

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE: EVIDENCE FROM HEALTH CARE SECTOR IN CHENNAI



****Navies Narmatha. S.P, PhD Research Scholar, *Dr. T. Amutha ,
Assistant Professor(SS)**

Department of Business Administration,

*Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science and Higher Education for
Women, Coimbatore.*

Mail ID : naviesnarmatha.15@gmail.com.

Mail ID: amuthamirthiga@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT

Several studies have established the value that quality of work life provides to the workplace in the healthcare sector. However, the link between job satisfaction and employee engagement is still being researched. The aim of this empirical study is to explore into the standard of work life in the health-care industry and see how it relates to employee engagement. Percentage analysis, ANOVA, and correlation were used to analyse data collected from a random sample of 168 employees working in Chennai hospitals. Employee engagement and quality of life at work both are positively correlated, according to the study. The study examines the quality of work life in the health-care sector from a different perspective. The data clearly show that increasing employee engagement at the individual level can be achieved by increasing the practise of quality of work life.

Keywords: Quality of work life, Employee engagement, Correlation, relationship

INTRODUCTION

If we look back at the early years of business, patterns of trading and sectors people were passive, technology was stable, speed to market was secondary, and competition was limited to specific most sectors and areas, as well as hierarchies, were accepted. Since the 1960s, America and the rest of world have been buffeted by change on a relatively close basis. Customers demand organizations to roll in the hay better, faster, and cheaper, and employees want to manage the production line's "Stop" button. During 20th century, nations across the world became a part of the global village, with trade barriers between them being decreased or eliminated entirely. Commerce and economic globalisation are well-established in India. New economic opportunities have emerged as a result of the comprehensive paradigm shift to one global organisation. The events of the preceding century attracted our attention to the importance of knowledge and understanding firms. As a result, high-quality human resources have become a crucial necessity for responding to the changing environment. The knowledge workforce, in particular, has a critical role to play in the digital economy's development.

The term "quality of work life" (QWL) comes from a 1970s notion of an socio-technical system that is open that promotes work autonomy, self-involvement and interdependence, based on the concept of the "perfect match between technology and social organisations." Despite the fact that the open socio-technical system is a well-established concept in practise, it implies that ensure the system performs optimally and, as a result, the "correct" technical organisation are consistent with the workplace conditions that satisfy workers' social and psychological

needs. To some, work-life quality entails industrial democracy, enhanced worker participation in corporate decision-making, or achieving the aims of a 20-year-old human relations group. Others, particularly those in management, use the word to mean any of a variety of measures to boost productivity by focusing on human resources rather than capital or technology inputs. Changes in the quality of work life are frequently viewed by unions and worker representatives as resulting in a more equitable distribution of money and hence the resources of the working environment, as well as more fair and healthier working conditions.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chelte (1983) in Waraswamy (2013) in their study Quality of work life is a process that responds to employee needs by developing a mechanism that allows employees to make full decisions and plan their work lives. An organization's process for ensuring employee welfare, job security, job happiness, a good reward system, employee benefits, and employee involvement in achieving the organization's goals is known as quality of work life.

Wibowo (2014) in this study the term "performance" is derived from the concept of "performance." Those who provide an understanding of performance as a result of job and work performance are also available. However, actual performance includes more than just the end products of work; it also includes how the work process is carried out. According to Wibowo (2014: 7), performance is the consequence of work that is closely related to the organization's strategic objectives, customer happiness, and economic contribution. As a result, performance is defined as the act of completing work as well as the outcomes of that work. What is done and how it is done are two aspects of performance.

Raju (2016) in this study assessed the role of industrial relations in the organization and its impact on productivity. A sample of 350 floor level employees and 150 supervisors was selected through quota sampling technique. Data analysis was done through simple percentage and ranking method for different variables that revealed the variable IR as a mediator between management and trade union for bargaining process hold first rank followed by cordially settle disputes, liaison officer for participative process, advisory services for welfare and don't pay attention for cordial relations rank 2,3,4 and 5 respectively. Further, the study revealed that most of the problems are resolved through counselling and collective bargaining. The study also reported a positive relation between productivity and cordial relations. The study contributes to develop a cordial work environment to promote productivity.

Khetavath (2015) evaluated Among Indian private sector firms, the quality of employees' working life is determined on six dimensions: work conditions and complexity, organisational and interpersonal relations, employee participation and commitment, as well as possibilities for growth, work satisfaction, and employment stability. Data was collected through questionnaire from 238 employees by using convenient sampling technique. Descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis revealed that except job security and job satisfaction all remained four factors significantly affect QWL. Growth feeling opportunities factor came out as most influencing factor of QWL. The study is beneficial in order to organizations, who would like to promote in order to the well-being of its employees

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The primary objective using data collection, quantitative analysis (questionnaire), and testing using ANOVA and Correlation, the study aims to determine and analyze the impact of quality of work life on employee engagement in healthcare.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The respondents' primary data is collected directly from them. The information is collected through structured questionnaires distributed to the firm's operations.

Secondary data is collected from a variety of sources, such journals, magazines, books, articles, websites, and company records.

Research Method: The respondents are selected through convenient sampling method.

Sampling Method: The collection is made up of the research design, measurement and a data analysis. The study's author may use quantitative methods, which generate numerical data.

Sample Size: The sample size of the study is 168 collected from Chennai city, Tamil Nadu. Percentage analysis, ANOVA and correlation is used in the study to analyze the data.

ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

In this section, the profile of the respondents, Anova test results and correlation analysis are reported.

Result and Discussion

The data analysis results are listed below.

TABLE 1: Respondents' Demographic Profile

S.No	Demographic Profile	Variables	No of Respondents	Percentage (%)
1.	Gender	Male	101	60
		Female	67	40
		Total	168	100
2.	Age	Less than 25 yrs	17	10
		25 yrs - 35 yrs	34	20
		35yrs - 45 yrs	62	37
		45yrs - 55 yrs	27	16
		Above 55 yrs	28	17
		Total	168	100
3.	Marital Status	Married	91	54
		Unmarried	77	46
		Total	168	100
4.	Educational Qualification	Schooling	15	9
		Diploma	5	3
		UG	93	55
		PG	55	33
		Total	168	100
5.	Types of hospital	Speciality	88	52
		Multi Speciality	80	48
		Total	168	100
6.	Income per month	Rs.10000 - Rs.15000	23	13
		Rs.15001 - Rs.20000	40	24
		Rs.20001 - Rs.25000	57	34
		Above Rs.25000	49	29
		Total	168	100
7.	Designation	Doctors	51	30
		Nurse/Nursing Assistant	56	33
		Technical	30	18
		Pharmacist	31	19
		Total	168	100
8.	Years of Experience	Less than 2 yrs	59	35
		5yrs - 10 yrs	48	28
		10yrs- 15 yrs	21	13

	Above 15 yrs	40	24
	Total	168	100

In the above table, the majority of the respondents (60%) are male, although the remaining 40% are female. regarding age group as for the respondents, the great majority of the respondents belong to the age group between 35yrs – 45 yrs i.e., 37 %. With respect to status on marital, the majority of those who responded are married i.e., 54%. majority of the respondents have quailed UG i.e., 55%. Regarding the type of hospital, majority of the respondents work in specialty hospitals i.e., 52%. Regarding the income of the respondents, Majority of the respondents are earn between Rs.20001 – Rs.25000 i.e., 34 %. Majority of the respondents are Nurse/ nursing assistant i.e., 33 %. Regarding years of experience, majority of the respondents have less than 2 years i.e., 35%.

ANOVA

Ho: There is no significant difference in Quality of work, with respect to the Age, Educational qualification, Designation and Years of Experience of the respondents.

Table 2: ANOVA results of Demographic variable and Quality of work life

		Total of Squares	DF	Mean Value	Square F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	27.298	21	1.300	.527	.956
	Within Groups	360.220	146	2.467		
	Total	387.518	167			
Educational qualification	Between Groups	23.284	21	1.109	1.716	.034
	Within Groups	94.335	146	.646		
	Total	117.619	167			
Designation	Between Groups	27.049	21	1.288	1.120	.014
	Within Groups	167.945	146	1.150		
	Total	194.994	167			
Year experience	of Between Groups	32.114	21	1.529	.903	.587
	Within Groups	247.219	146	1.693		
	Total	279.333	167			

Based on the above table, the F value for educational qualification is 1.716 with significant value of 0.034. Therefore, the significant value is lesser than the significance level (0.05). The F value for Designation of the respondents is 1.230 with significant value of 0.014. Therefore, the significant value is lesser than the significance level (0.05)

The results of the tests establish that there is a significant difference between the Quality of work, with respect to the Educational qualification and Designation of the respondents.

Table 3 shows the results of the ANOVA for the demographic variable and employee engagement.

		Total Squares	of DF	Mean Square Value	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	22.308	15	1.487	.619	.086
	Within Groups	365.210	152	2.403		
	Total	387.518	167			
Educational qualification	Between Groups	12.882	15	.859	1.246	.244
	Within Groups	104.737	152	.689		
	Total	117.619	167			
Designation	Between Groups	31.535	15	2.102	1.955	.022
	Within Groups	163.459	152	1.075		
	Total	194.994	167			
Year of experience	Between Groups	15.609	15	1.041	.600	.872
	Within Groups	263.725	152	1.735		
	Total	279.333	167			

Based on the above table, the F value for age of the respondents is 0.619 with significant value of 0.086. Therefore, the significant value is lesser than the significance level (0.10). The F value for Designation of the respondents is 1.955 with significant value of 0.022. Therefore, the significant value is lesser than the significance level (0.05).

The results of the tests establish that there is a significant difference between the Employee engagement with respect to the Age of the respondents and Designation of the respondents.

Table 4: Analysis of Correlation of Employee engagement and Quality of Work

Particulars		Employee Engagement
Quality of work life	Pearson Correlation	.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	168

From the above table, it is inferred that both the variables i.e., quality of work life and Employee engagement are statistically significant with each other since its significant value is lesser than 0.05.

SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY

The firm's management If you want to improve employee engagement in work by improving employee quality of life at work, one thing to consider is improving existing systems and structures in the organization by considering career path indicators, training, and office facilities, because it will benefit employees if the organization provides a working environment that satisfies their expectations it is expected that the environment will promote the creation of a dynamic and harmonious work environment, performance. Management enables employees to participate in decision-making, particularly operational decisions, by soliciting input and listening to employee suggestions and opinions. Moreover, open employee opinions must be treated as one of the decision-making elements, and procedures for establishing career paths for employees must be transparent and objective, based on the results of descriptive statistics. This must be taken into consideration in order to provide employees with a good quality of work life.

CONCLUSION

As per research, Employee engagement and the quality from one's work life are related in a favorable way. The research examines the quality of work life in the health sector across several dimensions. The data clearly indicate that improving employee engagement at the individual level may require an improvement in the concept of quality of work life. It's extremely crucial to emphasize that one of the most important factors in establishing organisational success is a high quality of working life. A rise in QWL has the potential to bring plenty of benefits. It has the potential to improve one's good attitudes toward oneself, self-esteem, and employee engagement. The study concludes that existing quality of work life can be improved when efforts are invested in employee engagement. Further research is required to get a better understanding of alternative job-related or personal resources that may be important to the link among work-life balance and employee development activities.

REFERENCES

1. Akbar, M. R. (2013). Pengaruh budaya organisasi terhadap employee engagement (Studi pada karyawan PT. Primatexco Indonesia di Batang). *Journal of social and industrial psychology*, 2(1).
2. Dole, C., & Schroeder, R. G. (2001). The impact of various factors on the personality, job satisfaction and turnover intentions of professional accountants. *Managerial auditing journal*.
3. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
4. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2013). Quality of work life of employees in private technical institutions. *International journal for quality research*, 7(3).
5. Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Satisfaction with co-workers' behaviour. *Employee relations*.
6. Rokhman, W. (2021, June). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life terhadap Kepuasan kerja, Komitmen Organisasi, Turnover Intention dan Stres Kerja: Studi pada BMT Di Kabupaten Kudus. In *Conference In Business, Accounting, And Management (CBAM)* (Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 1135-1145).
7. Testa, M. R. (1999). Satisfaction with organizational vision, job satisfaction and service efforts: an empirical investigation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
8. Wibowo, S. A. (2017). Pengaruh Quality of Work Life (QWL) dan Motivasi terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Kecamatan di Kabupaten Kulonprogo DI Yogyakarta. *JBTL: Jurnal Bisnis: Teori dan Implementasi*, 8(1), 84-96.