

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Study of Impact of Quality of Work Life on Managerial Creativity with Reference to Indian Executives

Dr. Jyoti Vyas Bajpai

Dean, Sri Aurobindo Institute of Management and Science, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India

Dr. Kapil Sharma

Associate Professor, Institute of Management Studies, DAVV, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India

Dr. Vivek Sharma

Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Studies, DAVV, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India

Abstract:

As business struggles trying to grapple with new issues and avenues every day, creativity among its people has come to become the most coveted skill. Recent times have witnessed the most trying circumstances economically and socially worldwide. Also, the extreme adversities have been a golden opportunity for the most innovations in business to come to the fore. Businesses have now come of an age where creativity and innovations are no longer a luxury choice but an essential survival expertise.

What then defines creativity? How can one understand the dynamics of its creativity? How does Quality of work life impact creativity? Does it really pay to make an effort to improve the work life quality or is it just another latest management fad, the new flavor of the season to improve quality of work life or creativity.

Keywords: Managerial creativity, quality of work life, Indian executives

1. Introduction

It is a well accepted fact that all the pressures on the individual working in the organization results in an all pervasive, omnipotent stress. Every employee goes through stress in their everyday working. Infact; Work stress has become synonymous with work itself. An obvious issue is how does one manage to balance both being creative which is very crucial and at the same time combat the influence of stress at work. To help achieve this feat, quality of work life, and a proper work life balance can bring in the much needed respite. Also, creativity needs a fertile, conducive environment to grow and develop; this is where the quality of work life comes into play. Needless to mention, the immediate work environment and the quality of work life will be of paramount importance in deciding the management of creativity.

2. Quality of Work Life

Organizations today, unlike the past have started to give the human factors its due credit. The quality of life that people experience in their workplace is of paramount significance. An average individual spends nearly 70-80% of his/her life at the workplace the quality of this life is a major issue from a managerial point of view.

There are some conceptual categories which provide a framework for analyzing the salient features of quality of work life like adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, future opportunity for continued growth & security, social integration in the work environment, constitutionalism or the 'rule of the thumb' in the work organization, work and the total life space and the social relevance of work life.

The word 'quality' is derived from the Latin term quails, meaning kind, sort, size, colour, etc. Therefore, quality of life means what is this or that life and what life may be. But the adjective 'quails' has its origin in the pronoun 'qui'.

Quality of life, in general, is the degree of satisfaction people find in their life, family, work, friendship and health. The enhancement of the quality of life will reduce the incidence of social, physical and mental pathology. The core symptoms of dysfunction in quality of life are fatigue, anxiety and depression.

The quality of life is operationally defined as freedom from discomposure, psychological boredom and stress, having satisfaction and happiness pertaining to material, physical, psychological and spiritual aspects. Hence, quality of life in macroscopic view evaluates both the individual's physical and mental health and social health too.

In short, it is the concept of self-esteem, self-worth and feeling of security. Since an individual spends the largest portion of their adult life at the workplace the general physical & psychological well being of the individual at the workplace that is the quality of work life becomes an important issue.

The world is becoming more and more complex. Modern conveniences abound, and technology seems to have touched everything from cooking to mass production, from communication to driving. In some ways life today is easier than ever before. In other ways, it is more difficult. Although we may now use a cellular phone to keep track of family members and to synchronize our appointments, we must also master cell phone operation—and update the requisite skills each time we buy a new cell phone. We must also develop new skills to operate our televisions, ovens, automobiles, and computers. Perhaps it would be most accurate to say that we have more opportunities than ever before, but more demands are placed upon us as well.

This complexity is increasing and will continue to do so. The information boom is not slowing down, and technological advances are occurring more often. Such changes reflect cultural evolution, which is unlike biological evolution in its rapidity.

3. Managerial Creativity

As mentioned in Management Development Review s (MDR 1997), some multinational companies realized that one of their main assets are employees' imagination and ideas. They consider the aptitude to convert ideas into useful knowledge and useful knowledge into added value as a key resource.

Thus, more important than allowing the flourishing of ideas and creativity, it is essential managers apply rigorous methodologies to idea management as they do for example, with the finance domain of organizations (John Kao cited by MDR 1997). According to Nogueira and Marques (2008), organizations should adopt management models that consider organizational innovation processes based on professional qualifications, management skills and decision capacities. Theories invoking divergent rather than convergent thinking (such as Guilford), or those describing the staging of the creative process (such as Wallas) are primarily theories of the creative process. A focus on creative product usually appears in attempts to measure creativity in people, or in creative ideas framed as successful memes. A focus on the nature of the creative person considers more general intellectual habits, such as openness, levels of ideation, autonomy, expertise, exploratory behaviour and so on. A focus on place considers the best circumstances in which creativity flourishes, including degrees of autonomy, access to resources and the nature of gatekeepers.

4. Traditional views in the West and East

It is generally thought that "creativity" in Western culture was originally seen as a matter of divine inspiration. In Greek culture, for instance, Muses were seen as mediating inspiration from the Gods. Romans and Greeks invoked the concept of an external creative "daemon" (Greek) or "genius" (Latin), linked to the sacred or the divine. This probably came closest to describing what the modern age views as creative talent. In the Judaeo-Christian tradition, creativity was the sole province of God; humans were not considered to have the ability to create something new except as an expression of God's work.

The traditional Western view of creativity can be contrasted with the traditional Eastern view. For Hindus, Confucianists, Taoists and Buddhists, creation was at most a kind of discovery or mimicry, and the idea of creation "from nothing" had no place in these philosophies and religions.

5. Key Aspects of Managerial Creativity

5.1. Individual Attributes of Creativity

- Guilford; (1959) identified what abilities are involved in being creative. His test concluded that originality; flexibility, idea in fluency, problem sensitivity and redefinition skills were all critical to creative managerial performance. Organizations which creative people encounter frequently.
- Shapiro; (1966) reviewed the characteristics of creative scientists and listed the key traits of creative scientists as curiosity, dedication to work, lack of inhibition, intuition, introversion, sensitivity, radicalism and showing initiative. McPherson; (1967) offered a description of creative engineers which portrays them as adopting conformist clothing to keep society at bay and ensure that management does not bother them too much. They have the guts to handle obstacles put in their way. They find autonomy and privacy for themselves and use it.
- De Bono; (1971) argued that managers fail in being creative due in part to the failure in teaching, thinking skills, and that practice in thinking skills can increase the flexibility of thought and be creative.

6. Review of Literature

There are evidences which indicate that productivity can be increased by improving the quality of work life Miller; (1975), Cummings and Molloy ;(1977), Rosow ;(1979). Katzell ;(1983) also discovered that improved quality of work life and productivity are related. Buchanan and Boddy; (1982) recognize that work should be organized to develop human skills and motivation required for overall system effectiveness. A review of research findings showed a consistent negative relationship between satisfaction and absenteeism Bhatia and Valecha; (1981) Kavoussi et al, (1978). The researchers studied the absenteeism rates of textile factory and recommended that closer attention should be paid to improve the quality of work life.

A large number of studies indicate that happiness at work is an important variable. But at the same time it is very much important to know about individual's values Robbins; (1988). Although they don't directly impact behavior, values strongly influence a person's

attitudes. So, knowledge of an individual's value system can provide insight into his or her attitudes. Furthermore, when a group offers us values and attitudes similar to our own, the values and attitudes of an individual are validated to remain in the group Martin and Hunt;(1981). However, if group membership can satisfy an individual's needs then he or she will want to continue his or her membership Klien and Ritti ;(1984).

Quality of work life in India

Trist ;(1975) made an eloquent plea for the importance of quality of work life in a developing country. "In a developing country the quality of work life can become both ends and means. It is an end in itself because it is highly significant component in the quality of working life- the goal of all development. It is the means because the experience of participation in decision making at the work place and progressive learning help workers acquire the civic competences and skills on which a developing country in the social democratic mode must rely. Singh ;(1983) in his study of managers from the public sector concludes that the overall perceived quality of work life in the Indian industries is considerably poor.

Amabile;(1983, 1996) analysed the influence of external factors on different aspects of creativity, developing a pioneer effort to look more broadly at creativity and to place it in a social context. In Amabile's Componential Model of Creativity (1996), the author presents creativity as a 5 stage process – Problem or task identification, Preparation, Response generation, Response validation and communication, Outcome. Although they can be seen on a sequential order, individuals can go throughout them in varying orders. This research has stimulated others to study factors beyond the creativity process. Results confer importance to motivational and environmental factors in creativity Weisberg ;(2006). The second confluence theory - Investment theory of creativity of Sternberg and Lubart ;(1995, 1996) – considered the key to being creative "to buy low and sell high" in ideas. These authors compared a new idea produced by a creative thinker with a stock valued low by investors. The person values it since has invested on it but waits for an opportunity of selling high. Sternberg and Lubart (1995, 1996) considered six interrelated factors as essential to this process: "intellectual abilities, knowledge, style of thinking, personality, motivation, and environment Kaufman and Sternberg; (2005:21)". According to the authors, we all have the required skills and can enlarge our creative ability.

Andriopoulos;(2001), based on literature review concluded for the existence of 5 main determinants of organizational creativity, organizational climate, leadership style, organizational culture, resources and skills and structure and organizational systems.

Morris ;(2008) concluded after a study conducted in New Zealand, the 10 facilitators of organizational creativity. By increasing order of the importance considered by respondents, the results point out the importance of:

- 10. Appropriate reward
- 9. Clear organizational goals
- 8. Positive staff motivation
- 7. Committed leadership
- 6. Individual empowerment/personal authority to initiate change
- 5. Supportive organizational structure
- 4. Open communication and information sharing
- 3. Spaces/resources to pursue ideas
- 2. Staff competence
- 1. Time

This study achieved, such as previous studies, that competent workers are important to organizational creativity.

According to Barret ;(2005), within a creative environment, there are activities that influence personal creativity, creative process and outputs or products. The better managers acknowledge the way creative environment influences decisions, the better they can develop and promote organizational performance. Barret ;(2005) believes creative environment may be seen as manageable factor.

Rhodes ;(1961/1987) distinguished between the creative person, process, product, and press.

7. Research Methodology

7.1. Objectives

1. To understand managerial creativity in organizations.
2. To study the effect of quality of work life on managerial creativity.
3. To prepare the factual base for innovative & developmental programs to enhance Managerial creativity among employees and in organizations.

7.1.1. The Study

The present study is an exploratory investigation to examine the effect of quality of work life as an independent variable on managerial creativity as the dependent variable.

The variables have two levels:

Quality of work life	: Good
	: Poor
Managerial creativity	: High
	: Low

7.1.2. The Sample

The initial sample was of 500 subjects. The incomplete sets of measures were screened out, and completed ones were classified into discrete groups as shown in the research design. The present research was conducted on a sample of 437 executives from different industries such as Telecom, Insurance, Banking, Hospitality, IT & ITES, Manufacturing, Media etc. The respondents were selected on a systematic random sampling basis. The executives represented the three layers of hierarchy as junior level managers, middle level managers and senior level managers as follows:

132-Senior Managers

163-Middle Managers

142-Junior Managers

7.1.3. Hypothesis

- H₀₁ Managerial Hierarchy level does not affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₂ Qualification does not affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₃ Age does not affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₄ Gender does not affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₅ Hierarchy and qualification do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₆ Hierarchy and age do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₇ Hierarchy, qualification and age do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₈ Hierarchy, qualification and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₀₉ Qualification and age not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₀ Hierarchy and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₁ Age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₂ Qualification and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₃ Hierarchy, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₄ Qualification, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₅ Hierarchy, qualification, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
- H₁₆ Quality of work life does not affect managerial creativity.
- For data collection:
Standardized tools were administered on each subject of the sample. The details of the tools are as follows:
- Quality of Work life Scale
Author Dr Santosh Dhar & Dr Upinder Dhar
- Managerial Creativity Scale
Author: Sangeeta Jain, Rajnish Jain and Upinder Dhar

8. Results & Discussions

		Value Label	N
Level	1	Top	132
	2	middle	163
	3	lower	142
Qual	1	Hsc	122
	2	Gr	175
	3	Pg	140
Age	1	less than 30	343
	2	30 or more	94
Gender	1	M	342
	2	F	95

Table 1

The median value of Work Stress is 3. Median value of Quality of Work Life is 3.4154. As depicted in table no.1, qualifications are categorized into three levels higher secondary and lower, Graduates, post graduates and above. Hierarchical levels are categorized into three levels, top, middle and lower managerial cadres. Age has been classified into two groups, less than 30 years and 30 years or more. Gender has been grouped into two, males and females.

Level	Qual	Age	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Top	Hsc.	less than 30	M	3.1067	0.635	45
			F	3.1886	0.69	7
		Total	3.1177	0.6361	52	
	30 or more	M	M	3.1093	0.6893	30
			F	3.24	1.8102	2
		Total	3.1175	0.7424	32	
Total	M	M	3.1077	0.6526	75	
		F	3.2	0.8759	9	
	Total	3.1176	0.6742	84		
G	less than 30	M	M	3.83	0.2777	8
			F	4.22	0.5374	2
		Total	3.908	0.3452	10	
	30 or more	M	M	3.79	0.3022	8
			F	3.96	0.5091	2
		Total	3.824	0.324	10	
Total	M	M	3.81	0.2811	16	
		F	4.09	0.453	4	
	Total	3.866	0.3286	20		
Pg	less than 30	M	M	2.6275	0.3097	16
			F	2.47	0.3088	4
		Total	2.596	0.3082	20	
	30 or more	M	M	2.375	0.267	8
			F	2.375	0.267	8
		Total	2.5433	0.3147	24	
Total	M	M	2.5433	0.3147	24	
		F	2.47	0.3088	4	
	Total	2.5329	0.3093	28		
Total	less than 30	M	3.0794	0.6363	69	
		F	3.1262	0.7945	13	
	Total	3.0868	0.6585	82		
30 or more	M	M	3.1	0.7139	46	
		F				
	Total					

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

Source	Type III Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
LEVEL	8.244	2	4.122	15.038	0
QUAL.	4.176	2	2.088	7.618	0.001
AGE	2.228E-02	1	2.228E-02	0.081	0.776
GENDER	0.221	1	0.221	0.805	0.37

Table 3: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

- H_{01} Managerial Hierarchy level does not affect managerial creativity.

F= 15.038

The null hypothesis is *rejected*.

It implies that managerial hierarchy has a significant affect on managerial creativity. From table 2 it is clear that the managerial creativity is highest in the lower managerial levels, not much difference was found between the top and middle level managerial creativity. The overall managerial creativity of both top and middle levels was found to be slightly less than the lower levels.

- H_{02} Qualification does not affect managerial creativity.

F=7.618

The null hypothesis is *rejected*.

It implies that qualification has a significant affect on managerial creativity .From table 2 it is clear that qualification has a significant impact on managerial creativity; managerial creativity is higher for higher qualification.i.e.in the category of post graduates and above.

- H_{03} Age does not affect managerial creativity.

F=.081

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that age does not have any significant affect on managerial creativity, no significant difference was observed between managerial creativity of employees of different ages.

- H_{04} Gender does not affect managerial creativity.

$F= .805$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that there is no significant difference observed between the managerial creativity manifested by males and females.

Source	Type III Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
LEVEL×QUAL.	15.358	4	3.84	14.008	0
LEVEL×AGE	0.799	2	0.399	1.458	0.234
LEVEL×QUAL.×AGE	0.583	4	0.146	0.532	0.712
LEVEL.×QUAL.×GENDER	0.746	4	0.186	0.68	0.606

Table 4: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

- H_{05} Hierarchy and qualification do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=14.008$

The null hypothesis is *rejected*.

It shows that hierarchy and qualification interact to affect managerial creativity.

- H_{06} Hierarchy and age do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=1.458$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It shows that Hierarchy and age do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

- H_{07} Hierarchy, qualification and age do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=.532$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that hierarchy, qualification and age do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

- H_{08} Hierarchy, qualification and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=.680$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that hierarchy, qualification and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

Source	Type III Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
QUAL.×AGE	0.282	2	0.141	0.514	0.599
LEVEL×GENDER	0.62	2	0.31	1.131	0.324
AGE×GENDER	3.18E-03	1	3.18E-03	0.012	0.914
QUAL.×GENDER	0.18	2	9.01E-02	0.329	0.72

Table 5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

- H_{09} Qualification and age do not interact to affect managerial creativity

$F=.514$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that qualification and age do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

- H_{10} Hierarchy and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=1.131$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that hierarchy and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

- H_{11} Age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=.012$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It shows that age and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

- H_{12} Qualification and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.

$F=.329$

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that qualification and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

Source	Type III Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
LEVEL×AGE×GENDER	0.215	2	0.107	0.392	0.676
QUAL.×AGE×GENDER	8.777E-02	2	4.389E-02	0.160	0.852
LEVEL.×QUAL.×AGE×GENDER	9.336E-02	1	9.336E-02	0.341	0.560

Table 6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

• H₁₃ Hierarchy, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
F=.392

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It shows that hierarchy, age and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

• H₁₄ Qualification, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
F=.160

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that qualification, age and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

• H₁₅ Hierarchy, qualification, age and gender do not interact to affect managerial creativity.
F=.341

The null hypothesis is *accepted*.

It implies that hierarchy, qualification, age and gender do not interact to significantly affect managerial creativity.

Source	Type III Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
QWL	94.164	122	0.772	51.885	0.00

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Managerial Creativity

• H₁₆ Quality of work life does not affect managerial creativity.
F=51.885

The null hypothesis is *rejected*.

It implies that quality of work life has a significant affect on managerial creativity. From the table, it is clear that higher the quality of work life, higher is managerial creativity.

9. References

- Kao, J. (1996) Jamming: The Art and Discipline of Business Creativity. Harper Business.
- MDR (1997) Management Development Review, vol 10, N.er 6/7 pp.203-204. MCN University Press. ISSN 0962- 2519
- Guildford. (1959). Trends in creativity. In Anderson. Creativity and its Cultivation, New York: Wiley
- Shapiro. (1966). The identification of research scientists. Psychological Africana, 99-132.
- McPherson, J. (1967).The People, the Problems and Problem Solving Methods. Michigan: Pendell Midland.
- De Bono, E. (1971) Lateral Thinking. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Miller, E.J. (1975),”Socio-Technical Systems in Weaving, 1953-70,”A Follow-up Study; Human Relations, 1975, 28, 4, pp.349-86.
- Cummings, T.G. and Molloy S.,”Improving Productivity and the Quality of Work Life,”Praeger, 1977, xvi, p.305.
- Rosow, J.M. (1979),”Human Dignity in the Public –Sector Workplace,”Public Personnel Management, January-February 1979, Vol. 8(1), pp.7-14.
- Buchanan, D.A. and Boddy, D.A.,”Advanced Technology and the Quality of Working Life: the Effects of Word Processing on Video Typist”, Journal of Occupational Psychology, Mar.1982, Vol.55 (1), pp.1-11.
- Bhatia, S.K. And Valecha, G.K. (1981).”A Review of Research Findings on Absenteeism”, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 1981, (October), Vol.17 (2).
- Kavoussi, N.et.al.”The Effects of Unsatisfactory Working Condition on the Epidemiology of unauthorized Absenteeism in an old textile factory,”Journal of Human Erology,September 1978,Vol.7(1),pp.81-87.
- Klien and Ritti, Understanding Organisation Behaviour, 1984.Kao, J. (2007)
- Robbins, S.P., Organisational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies and Applications, PHI 1988.
- Martin and Hunt, Reference in Klein and Ritti: Understanding Organizational Behaviour, 1984.
- Trist, E. L. (1981), the sociotechnical perspective. The evolution of sociotechnical systems as a conceptual framework and as an action research program», in A. Van de Ven, W.F. Joyce, Perspectives on organization design and behavior, New York, Wiley, 19-75.
- Singh, H.,”QWL and Quest from Meaningful Work,”Paper presented at National Symposium on QWL, Hyderabad, 1983.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential Conceptualization. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45(2): 357-376.

19. Andriopoulos, C. (2001) Determinants of organisational creativity: a literature review. *Management Decision*, v.39, 10, pp.834 – 841. ISSN: 0025-1747. DOI: 10.1108/00251740110402328. MCB UP Ltd.
20. Kaufman, J.C., Sternberg, R.J. (2006) *the International Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge University Press.
21. Morris, W. (2006) *Enhancing Organisational Creativity: A Literature Review* [online], December, <http://www.future-edge.co.nz/Files/Organisational.pdf>
22. Rhodes M. 1961/1987. An analysis of creativity. In *Frontiers of Creativity Research: Beyond the Basics*, ed. SG Isaksen, pp. 216–22. Buffalo, NY: Bearly
23. Barret H., Balloun, J.L. and Weinstein, A. (2005) *The impact of creativity on performance in non-profits*.