CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA - II

PERFORMANCE AND SATISFACTION IN THE
QWL ENVIRONMENT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In continuation to the analysis of the prevailing QWL, the present chapter is intended to examine the levels of performance, satisfaction and the extent of association among them if any. As already stated QWL is an intentionally designed effort to bring about increased employer employee cooperation to jointly solve the problem of improving organisational performance and employee satisfaction\(^1\).

Satisfaction is influenced both by the extent to which the work a person does is intrinsically interesting to him and by his attitude toward the total work situation including the company, the supervision and his fellow workers\(^2\). Job satisfaction is, therefore, the result of various attitudes the

---


executive holds towards his work environment, his management, his work group and also work in general.

The analysis is done in the following three stages:

I - Evaluation of performance by the executives
II - Satisfaction at the job
III - Inter-linkage between QWL, Performance and Job Satisfaction.

5.2 METHODOLOGY IN BRIEF

The executives were asked to evaluate themselves on various aspects of performance on a 5 point rating scale (Refer D.5 of Questionnaire). The various aspects relevant to performance taken for the study include:

- The efforts taken to meet targets;
- Concern for Quality of output;
- Efforts taken towards optimum utilisation of resources;
- Training provided by them to their subordinates;
- Role in motivating their group members;
- Innovation introduced in their work;
- Knowledge pertaining to their job;
- Management of critical situations;
- Personal Relationship with members of their team;
- Initiative taken in job related matters;
- Level of acceptability (of their jobs/ performance) by the top management;
- Minimal Stress/Strain resulting from day to day work.

The scores assigned by the executives for the above were consolidated into 3 categories or levels\(^1\) namely 'High', 'Medium' and 'Low' for further analysis. Having obtained the scores on the basis discussed earlier, the performance of the executives according to their own perceptions were found out using Percentages, Chi-Square Test and Correspondence Analysis.

Similarly, to find out the levels of satisfaction in the given work environment and performance, a five point scale viz., 'Very high', 'High', 'Medium', 'Low' and 'Very low' was used in respect of each of the following factors:

- State of inter-personal relations;
- Prevailing pay structure;
- Authority given by the management;
- Level of productivity;
- Level of interest in the job they do;
- Sense of accomplishment;
- Recognition for the work done;
- Leadership under which they work;
- Level of personal growth in knowledge and skills;
- Fairness / Equity in rewards;
- Challenges in the job\(^2\)

\(^1\) Detailed Methodology is provided in Chapter III.

\(^2\) For details see D-6 (Q. No. 59 to 69) of the Questionnaire.
The scores were computed on the basis of the responses of the executives and were regrouped into 3 groups such as 'High', 'Medium', and 'Low'. These scores were utilised in finding the association between the variables such as age, experience, functional area of the job and the sector and satisfaction using Percentage analysis, Chi-Square Test and Correspondence Analysis.

5.3 SELF EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

Performance refers to employee productivity of an executive in an organisational situation in various ways including the extent to which the employee has demonstrated his competency during employment within the company. Performance may be measured with the ratings done by the employee himself or by a superior who is in a position to know about job and related behaviour of the employee who's performance is to be evaluated. By asking a person to rate his performance on the several aspects of his job and job related behaviour, possibility of subjectivity and over rating is reduced to a reasonable extent. In the absence of any other reliable method which can be used, particularly by an outsider, self rating may be taken as a convenient and fairly useful, dependable method. In order to enhance one's capacity to work and willingness to work, an executive would utilise his knowledge, skills and abilities for realising his potentialities in every organisational activity.

Effective performance also depends on the power or the position the individual holds in the organisation, the relationship which he had established

---

among his work group, the norms that have been set for the organisation by the management, the organisation structure and technology, the variety of tasks the individual is expected to perform and the morale of one’s subordinates.

In any given situation, the performance of an individual is a function of at least four inputs: commitment, confidence, competence and contingencies. Performance outputs are expressed as feelings and behaviours that vary for each input and either encourage or discourage an individual’s behaviour. Because, outputs result from inputs, labeling discouraging feelings and behaviours can help identify input problems. Performance deficiencies then can be correlated by altering inputs in ways that yield more encouraging feelings and behaviours.

Again, the awareness of one’s own strengths and weaknesses is an important ingredient of the successful executive. Very few people do have the attributes for success in a variety of pursuits. Such successful individuals are those who marshal situations in order to make the best use of the qualities they possess*. Thus, based on the actual work life situation, the executives’ ratings on various aspects of performance presented through section C (D5) of the questionnaire are consolidated in Table 5.1 for further analysis.

---


* During the course of a personal discussion in data collection, one of the executives described performance, in the context of QWL as follows: "My growth in this organisation is more performance related. Hence I can certainly achieve my career goals in this conducive working atmosphere".
TABLE 5.1

SELF EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Ratings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>36.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5.1 it is evident that only 2.91% of the executives i.e. just 12 of them, have rated themselves as 'Low performers'. At the same time 36.41% of them or 150 executives claim themselves to be 'High performers' and the remaining 60.68% or 250 executives consider themselves only as 'Medium performers'.

Having grouped the executives according to their own performance rating, further analysis is done, in order to probe into the fact, whether any relationship could be established between performance and the personal factors.

5.3.1 Performance Based on Age

An executive's performance depends on his enduring features, the people with whom he is associated and also the nature of a particular work situation. His performance may also depend, to an extent on some other personal factors such as age, sex, the job he holds, etc. The self-image, attitude towards
authority, seniority and his reactions to stress and strain resulting from the job may also affect an executive's performance. Having worked for an organisation for a substantial period of time, a person might reconcile himself to certain work culture and thereby change his entire outlook towards his own work capabilities and performance.

The extent of variations in the performance of the executives when considered in terms of their age are presented in Table 5.2.

**TABLE 5.2**

**PERFORMANCE BASED ON AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Ratings</th>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 35</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 6.0129

Table value at 5% level of significance = 9.49

From Table 5.2, different levels of performance are found in all age groups i.e., in the age group of below 35 years, there are 41 High performers, 96 Medium performers and 5 Low performers. Whereas, in the age group of 35-40 years there are 49 High performers, 68 Medium performers and 2 Low
performers and in the age group of 41-60 years, there are 60 High performers, 86 Medium performers and 5 Low performers.

The Chi-Square test shows that there is no significant association among the executives belonging to different age groups and their levels of performance.

To find out a much more clear cut distinction, the data found in Table 5.2 are presented in Fig. 5.1, with the help of Correspondence Analysis.

The Correspondence Analysis exhibits two clusters of data.

The figure indicates that, Executives in the age group of below 35 years are associated with Medium performance (cluster 1) and the Executives who are in the age group of 35 and above years are associated with High performance (Cluster 2).

Therefore Correspondence Analysis reveals the extent of association between the two variables viz., age and performance. It indicates a relationship between High Performance with prime and mature groups of executives of the organisation; whereas the younger executives who are in the age group of below 35 years are associated only with Medium level of performance. However, Low performance does not exhibit clustering with any of the different age groups.
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5.3.2 Performance Based on Total Experience

Performance implies the accomplishment of the assigned tasks of an employee\(^1\). Achievement motivation actuates a person's hard work in situations where there is an opportunity of accomplishing great tasks. When an organisation places primary emphasis on results, there is an increasing evidence of high performers. Performance of persons may be better or poor perhaps due to the nature of interpersonal relations, leadership, situational constraints, skills, utilisation of resources in an optimal way and the like.

In order to illustrate the levels of performance in relation to the experience of the executives, the total experience of executives are classified into 4 groups and their level of performance are cross tabulated in Table 5.3.

**TABLE 5.3**

**PERFORMANCE BASED ON TOTAL EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance levels</th>
<th>Total experience in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 0.9481

Table value at 5% level of significance = 12.6

---

Table 5.3 brings to light the fact that, according to their self evaluation, there are 11 High performers, 29 Medium performers and just one Low performer among the executives who have below 5 years of total experience; similarly, there are 30 High performers, 71 Medium performers and 3 Low performers among the 5-10 years total experience category; likewise, there are 48 High performers, 51 Medium performers and 3 Low performers within 11-15 years of total experience, 99 Medium performers and 5 Low performers who have more than 15 years of total experience to their credit. The Chi-Square test applied reveals that there is no significant association among the executives' different levels of performance and their total work experience. Thus, it may be concluded that different levels of performers are found irrespective of the number of years of experience.

In order to find out whether on a closer analysis through the Correspondence Analysis, any association could be established the same data found in Table 5.3 are presented in Fig. 5.2. Three Clusters could be seen from the figure.

Cluster 1 groups total experience of below 5-10 years with Medium performers.

Cluster 2 groups High performance with executives who have an experience of 10-15 years and

Cluster 3 associates executives with more than 15 years of experience and Low performance.
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Thus, Correspondence Analysis exhibits some association between different levels of performance and the total experience gained by executives.

5.3.3 Performance Based on the Experience with the Present Employer

Rummler\(^1\) points out that managers learn to see the organisation as a system, to ask critical questions to analyse their work process and to make their own recommendations. He is of the view that, performance, regardless of its dimensions, is a function of three levels viz., the organisational level, the process level and the performer's level. He adds further that, the quality analysis and quality improvement starts and stops right at the performer's level. The situational approach to work performance measurement would enable the executives to assess their work skills in terms of their own strengths and weaknesses. In this regard one's work experience in the particular system can contribute more to his performance. Hence the work experience with the present employer would be a relevant variable to establish a relationship with various levels of performance. Table 5.4 exhibits the three levels of performance in terms of the number of executives with four types of year-wise experience groupings with the present employer.

---

TABLE 5.4

PERFORMANCE BASED ON EXPERIENCE WITH PRESENT EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance levels</th>
<th>Total experience in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 7.7691

Table value at 5% level of significance = 12.6

Table 5.14 reveals that there are 48 High performers, 84 Medium performers and 5 Low performers among the executives with less than 5 years of work experience with the present employer. Taking the next classification with 5-10 years of experience, it could be seen that, there are 38 High performers, 61 Medium performers and 3 Low performers. Similarly in the 11-15 years experience category there are 24 High performers, 37 Medium performers and 2 Low performers. In the next category which contains 110 executives who are working with the present employer for more than 15 years, there are 40 High performers, 68 Medium performers and 2 Low performers. The Chi-Square test applied to this data leads to the conclusion that there is no significant association between the different levels of performance and their work experience with the present employer.
Since no clear relationship could be established through Chi-Square Test the cross tabulated data found in Table 5.4 are exhibited in Fig.5.3.

2 clusters associating 2 types of performers with different years of experience with the present company, could be visualised from the figure.

Cluster 1

According to this cluster, Medium performers are associated with more than 15 years of experience and with less than 5 years of experience with the present employer.

Cluster 2

Executives with 5-15 years of experience with the present employer, exhibit High performance.

A notable feature of Fig. 5.3 is that Low performance could not be associated with any of the experience categories, which is obvious from its distant location.

5.3.4 Performance and Job Categories

Executives overall job performance depend upon their knowledge, skill, ability, attitude of the management, authority given, the availability of resources and the like. Each of these components may vary from one job category to that of the other. The person who performs a task well, often almost automatically will be asked or allowed to do it again. Practically
everyone likes to be successful and to be associated with successful performance. Promotions to positions of greater power results from successful performance$^1$.

There are very few singular events in any job. For this reason, fine distinctions between the performance of one man and another are seldom really possible. Ordinarily, their performance levels are quite difficult to distinguish from each other, because their performance is in fact determined more by the job itself than by themselves$^2$. Therefore different job categories may also be considered for understanding the levels of performance.

In order to bring to light the existence of any association between various levels of performance and job categories, performance levels of the executives and different job categories are tabulated in Table 5.5.

---


TABLE 5.5
PERFORMANCE BASED ON JOB CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Job categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 7.5156

Table value at 5% level of significance = 21

From Table 5.5, it is evident that, out of 150 'High performers', 46 executives discharge Production function; 23 are involved in Finance/Accounts/Systems; 15 are managing Personnel/Industrial Relations/Labour welfare function; 14 are in the field of Marketing/Sales, yet another 15 executives look after Purchase/Stores/Materials Management; 21 executives are concerned with General Administration/Public Relations and the remaining 16 High performers are engaged with R&D/Quality Control function.

Out of the 12 'Low performers', 4 belong to the job category of Production, 2 executives each in Finance/Accounts and General Administration; 3 executives are looking after the Personnel and related function and one executive is involved in Marketing and Sales.
The conclusion that could be obtained by applying Chi-Square Test is that there is no significant association between different levels of performance and job categories.

Having not found any significant association between different levels of performance and job categories with the help of Chi-Square Test probing them further through Correspondence Analysis may yield some fruitful results. The cross tabulated data in Table 5.5 are exhibited in Fig. 5.4.

The relative closeness of the job categories and their performance levels are identified through Correspondence Analysis. It reveals only 2 clusters formed with the association of rows and columns.

Cluster 1

The formation of cluster 1 is through the association of job numbers 5, 7, 4 and 2 with Medium performance. In other words, executives whose job title is Purchase/Stores/Materials Management, R&D/Quality Control, Finance/Accounting and Marketing/Sales are associated with Medium performance.

Cluster 2

The grouping of job categories 1 and 6 with High performance, results in the formation of cluster 2. It implies that executives who look after Production and General Administration/Public Relations are associated with High Performance.
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Cluster 3

Low performance is associated with executives engaged with Job 3 viz. Personnel/Industrial Relations.

Further it can be seen that, the distance associating the clusters are not uniform. Thus, cluster 1 and 2 has greater cohesiveness and similarity in performance than cluster 3.

5.3.5 Performance Based on Sector

Performance of the individuals may also vary in tune with their level of authority, responsibility and accountability. In public sector managements, it is said that normally, are soft towards responsibility and accountability of the employees, whereas, in private sector undertakings, these are taken quite seriously. The executives in most of the public sector are not given much authority they too, in turn, prefer to take the approval from their superiors rather than use their discretion within the authority. Hence the public or private sector organisations in which the executive functions may be also considered for understanding the performance of executives.

In order to know whether any association exists between levels of performance and the sector to which the executives belong, the performance ratings of the executives are grouped according to the sector they belong and presented in Table 5.6.
### Table 5.6

**Performance Based On Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Levels</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 1.1231

Table value at 5% level of significance = 5.99

Table 5.6 reveals that out of the 288 private sector executives, 109 (26.46%) have evaluated themselves as High performers; 170 (41.26%) of them as Medium performers and the remaining 9 (2.18%) as Low performers. Likewise, the 124 public sector executives include 41 (9.95%) High performers, 80 (19.42%) Medium performers and the rest 3 (0.73%), Low performers.

The results obtained from Chi-Square Test brings to light the fact that there is no significant association between various performance levels of the executives and the sector to which they belong. In both sectors there are high, medium and low performers.

Since there are only two groups, further mapping through Correspondence Analysis is not done.
5.4 SATISFACTION AT THE JOB

Those outward or inner manifestations that give the individual a sense of accomplishment in the performance of his work is satisfaction. Job satisfaction may also result from the product or item produced, from the speed with which it is accomplished, or from other features relating to the work and its performance. Job satisfaction refers to an overall orientation on the part of the individual toward work roles which they are presently occupying.

Herzberg’s two factor theory is a widely accepted and tested one in understanding the concept of job satisfaction. The wants and expectations that people attach to their work activity shape the attitudinal and behavioural patterns of their working lives as a whole. To quote Herzberg, ‘A need to avoid unpleasant job environments led to job dissatisfaction, the need for self-realisation led to job satisfaction when the opportunity for self-realisation was afforded’.

Job satisfaction, therefore includes both the satisfaction derived from being performing a work, and is essentially related to the human needs and their fulfillment through the art of doing the work. An individual’s perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs generates job


satisfaction. Table 5.7 presents the prevailing levels of job satisfaction as perceived by the executives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>70.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of satisfaction perceived by the middle-level executives from their work, as may be seen from Table 5.7 which reveals that, 68 executives perceive High level of job satisfaction; 289 executives perceive Medium level of job satisfaction and the remaining 55 perceive Low level of job satisfaction.

A group of satisfied workers is a source of strength for any organisation, a dissatisfied lot is not only a weak link, but their attitude and actions will also affect the overall efficiency and morale of the workers\(^1\). The level of satisfaction as perceived by the executives classified according to their personal factors are taken for discussion in the following pages.

---

5.4.1 Satisfaction Based on Age

Studies have found different results in different groups on the relationship of age to job satisfaction. For example there may be higher intrinsic job satisfaction among older white collar employees, since financial and job status might have also improved among this group. The age and the perception of the executives regarding the level of satisfaction has some significance in a study relating to the quality of work life among the employees. Table 5.8 presents satisfaction levels of employees based on their age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 35</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 9.135109

Table value = 9.49

Table 5.8 reveals that in the age group of below 35 years there are 18 executives who perceive that their level of satisfaction High 102 executives perceive Medium satisfaction and 22 executives perceive Low satisfaction.
Similarly, in the group of 35-40 years, 27 executives perceive that the job yields High satisfaction 73 are found with Medium satisfaction and the remaining 19 executives perceive a Low level of satisfaction. Finally, in the 41-60 years age group, 23 executives perceive High level of satisfaction, 114 executives perceive Medium satisfaction and the remaining 14 executives perceive Low satisfaction.

The application of Chi-Square Test reveals that, there is no significant association between the Age of the executives and their levels of satisfaction. It implies all levels of satisfactions are found in all age groups.

Having not able to establish a clear-cut association between levels of satisfaction and different age groups through Chi-Square Test further analysis is done through Correspondence Analysis. The cross tabulated data found in Table 5.8 is presented in Fig. 5.5.

Two clusters could be located, due to the association of Rows and Columns, when presented through Correspondence Analysis

Cluster 1

The inference is that the executives who exhibit high level of satisfaction belong to the age group of 35-40 years.
Figure 5.5
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Cluster 2 is formed by the association of the two variables. Viz. Medium level satisfaction with executives who are in the age group of 41 to 60 years. Therefore, executives who belong to the age group of 41 to 60 years perceive that their level of job satisfaction is only medium.

Further, Age group 1 (below 35 years) and Low level of satisfaction cannot be associated with any levels of satisfaction and different age groups, which is evident from their distant location.

5.4.2 Satisfaction Based on Total Experience

The personal characteristics of the individual, together with their relationship with the others in the organisation has a strong impact on satisfaction. Research findings have proved that, when individuals enjoy positive friendly relations, it facilitates greater job satisfaction. If such positive attitudes are to be prevalent, then it generates from the experience one has by working with groups, over a period of time. When work environment is conducive, the management policy is considerate and the group with which one works, promotes harmony and happiness, it certainly would lead to job satisfaction. The above components of work life, and their inherent feelings could be felt by an individual only over a period of time. Table 5.9 gives a vivid picture of how far the years of experience gained may be associated with their perceived level of job satisfaction.
TABLE 5.9
SATISFACTION BASED ON TOTAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 3.3891

Table value at 5% level of significance = 12.6

Table 5.9 highlights the levels of satisfaction as perceived by the executives, grouped according to their total experience. It can be seen that out of 41 executives who have below 5 years of total experience, only 5 have High level of satisfaction; 34 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and 2 perceive Low level of satisfaction. In the 2nd group with 5-10 years of total work experience, out of 104 executives only 20 perceive High level of satisfaction; 65 perceive Medium satisfaction and 19 perceive Low level of satisfaction.

Out of the 102 executives who have 11-15 years of total work experience, only 19 perceive High level of satisfaction; 70 exhibit Medium level of satisfaction and 13 executives reveal Low level of satisfaction. In the last group of more than 15 years of total work experience, with 165 executives, 24 perceive High level of satisfaction; 120 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and the remaining 21 executives perceive Low levels of satisfaction.
Therefore, it can be stated that, levels of satisfaction ranging from high to low, prevail with all categories of executives, when classified according to their total work experience.

Further analysis, through Chi-Square Test reveals that, there is no significant association between various levels of satisfaction and total work experience. The existence of a finer relationship if any, is explored into, with the help of Correspondence Analysis.

The cross tabulated data found in Table 5.9 is presented in Fig. 5.6 to find out the extent of association between job satisfaction and total work experience. It highlights 3 clusters, with the association of the two variables.

Cluster 1

In cluster 1, executives who have more than 15 years of work experience are associated with Medium level of satisfaction.

Cluster 2

Cluster 2 associates experience 2 with Low level of satisfaction. Here, the executives who possess a total experience of 5-10 years are associated with Low level of satisfaction.
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The revelation from cluster 3 is that, experience 3 is associated with high level of job satisfaction. The executives who have 11 to 15 years of total experience perceive a High level of satisfaction, is the inference that could be drawn from this association.

It is noted here that, experience 1 i.e. executives with less than 5 years of total experience do not associate with any levels of satisfaction, which is evident from Fig. 5.6.

5.4.3 Satisfaction Based on Experience with the Present Employer

Individuals who may be more mobile in their jobs may be doing so due to dissatisfaction with the job they hold. At the same time, despite dissatisfaction, some individuals may stick to their jobs due to certain features such as proximity to the worksport, climatic conditions, family responsibilities and certain other compelling circumstances including lack of better opportunity elsewhere. The extent of satisfaction in relation to the experience gained by the sample executives are categorised and presented in Table 5.10.
TABLE 5.10
SATISFACTION BASED ON EXPERIENCE WITH THE PRESENT EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Experience In years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 9.7487
Table value at 5% level of significance = 12.6

Table 5.10 reveals that 28 out of a total 137 executives with less than 5 years service under the present employer perceive High level of satisfaction, 91 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and only 18 perceive Low level of satisfaction. Out of 102 executives with 5-10 years experience with the present employer, 16 executive reveal High satisfaction; 71 reveal Medium satisfaction and the remaining 15 exhibit Low level of satisfaction.

In the 11-15 years category, 10 executives perceive High level of job satisfaction, 44 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and 9 perceive Low level of satisfaction. Similarly, in the group of executives who have more than 15 years of experience with the present employer, 14 executives perceive High level of satisfaction; 83 executives demonstrate Medium level of satisfaction and 13 executives perceive Low level of satisfaction.
The outcome of Chi-Square test, is that there is no significant association between levels of satisfaction and the experience of the executives with the present employer.

Correspondence Analysis is, therefore, used to find out whether any striking relationships could be established between the variables viz., Experience with the present employer with levels of satisfaction. The data found in Table 5.10 are graphically represented in order to find out the extent of association between these variables.

Fig. 5.7 reveals three clusters, that are formed by the association of different variables.

Cluster 1

It is inferred that, executives who are new bloods to the existing organisation, i.e. executives with less than 5 years of experience with the present employer, are associated with High level of satisfaction.

Cluster 2

Cluster 2 is formed by the association of Medium level of satisfaction with experience 4. The above association brings to light the relationship between Medium level of satisfaction with the executives who have more than 15 years of experience to their credit with their present employer.
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In this cluster, Low level of satisfaction is clustered with executives who have 5-15 years of experience.

5.4.4 Satisfaction based on Job Categories

Job satisfaction varies greatly among different employees due to the nature of their own job. The expectations of the technical and administrative executives may not be the same due to variety in the job they perform. When recruiting new employees, organisations tend to paint an overly rosy picture of their internal conditions; when individuals join the company, they may become dissatisfied\(^1\). There is considerable evidence that the attitude people have toward their job is more than an individual matter; it is related to the value system of the class\(^2\). The relative difficulty of the demands of a particular job would be a dividing factor in bringing satisfaction or dissatisfaction from the job. Job characteristics therefore do produce evaluative judgements regarding job satisfaction. Table 5.11 elicits the above view.

---


TABLE 5.11
SATISFACTION BASED ON JOB CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of satisfaction</th>
<th>Job categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 12.0173

Table value at 5% level of significance = 21

From Table 5.11, it is observed that in job category 1 (Production), 21 executives perceive High level of job satisfaction, 84 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and 14 executives perceive Low level of satisfaction.

In job category 2 (Finance/Accounts), 13 executives perceive High level satisfaction, 42 perceive Medium level satisfaction and the remaining 8 executives perceive only Low level of job satisfaction.

Out of 40 executives in job category 3 (Personnel/Industrial Relations/Labour Welfare), 10 perceive High level of satisfaction, 22 perceive Medium level of satisfaction and 8 perceive Low level of satisfaction.
In the 4th category (Marketing and Sales), only 3 executives perceive High satisfaction, 32 perceive Medium satisfaction and 4 executives perceive Low level of satisfaction.

In the job category 5 (Purchase/Stores/ Materials Management), 4 executives perceive High satisfaction, 8 executives perceive Low satisfaction and 34 executives perceive Medium level of satisfaction.

Out of 56 executives in job category 6 (General Administration/Public Relations), 11 executives perceive High level of job satisfaction, 39 perceive Medium level satisfaction and 6 executives perceive Low level of satisfaction.

In category 7 (Research and Development/ Quality Control), there are only 6 executives who perceive High level of job satisfaction, 36 exhibit Medium level of satisfaction the rest 7 executives perceive only Low level of satisfaction.

The result of Chi-Square Test is that there is no significant association between different levels of job satisfaction and Functional Area/ Job categories of executives.

To ascertain the existence of any clear relationship, the cross tabulated data in Table 5.11 are graphically represented to find out the association among variables viz. Job categories and levels of job satisfaction, through Correspondence Analysis.
Fig. 5.8 exhibits 3 clusters due to the association of various levels of satisfaction with the functional area of the job.

Cluster 1

The association of High level satisfaction with Job 1, Job 2 and Job 6, leads to the formation of cluster 1. Thus executives whose functional areas are Production, Finance/Accounts and General Administration/Public Relations are associated with High level of job satisfaction.

Cluster 2

In cluster 2, job 4, job 5 and job 7 are associated with Medium level of satisfaction. Hence, executives whose job category is Marketing and/or Sales, Purchase/Stores/Materials Management and R&D/Quality Control exhibit an association with Medium level of satisfaction.

Cluster 3

The formation of cluster 3 is due to the association of Low level satisfaction with executives whose functional area is Personnel/Industrial Relations.

Therefore the results of Correspondence Analysis, reveals the, level of satisfaction that could be specifically associated with different job categories of the executives. In other words the association justifies that majority of the executives belonging to a particular category could be associated with a
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particular level of satisfaction which is evident from the closeness of the clusters.

5.4.5 Satisfaction based on Sector

Job satisfaction is a determinantal factor in the success of an organisation. Satisfied workers are considered to be assets of their organisation. The organisation cannot achieve its goals and targets unless it has a satisfied work force.

Ownership, whether public or private is merely an element of framework. It does not by itself settle the kind of objectives to be pursued within the framework. From this point of view, it is correct to say that ownership is not the decisive question. But it is also necessary to recognise that private ownership of the means of production is severely limited in its freedom of choice of objectives, because it is compelled to be profit seeking, and tends to take a narrow and selfish view of things. Public ownership gives complete freedom in the choice of objectives and can therefore be used for any purpose that may be chosen. While private ownership is an instrument that by itself largely determines the ends for which it can be employed, public ownership is an instrument the ends of which are undetermined and need to be conscious by chosen\(^1\).

Systems are never more or less than incarnations of man's most basic attitudes. Some incarnations, indeed, are most perfect than others. General evidence of material progress would suggest that the modern private enterprise system is - or has been - the most perfect instrument for the pursuit of personal enrichment. The modern private enterprise system ingeniously employs the human urges of greed and envy as its motive power, but manages to overcome the most blatant deficiencies of laissezfaire by means of keynesian economic management, a bit of redistributive taxation and the countervailing power of the trade unions.¹

When the entire business environment in India is undergoing drastic changes, one finds that market orientation and globalisation are the buzz words. When such traumatic changes takes place in our economy what is the level of satisfaction, do executives get from their work may it be private or public. Table 5.12 presents the perceptions of executives with respect to various levels of satisfaction and the sector to which they belong.

### TABLE 5.12

SATISFACTION BASED ON SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 1.1879  Table value = 5.99 (5%)

Table 5.12 brings out the relationship between levels of satisfaction and the two categories employer - organisations. In the private sector, 48 (11.65%) executives perceive High satisfaction, 205 (49.75%) perceive Medium satisfaction and 85 (8.5%) executives perceive Low satisfaction. Similarly, in the public sector category 20 (4.85%) executives each perceive High and Low levels of satisfaction and 84 (20.4%) executives perceive Medium level of satisfaction.

There is no significant association between different levels of satisfaction as perceived by the executives and the sector to which they belong. Both in public and private sectors, all levels of satisfaction prevail, which is evident from the results of the Chi-Square test.

Having analysed the concepts of performance and job satisfaction individually, the following discussion would throw light on the interlinkage between QWL, Performance and Job satisfaction.

5.5 INTER-LINKAGE BETWEEN QWL, PERFORMANCE AND SATISFACTION

A style of management that invites participation in or consultation on work related matters and issues that specifically relate to certain situations, wherein the employees' ideas are vital, would be essentially a QWL improvement programme. Such a programme would add meaning to work, adding a variety of improvement in design, structure and the way in which the work is performed; bringing psychological satisfaction to the workers.
In a productive work environment, workers are involved and contribute their efforts and ideas for improvement and feel pride in their accomplishments\(^1\). Therefore, employees need job satisfaction and expect an opportunity to make a contribution and thereby pave a way for personal growth. If the Quality of work life is highly conducive, it is assumed that their level of performance would be equally high, leading to high job satisfaction.

The following discussion would throw more light on the inter-linkage between QWL, performance and satisfaction of the executives taken for the study.

5.5.1 Performance and Satisfaction

In most work environments there is little scope for changes in performance, as the organisation structure would be so rigid and the pace for one's progress would be much slow due to inter dependence of various functions. But, according to Porter and Lawler, job satisfaction and performance are not directly linked. Instead both stem from individual's perception that there is a contingency between their output and the rewards they receive\(^2\).


If job satisfaction and performance are related, then what is the kind of perception that these executives have towards performance or what is the level of satisfaction these executives derive in the prevailing work environment?.

Job satisfaction is an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job\(^1\). Therefore, assessing job satisfaction depends upon a given situation, in spite of a commendable performance of the executive. Similarly, satisfactory performance, can be the satisfactory job one holds.

Table 5.13 presents details of rankings obtained for performance and satisfaction.

**TABLE 5.13**

**LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE AND SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 111.0936

Table value at 5% level of significance = 9.49

---

\(^1\) Bullock, R.R. *Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction*. Research Monograph, No. 70, Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1952.
Table 5.13 reveals that out of 68 executives who have revealed High levels of satisfaction, 55 executives have also expressed High levels of performance and the remaining 13 executives have expressed a Medium level of performance.

Again, out of 289 executives who have expressed Medium level of satisfaction, 88 executives perceive High level of performance, 198 executives perceive Medium level of performance and only 3 have perceived Low level of performance.

The remaining 55 executives have revealed Low levels of satisfaction. Among these, 7 executives perceive High levels of performance; 39 Medium level performance and rest 9 executives perceive only Low levels of performance.

The results of Chi-Square test also reveal that there is significant association between the two variables viz. levels of performance and levels of satisfaction. The cross tabulated data in Table 5.13 has been figuratively represented through Correspondence Analysis in Fig. 5.9, in order to find more finer results, through clustering of different variables.

The figure exhibits three clusters by the association of levels of performance and levels of satisfaction.
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It exhibits High level of performance with High level of satisfaction. The association of these two variables results in the formation of cluster 1. The inference from cluster 1 is that, executives who perceive High level of satisfaction also express High level of performance.

Cluster 2

The formation of cluster 2 is by the association of Medium level performance with Medium level satisfaction. It indicates the perception of executives who derive Medium level of satisfaction from the job are only Medium level performers.

Cluster 3

The observation that could be made by the formation of cluster 3 is that, Low performers are associated with Low levels of satisfaction.

Another inference that could be drawn from this analysis is that cluster 1 and 2 are more cohesive when compared to cluster 3.

From the above two analysis viz. Chi-Square Test and Correspondence Analysis a clear relationship emerges between performance and satisfaction.
5.5.2 Satisfaction and QWL

Work enables an individual to promote his dignity, by improving his potential. The behaviour of an individual reduces behavioural pollutants in the work environment and hence improves the quality of work and life. Thus, if the result of an improved performance is deriving greater job satisfaction, which ultimately point out that there is conducive quality of work life. Ultimately, when there is better QWL, it implies greater job satisfaction too.

Job satisfaction depends upon the fit between expectations and experience\(^1\). In the words of Miller, an organisation, by the way it organises, can dull or enhance the vitality of the individuals who work in it. In the event of a management taking care of its workers problems, then working for such an organisation would give the employee enhanced performance and greater satisfaction.

The relationship between, levels of satisfaction and levels of QWL could be established with the data found in Table 5.14.

TABLE 5.14

LEVELS OF QWL AND SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Levels of QWL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 212.9202

Table value at 5% level of significance = 9.49

The Chi-Square Test reveals that there is significant association between different levels of QWL and various levels of satisfaction.

The above drawn inference is an evidence to substantiate the view that, when the QWL is satisfactory, the level of satisfaction would also be satisfactory. In order to establish a concrete evidence, the data in Table 5.14 is diagrammatically represented in Fig.5.10 for further discussion through Correspondence Analysis.

In Fig.5.10 the association of levels of satisfaction with levels of QWL leads to the formation of 3 clear clusters. The clustering of the variables are so close that, it establishes a fine relationship between levels of QWL and levels of job satisfaction.
Figure 5.10
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High level of satisfaction is associated with High QWL. Therefore cluster 1 implies that when the QWL is High, the amount of satisfaction derived from the job by the executives are also High.

Cluster 2

Formation of the above cluster is by the association of Medium level of satisfaction with Medium quality of work life. The association reveals, Medium level of satisfaction is the ultimate result of Medium QWL.

Cluster 3

The affiliation of Low level satisfaction with Low QWL is the inference that could be drawn from this cluster.

The unique feature of this analysis is that, the distance between the variable is minimal indicating a very close association of the two variables viz. QWL and satisfaction. Thus a high job satisfaction is perceived by the executives denotes the prevalence of High QWL as per their perceptions.

Thus job satisfaction is the amount of overall positive affect (or feelings) that individuals have toward their jobs\(^1\) If an individual has High job

satisfaction, we mean that the individual generally likes and values job highly and feels positively toward it.

5.5.3 QWL and Performance

Effective performance is not only the result of the executives efforts but it reflects the prevailing quality of work life in the organisation. The determining factor for effective performance and higher job satisfaction is the QWL. When the QWL is highly satisfactory, the individuals would also contribute to high levels of performance.

The following performance levels of the executives in tune with the prevailing level of QWL will highlight the association of the two variables as found in Table 5.15.

TABLE 5.15

LEVELS OF QWL AND PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Levels of QWL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square value = 58.2182

Table value at 5% level of significance = 9.49

Table 5.15 reveals that among the 150 High level performers, 42 of them perceive High QWL, 101 executives perceive Medium QWL and the remaining 7 is of the perceive that the QWL is Low.

Out of the 250 Medium performers the QWL is High for only 13 executives, it is Low for 42 executives and it is Medium QWL for 195 executives.

Similarly out of the 12 low level performers, 7 perceive the QWL to be Medium and another 5 executives perceive the QWL to be Low.

The Chi-Square Test also brings to light that there is significant association between different levels of performance and QWL.

The above association is further probed into with the help of Correspondence Analysis. The cross tabulated data are presented through Correspondence Analysis.

Fig. 5.11 exhibits three clusters by the association of levels of performance and levels of QWL.

Cluster 1

The result of the above cluster is through the association of High level performance with High Level QWL. It is inferred that, executives who perceive a High QWL are High performers.
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Cluster 2

The formation of the above cluster is by the association of Medium level performance with Medium level QWL.

Cluster 3

This cluster is formed due to the association of Low performers perceiving a Low QWL.

The observation validates the discussion by concluding that the QWL is a determinant factor for the work performance of the executives as perceived by them according to their own experiences in their organisations.

5.5.4 QWL and Satisfaction based on sector

The aggregate data on QWL and satisfaction may be consolidated for each organisation to find how these are placed. Fig.5.12 presents 31 organisations of the sample in a certain order when the QWL and satisfaction (perceived by the executives in the respective organisations) are considered together. The figure also exhibits the private and public sector organisations distinctively. It may be seen from the figure that organisations, irrespective of they being in the private or public sector, may provide a High or Low QWL and satisfaction content to its executives. It must, however, understand where it stands in the company of other organisations so that appropriate HRD may be initiated.
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5.5.5 QWL and Performance Based on Sector

It may be seen from the Fig. 5.13 that the executives irrespective of their perceptions to high or low QWL, their performance is high or low in both private and public sector. The figure however explains where an organisation stands in the context of others and how many of them need to give more attention to these aspects.

5.6 SUMMARY

The foregoing discussion examined the relation between performance, satisfaction and QWL. Ratings of performance and satisfaction as perceived by the executives exhibits prevalence of High, Medium and Low levels of performance and satisfaction. The Chi-Square test did not establish any relationship between performance and personal factors. But levels of performance could be clustered with variations in personal factors, through Correspondence Analysis. In this way it was found high performance could be associated with senior executives, who have 10-15 years of total experience, and with executives of 5-15 years of experience with the present employer and the job categories of these executives were Production and General Administration.

The analysis also reveals that levels of satisfaction are independent of age, experience, job category/functional area or the sector. But a much finer analysis could establish an association between High, Medium and Low levels
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of satisfaction with different categories of age, experience, job category with that of the levels of satisfaction.

The most significant feature of the analysis in this chapter was the establishment of a positive inter-linkage between performance and satisfaction, QWL and satisfaction and QWL and performance. The relational analysis through Chi-Square Test revealed a significant association between performance and satisfaction; QWL and performance and QWL and satisfaction. This fact was further reiterated by the Correspondence Analysis.