The CMI/Simplyhealth Quality of Working Life Survey*. London:C
- Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist*, 63, 96-110.