IMPACT OF EMPLOYEES MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF BANK MANAGERS

Dr. Kamlesh Rani,
Assistant Professor
Department of Commerce,
Ch. Devi Lal University,
Sirsa, Haryana, India

ABSTRACT

Banking sector plays a vital role in any economy. It is the main unit that circulates the money in different forms. Hence, the smooth and effective functioning of this sector is the need of any economy. Effective functioning of any institution depends on the performance of its human resources. Likewise, in banking sector manager plays a crucial role. He is the one who is responsible for the functioning and controlling the bank. He delegates the responsibilities among the bank employees and co-ordinate their activities. The present study is attributed to assess the impact of employees' management relationship with the quality of work life of bank managers. A sample of 150 managers has been taken. The seven factors of QWL namely life satisfaction, high order need strength, intrinsic job motivation, self-rated anxiety, intrinsic job characteristics, work involvement and job satisfaction were extracted. Five factors of EMR namely employee counseling and involvement, employee rights and grievances handling, management support and effective communication, employee discipline and feedback and unionism and appeal were extracted using Factor analysis. High order need strength is most affected and self-rated anxiety is the least affected by EMR.

© Associated Asia Research Foundation (AARF)

Key Words: QWL, Quality of Work Life, EMR, Employee Management Relationship, Bank Managers,

I. Introduction

Workplace is the place where the different parties of orgnization joins their hands to attain their objectives. It is combination of physical resources as well as human capabilities.This combination together constitute the working environment of any organization. Gensler (2005) found an improvement in workplace environment led 19 percent increase in employee productivity. Chandersekar (2011) found a significant impact of working environment on employees performance and their attitude. It becomes necessary to have a balance of these resources to attain organizational goals. Bank is an essential pillar of Indian economy. Bank managers are the one who make a balance between interests of different parties associated with banks. Hence, it is necessary to provide a quality environment to them to benefit all interested parties.

II. Review of Literature

Monga & Maggu (1981) examined the quality of work life of 90 public sector employees on eight dimensions and found the perceived QWL unsatisfactory and a significant gap between the perceived quality of work life and expected quality of work life. The study further revealed that age, experience and qualification and training didn't influence the gap between perceived and expected QWL.

Chan & Wyatt (2007) examined the quality of work life of 319 respondents from banking, insurance, airlines, finance and export/import companies. Six needs, namely health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs and knowledge needs were identified as constructs of QWL. The study identified a positive correlation of QWL with life satisfaction, well-being, job satisfaction and organizational and negatively related with negative affectivity and turnover. Further, multiple regression analysis found esteem needs are the predictor of life satisfaction; well-being could be projected by esteem needs, actualization needs, health and safety needs and economic and family needs; job

---

satisfaction may be predicted by health and safety needs and economic and family needs and knowledge needs; health and safety needs and knowledge needs better explained the affective commitment and turnover intention is significantly predicted with esteem needs only.

Othman & Lieng (2009) examined the relationship between the quality of work life and job satisfaction of 80 employees. The study used 12 dimensions of QWL and five dimensions of job satisfaction. Correlation analysis revealed a significant and positive relationship between the overall quality of work life and job satisfaction with a value of r= 0.754, p= 0.01. Fair compensation is the main dimension with the highest correlation coefficient (0.729).

Sundaray, et.al (2010) examined the impact of employee relations on QWL of the employees in power sector units. The study adopted five measures of employee relations which are: employee empowerment and involvement, initiating employee suggestions, facilitating collective bargaining, conflict management and grievances redressal measures and dynamic union management relations. Correlation shows that TTPS is doing well in all measures, but OPTCL policies related to empowerment and involvement, conflict management and grievances redressal measures and union management relations are not satisfactory. The study concluded that employee relations significantly contribute to improve quality of work life.

Boreham et al. (2016) analyzed the impact of employment conditions on quality of life taking into consideration social well- being. The data were collected based on stratified random sampling from 1653 respondents. Multiple linear regression results showed that work place variables, namely participative management have significantly and positively related to social well- being, whereas threat to employment and work to life interference showed negative but significant association with social well -being. Other work place variables, namely Flexi time, job insecurity, workload, and stress have no significant association with social well- being.

III. Objectives The following objectives are framed to assess the impact.

1. To identify the factors of QWL and EMR
2. To find the relationship between QWL and EMR
3. To measure the impact of EMR on QWL

IV. Research Methodology

A sample of 150 bank managers of public sector, private sector and foreign banks have been selected with convenience sampling technique. Data was collected through questionnaire of 63 items developed on a five point Likert scale having values SD=1, D=2, N=3, A=4, SA=5. Factor analysis and Regression analysis are used to draw out the results.

V. Analysis and Interpretation

Seven factors of Quality of work life of bank managers have been identified namely life satisfaction (F1), high order need strength (F2), intrinsic job motivation (F3), self-rated anxiety (F4), intrinsic job characteristics (F5), work involvement (F6), and job satisfaction (F7) with Cronbach' s Alpha= .963, Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy= 0.874, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Approx. Chi-Square= 5179.164, Degree of Freedom= 595, Sig= .000 , Mean= 128.6600. Five factors of Employee management relationship namely employee counseling (F1), employees' rights and grievances handling (F2), management support and effective communication (F3), employee discipline and feedback (F4) and unionism and appeal (F5) have been extracted with Cronbach' s Alpha= .959, Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy= .899, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Approx. Chi-Square= 3833.497, Df= 378, Sig= .000 , Mean= 99.6067.

Table 1.1 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_1 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.760[a]	.577	.562	.58034636

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.1 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_1)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	66.186	5	13.237	39.303	.000[b]
	Residual	48.499	144	.337		
	Total	114.686	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score of QWL for F1

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4,$ and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.1 (C): Showing Relationship Between F_1 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.139	.275		.505	.614
Average score for EMR factor 1	.073	.124	.060	.591	.555
Average score for EMR factor 2	.342	.116	.283	2.953	.004
Average score for EMR factor 3	.426	.093	.394	4.595	.000
Average score for EMR factor 4	.031	.078	.027	.405	.686
Average score for EMR factor 5	.109	.051	.135	2.136	.034

a. Dependent Factor: Average score of QWL for F1

Table 1.1 (a) displays strong relationships between life satisfaction and F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 and F_5 of EMR with R-value (. 760). Table 1.1 (b) has reflected the strength of the overall relationship between life satisfaction and the factors (5) of EMR (F=39,303, Sign. F=. 000). Table 1.1 (c) revealed that F_2, F_3 and F_5 significantly affect life satisfaction at.05 level of significance and the rest of the factors have no effect.

Table 1.2 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_2 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.845[a]	.714	.704	.39771843

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4,$ and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.2 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_2)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	56.746	5	11.349	71.748	.000[b]
	Residual	22.778	144	.158		
	Total	79.523	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F2

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4,$ and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.2 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_2 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.648	.188		3.438	.001
Average score for EMR factor 1	.278	.085	.273	3.279	.001
Average score for EMR factor 2	.312	.079	.311	3.935	.000
Average score for EMR factor 3	.349	.064	.386	5.481	.000
Average score for EMR factor 4	-.108	.053	-.113	-2.034	.044
Average score for EMR factor 5	.032	.035	.048	.927	.355

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F2

Table 1.2 (a) depicts strong relationship between high order need strength and EMR factors with R-value (.845). Table 1.2 (b) reflected the strength of overall relationship between high order need strength and all factors of EMR (F=71.748, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.2 (c) revealed that F_1, F_2, F_3 and F_4 have been significant effect high order need strength at .05 level of significance and F_5 has no effect.

Table 1.3 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_3 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.840[a]	.706	.696	.46380618

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.3 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_3)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	74.411	5	14.882	69.182	.000[b]
1	Residual	30.977	144	.215		
	Total	105.388	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F3

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.3 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_3 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.268	.220		1.219	.225
Average score for EMR factor 1	.442	.099	.376	4.470	.000
Average score for EMR factor 2	.684	.092	.592	7.399	.000
Average score for EMR factor 3	-.107	.074	-.103	-1.447	.150
Average score for EMR factor 4	-.115	.062	-.104	-1.843	.067
Average score for EMR factor 5	.055	.041	.072	1.359	.176

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F3

Analysis in table 1.3 (a) elicits strong relationship between intrinsic job motivation and F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 and F_5 of EMR with R-value (.840). Table 1.3 (b) has reflected the strength of the overall relationship between intrinsic job motivation and factors (5) of EMR (F=69.182, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.3 (c) showed that F_3 of QWL has been significant effected by F_1, and F_2 at .05 level of significance and the rest of the factors has no effect.

Table 1.4 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_4 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.577[a]	.333	.310	.78543182

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4,$ and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.4 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_4)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44.434	5	8.887	14.406	.000[b]
	Residual	88.834	144	.617		
	Total	133.268	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F4

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor $F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4,$ and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.4 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_4 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.982	.372		2.638	.009
Average score for EMR factor 1	-.282	.167	-.214	-1.686	.094
Average score for EMR factor 2	.578	.157	.445	3.690	.000
Average score for EMR factor 3	.202	.126	.173	1.607	.110
Average score for EMR factor 4	-.105	.105	-.085	-.995	.321
Average score for EMR factor 5	.252	.069	.290	3.661	.000

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F4

Table 1.4 (a) shows strong relationship between self- rated anxiety and EMR with R-value (.577). Table 1.4 (b) reflected the strength of this overall relationship with (F=14.406, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.4 (c) revealed F_2 and F_5 of EMR have been significant effect on F_4 of QWL and rest of the factors have no effect.

Table 1.5 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_5 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.612[a]	.374	.352	.69795649

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.5 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_5)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	41.944	5	8.389	17.220	.000[b]
	Residual	70.149	144	.487		
	Total	112.093	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F5

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.5 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_5 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.751	.331		2.271	.025
Average score for EMR factor 1	.191	.149	.158	1.285	.201
Average score for EMR factor 2	.176	.139	.148	1.267	.207
Average score for EMR factor 3	.372	.112	.347	3.332	.001
Average score for EMR factor 4	-.010	.094	-.009	-.107	.915
Average score for EMR factor 5	.035	.061	.044	.572	.568

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F5

Table 1.5 (a) depicts strong relationship between intrinsic job characteristics and F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 and F_5 of EMR with R-value (.612). Table 1.5 (b) has reflected the strength of overall relationship with (F=17.220, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.5 (c) revealed that only F_3 of EMR has been found significant effect on intrinsic job characteristics and rest of the factors have no effect.

Table 1.6 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_6 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.707[a]	.500	.482	.53220472

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.6 (b) Showing Overall F Statistic of EMR (F_1 To F_5) and QWL (F_6)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	40.737	5	8.147	28.764	.000[b]
	Residual	40.787	144	.283		
	Total	81.523	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F6
b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.6 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_6 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.303	.252		5.165	.000
Average score for EMR factor 1	.358	.113	.346	3.152	.002
Average score for EMR factor 2	.266	.106	.262	2.511	.013
Average score for EMR factor 3	.068	.085	.074	.798	.426
Average score for EMR factor 4	.090	.071	.093	1.268	.207
Average score for EMR factor 5	.023	.047	.034	.501	.617

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F6

Table 1.6 (a) elicits strong relationship between work involvement and EMR with R-value (.707). Table 1.6 (b) reflected the strength of the overall relationship between work involvement and factors of EMR (F=28.764, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.6 (c) showed that F_6 of QWL significant effected by F_1, and F_2 of EMR at .05 level of significance and the rest of the factors has no effect.

Table 1.7 (a): Showing Relationship Between F_7 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.684[a]	.468	.449	.55195381

a. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.7 (b) Showing overall F statistic of EMR (F_1 to F_5) and QWL (F_7)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	38.551	5	7.710	25.308	.000[b]
	Residual	43.870	144	.305		
	Total	82.421	149			

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F7

b. Predictors: (Constant), independent average score (5) for factor F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4, and F_5 of EMR.

Table 1.7 (c): Showing Relationship Between F_7 (QWL) and Each Factor From F_1 To F_5 of EMR Towards Managers

Coefficients[a]

Factors(F)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	1.023	.262		3.912	.000
Average score for EMR factor 1	-.139	.118	-.134	-1.180	.240
Average score for EMR factor 2	.393	.110	.385	3.574	.000
Average score for EMR factor 3	.095	.088	.103	1.076	.284
Average score for EMR factor 4	.070	.074	.072	.941	.348
Average score for EMR factor 5	.279	.048	.408	5.763	.000

a. Dependent Factor: Average score QWL F7

Analysis in table 1.7 (a) shows strong relationship between job satisfaction and F_1, F_2, F_3, F_4 and F_5 of EMR with R-value (.684). Table 1.7 (b) reflected the strength of the overall relationship between job satisfaction and the factors of EMR (F=25.308, Sign. F=.000). Table 1.7(c) revealed that F_7 of QWL is significantly affected by F_2, and F_5 of EMR at .05 level of significance and the rest of the factors has no effect.

VI. Conclusion

It is to be concluded that all factors of QWL of bank managers have a positive and strong relation with EMR factors. And high order need strength is most affected and self-rated anxiety factor of quality of work life of bank managers is the least affected by EMR factors. The results of the study also supported by Sundaray, et.al (2010) and Boreham et al. (2016). Hence, to ensure a better quality of work life, better employee relations should be maintained and promoted.

References:

1. Boreham, P., Povey, J. and Tomaszewski, W. (2016), "Work and social well-being: the impact of employment conditions on quality of life'', The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol 27 No. 6, pp. 593-611, DOI:

10.1080/09585192.2015.1027250.   Retrieved   from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09585192.2015.1027250?needAccess=true

2. Chan, K.W. and Wyatt, T.A. (2007), ''Quality of work life: a study of employees in Shanghai, China'', Asia Pacific Business Review, Vol 13 No. 4, pp. 501-517.

3. Chandrasekar, K. (2011), ''Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations'', International Journal of Enterprise Computing   and   Business   Systems   (Online),   Vol   1   No   1 http://www.ijecbs.com/January2011/N4Jan2011.pdf

4. Dunlop, J.T, Employee Management Relations System, Henry Holt, New York, 7.

5. Durai, P. (2010), Human Resource Management, Pearson, New Delhi, 467-471.

6. Dwivedi, R.S. (2009), A Text Book of Human Resource Management, Vikas Publication, New Delhi, 273, 282.

7. Haldar, U. K. and Sarkar, J. (2013), Human Resource Management. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 41.

8. Monga, M.L. and Maggu, A. (1981), ''Quality of work-life: a study of public sector in India'', ASCI Journal of management, Vol 10 No 2, pp. 115-137. Retrieved from http://asci.org.in/journal/Vol.10(1980-81)/10_2_1981_MONGA%20M%20L.pdf

9. Othman, A. and Lieng, MC. (2009), ''Relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction: a case study of enterprise" XYZ" in Malacca'', International Conference on Human   Capital   Development,   Retrieved   from http://eprints.uthm.edu.my/2725/1/D2_Fullpaper_152_Ahmad_Othman_%26_Mok_Chea k_Lieng.pdf

10. Sundaray, B. K., Sahoo, C. K., and Tripathy, S. K. (2010), ''Employee relations initiatives and quality of work life: a study in power sector units'',. Retrieved from http://dspace.nitrkl.ac.in/dspace/bitstream/2080/1341/1/Conference%20Paper.pdf.