

Quality of worklife and Labor Productivity in the Hotel Industry

Inanda Karina Astari Fatma *, Syamsurijal Abdul Kadir **, Tatang Sariman **, Saadah Yuliana **

*Graduate Student PhD, Study Program : Science of Economic, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia

** Faculty Of Economics, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia

Abstract- One of the factors that affect labor productivity, especially in the hospitality industry, namely Quality of worklife (QWL). QWL is considered as the main driving force for the company's performance and the importance of free time indicated by the relationship with the various domains of life other that ultimately leads to QWL. QWL reveals the importance of respect for the human being in the work environment, the important role of QWL ie changing work climate that is technically and humane organization that brings to the quality of work life better, productive, efficient and profitable. But theory and previous studies have recently seen QWL as a dimension of its own and yet see how they affect the productivity of labor from an economic standpoint. Therefore, researchers see this gap as an opportunity in an effort to uncover the phenomenon that occurs during labor and seeks to develop an empirical model to see the effect of QWL on productivity and a variety of other variables that also affect labor productivity among wages, human capital, the age of the workforce and employment status and assess the dimensions of QWL most influential kind to QWL itself and productivity. This research approach with constructivism approach through quantitative analysis technique with multiple regression by Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and using a Likert Scale to measure the value of QWL all workers. The analysis research unit are workers in the hospitality industry. The estimation results of research show that QWL and wages are significantly positive effect on productivity, while the education, experience, age and employment status did not significantly while pe exercise significant influence but do negatively on productivity. QWL most significant dimension to explain the variable QWL is a social dimension. While the dimensions of QWL most significant effect on labor productivity is the dimension of hospitality management.

Index Terms- Hotel Industry, Labor Productivity, Quality of worklife.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term *Quality of Work l ife* (QWL) was first introduced in 1972. The QWL into the spotlight after *the United Auto Workers and General Motors* started a QWL program for job changes. QWL program initially focused on the needs of women workers and then extended to all employees. Some companies regularly identify the needs of its employees to ensure that their QWL program responsive and relevant, especially when the worker needs to change. Development of QWL is intended to

help balance work with the needs, interests and pressures faced by employees so it is useful to enhance the company's productivity and reduce employee *turnover*. In recent years, *Quality of worklife* play a key role in increasing the productivity of the workforce in many companies and large enterprises. QWL factors, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and team spirit are recognized as an important factor in organizational productivity and performance (Koonmee, 2010).

One of the factors that affect labor productivity, especially in the hospitality industry, namely *Quality of worklife* (QWL), with a good QWL will be more productive, efficient and profitable. QWL express respect for other human beings in the work environment (Walton, 1975). The results Rosa Naude (2010) reveals the importance of leisure time indicated by relationship with various domains life other end k leads to the Quality of working life. With the quality good working life will be more productive, efficient and profitable.

Viewed from the perspective of employees, QWL program aims to improve working conditions. Meanwhile, from the perspective of the employer intended to improve organizational effectiveness. In connection with that, Cascio (1992) puts four characters is tik general related to QWL, the *work content, labor relations at the micro level, employee condition and work environment*. Thus the critical role of quality of work is changing the working environment so that the organization as technical and human brings to the quality of work life better (Luthans, 1998). In addition, studies show that the productivity and quality of work life today is considered a major driving force for the company's performance.

Peshave and Gujarathi (2014) declare that the effect of p raktek work diadposi by the hotel industry have a positive impact on employee productivity. However, productivity management system should be designed to focus on work practices in order to improve overall employee productivity. The hotel management should provide "*Monitory Benefits*" (salaries, wages, overtime and intensive) and "*Worklife Balance*" (weekly rest). Labour productivity per hour worked itself is one important determinant of the performance of the company. Low labor productivity has serious implications for international competitiveness and sectoral growth rates. Therefore, the productivity of labor also affects competitiveness in the international tourism market (Dwyer, 2000).

Harrison (2008) states that p rowth labor productivity is the only way to improve living standards in the long term, and real wages are the most direct mechanism to transfer the benefits of productivity growth. Meanwhile, several other variables that affect labor productivity has been investigated by some empirically previous pronouncing that hour to performance is

one of the factors that affect wages and Productivity. the more the number of hours devoted by labor work in economic activity, the wages or remuneration power Accepted work will also increase. In addition, the age variable labor is also quite decisive success in doing a job, both physical and non-physical nature. In general, the labor force aged parents have physically weak and limited, otherwise workforce young age has a strong physical abilities (Blanchard, 2004).

Then there is also the relationship between the status of a job with wages and productivity, where Ward (2001) examines the dilemma of system management contract workers, the results showed that employees with the status of contract workers do not fall in investment companies, but the productivity of the employees increases as wages received , Furthermore, the results of research Wiens (2002) showed that the company will allocate resources less for training and skills for contract employees rather than temporary rather than permanent employees. In addition, according to the approach of human capital, a variety of other factors that affect wages and productivity of the study results Becker (1976), showed that differences in income derived from the difference in labor productivity between men and women. Se added Blanchard (2004) stated that work experience and training to be a determinant of income, while the m cording Polacheck (2004), wage differences can be explained by individual characteristics associated with productivity, such as level of education.

From searching through theory and previous research, a new look at the QWL as a dimension of its own and yet see how they affect the productivity of labor from an economic standpoint. Therefore, researchers see this *gap* as an *opportunity* in an effort to uncover the phenomenon that occurs during labor and seeks to develop an empirical model to see the effect of QWL on productivity and a variety of other variables that also affect labor productivity among wages, *human capital*, the age of the workforce and employment status and assess the dimensions of QWL most influential kind to QWL itself and productivity. the research will focus on the influence of QWL on labor productivity, especially in 3-star hotel 5 star hotel until as population. The reason is because the five-star hotel has met the specified requirements such as physical requirements, the type of services provided, qualified labor force, number of rooms and others. By analyzing the dimensions of QWL, productivity, *human capital* factors, wages, employment status and hours of work, the problems related to QWL and its effects on labor productivity in the hospitality industry Palembang City is expected to be revealed.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

The research design uses Constructivism with design research causality see a causal relationship between the variables studied to answer the research results. In this study conducted by a quantitative method that enables researchers to understand a phenomenon in greater depth with the way each case under study should be identified, categorized and clearly defined to then be measured in ways appropriate. the unit of research analysis is a workforce that works in 3-star hotel to a 5 star in the city of Palembang. the population or territory generalization of this study is the number of workers who work in 17 3-star hotel to a 5

star in town Palembang as much 1,550 workers. Of every five-star hotel that there are ten departments of any hotel is the *Front Office Department, Housekeeping Department, Food & Beverage Service Department, Kitchen Department, Marketing Department, Accounting Department, Purchasing Department, Engineering Department, Security Department and Personnel Department* ,

To measure a sample of the population in the labor force 173 star hotels to 5 star is done with 2 times the *sampling* technique is technique *simple random sampling* to calculate a sample of one of the seven hotels and the next technique is a technique of *proportionate stratified random sampling* technique is used to calculate a sample of 10 departments at each hotel. The first *simple random sampling* technique was used to calculate the sample size of the population of labor force 3 to 5 star hotel, is calculated using a formula based on the sampling table determining the number of samples of a given population that developed Isaac (1981) and showed a total sample of 308 people.

Validity test

Validity test is used to determine the feasibility of the items in a list of questions to define a variable. Testing data validity test is done by correlating step between the scores have been obtained for each question (questionnaire) to correspondent with a total score.

Test Reliability

Reliability is a measure that shows that the measuring instruments used in the study behavioral have reliability as a measuring tool, the consistency of which is measured through the measurement results over time if the phenomenon being measured has not changed. Test reliability will be tested using *Cronbach lpha A* technique.

Likert scale

Likert scale is used to measure the variables *Quality of worklife* (QWL) since this variable is the value the satisfaction of labor over their working life. The way the measurement is to confront a respondent with a statement and then asked to asked to answer five answer choices, where the value of the answer have values different answers. Variable *Quality of worklife* in the study awoke on 9 and 58 point statement dimension. With a *rating scale* values obtained can then look for the value of each of the questions asked in the 308 respondents.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a statistical tool used to complete the multilevel models simultaneously and based on the analysis of covarians. In this study using the analysis by SEM to examine whether the ninth dimension QWL can explain the concept of QWL as a whole and which dimension is the most dominant explain the variables QWL.

Ordinary Least Square (OLS)

According to Gujarati (2003) the main assumptions underlying the linear regression model classic using OLS model is a linear regression model, that is linear in the parameters, the value of X is assumed non-stochastic, meaning that the value of X is considered fixed in the sample are repeated, the average

value of the error is zero, or $E(u_i / X_i) = 0$, homo scedasticity, no autocorrelation, the number of observations, must be greater than the number of parameters to be estimated (the number of independent variables), the variability in the value of X, which means that the value of X should be different, models regression has been specified correctly, in other words there is no bias specification in the models used in the empirical analysis, and there is no perfect multicollinearity between independent variables.

III. RESULT

Validity and reliability of results

Validity and reliability of the study was used to test the variable item statement *Quality of worklife* (QWL). In QWL variables consisting of 58 items were awakened statement of 9 dimensions of QWL. In this study conducted twice validity and reliability. Having tested the validity of the first then obtained the numbers r count for each item. For reliability test results showed *Cronbach Alpha* value of 0.964 which is greater than 0.90 reliability means perfect and reliable suggestion all items and all tests consistently internally because it has a strong reliability. The results of the first test of validity, of the fifty-eight items were 55 items statement statement of values $r > 0.25$ means 55 item valid statement to measure the variables to be studied, but there are 3 statement item that has a value of $r < 0.25$. For the second reliability test *Cronbach alpha* values obtained for 0,965 greater than 0.90 means perfect reliability and suggestion throughout the entire test items reliably and consistently internally because it has a strong reliability. And to the validity of the test results on fifty-five statements r values obtained for all of these greater than 0.25 which means that each statement is valid and can be point statement for the variables studied.

Results Likert Scale *Quality of worklife*

One of the main goals of this study was to see whether labor 3-star hotel to five-star satisfied with Quality of Work Life (*Quality of worklife*) they are overall. The nine dimensions of *Quality of worklife* is (1) Health and Safety, (2) Economic and Family, (3) Social, (4) Choice, (5) Self-Actualization, (6) knowledge, (7) Creativity and Aesthetics, (8) Management and (9) Children. The following percentage of the nine dimensions of QWL:

Table 1. Percentage Value Dimensional QWL

No.	Dimension	Total Value Answer	Value Ideal Answers	Percentage
1	Health and Safety	5,937	7700	77.104
2	Economy and Family	12 477	18,480	67.516
3	Social	8904	12 320	72.273
4	Appreciation	7849	10,780	72.811
5	Self-actualization	8,004	10,780	74.249
6	Knowledge	5,667	7700	73.597

7	Kreati v itas and Aesthetics	4329	6,160	70.276
8	Management	6426	9240	69.545
9	Free time	4459	6,160	72.386

Sources: Primary data is collected, processed, 2016

Of the nine dimensions of QWL the weight of the highest percentages of the dimensions of Health and Safety at 77.104 percent, to interpret these percentages through grains statement questionnaire it means that the workers were satisfied with the working environment is safe and clean, what we do not create stress and energy Employers have the opportunity to stay healthy and fit.

The next highest is the second dimension of Self Actualization of 74.249 per cent means that the workforce feel the work performed to his potential so they can channel their talents and skills. In addition, labor also felt that supervisors and management concerned with what the workers are doing, provide an opportunity for workers to perform the duties and responsibilities of a larger and were given the opportunity to give a fresh new ideas. The third dimension is the highest is Knowledge of 73.597 percent, which means the workforce feel offers educational programs and opportunities to learn new standards in an effort to improve corporate performance, workers also feel companies educate employees to be professional and better and help employees to learn job skills required.

The fourth dimension is the dimension of Choice amounted to 72.811 percent means that the workforce feel valued at work either by employers, management and colleagues, workers feel valued based on their performance, help serve hotel guests to be satisfied with the service of the hotel where they work also be an achievement for workers the next labor was comfortable with the uniforms worn and feel appreciated for it.

Dimension highest fifth dimension of Children of 72.386 percent means that workers feel they have the time to rest, air creations and sports in an effort to balance their working lives. The sixth dimension is the dimension of Creativity and Aesthetics of 70.276 percent which means the employment of a hotel feel working to encourage each person to express his creativity and design of workplace facilities are nice and lovely. Dimensions of the seven who were in the top 70 percent is the dimension of Social Affairs, with a weight of 72.273 percent means the employment find discount good friend at work, besides workforce also feel communication between colleagues is effective, there is a good relationship and a sense of unity among the workforce and labor can still have time to socialize with life outside of work.

There are two dimensions that weight percentage is below 70 percent of the dimensions of the percentage of 69.545 percent Management and Economic dimensions and friendly percentages 67.516 percent. This means that under labor were less satisfied with the standards and procedures set out in the management and space management democratic less wide open, manpower is also less satisfied with the given workload management. Further to the economic dimension and family labor means less satisfied on aspects of their salary, workers feel their jobs are less flexible in order to make extra money, they also feel the hotel is less care about the welfare of labor economics. Besides labor also find the hotel where they work less attention to family life of employees,

and find a place to work away from home and the location of their child's school.

Based on research data and the results of SEM test 9 QWL against QWL dimensions:

Estimation Results 9 Dimensions QWL against QWL with SEM

Table 2. Test Results SEM 9 Dimensions Variable QWL against QWL

Dimension	Estimate	standard Error	Constanta Regression	Probability	Standardized Regression
Healthsafety	1,000				.795
Economyfamily	1,022	.060	17 156	***	.848
Social	1113	.064	17 484	***	.859
Esteem	1102	.065	16 914	***	.839
Actualisation	1,122	.067	16 839	***	.836
Knowledge	1197	.076	15 805	***	.798
Creativity	1,267	.082	15 449	***	.785
Management	1,335	.078	17 053	***	.844
Leisure	1,122	.085	13 246	***	.696

Sources: Primary data is collected, processed, 2016

Ninth significant QWL dimensional concept to explain the QWL variables, it is described in which the ninth dimension QWL has the *Probability* of ***, which means a significant and there is a relationship between the dimensions and variables QWL or ninth means QWL dimensional concept that can explain the overall concept of QWL. From the ninth dimension, the dimension of the most dominant influence on the concept of QWL is described Social dimension of value *Standardized Regression* highest of the eight other dimensions.

Estimation Results 9 Dimensions QWL to productivity with OLS method

Furthermore, to obtain more detailed picture of the influences and relationships ninth dimension *Quality of worklife* (QWL) to variable Productivity then performed multiple linear regression estimation with *Ordinary Least Square* (OLS), the following results were obtained estimation:

Table 3. Estimated 9 Dimensions QWL to productivity with OLS method

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	beta			Tolerance	VIF
Constant	81 040	3,035		26 704	.000		
Healthsafety	.090	.057	.143	1575	.116	.374	2,672
Economyfamily	-.032	.067	-.048	-.472	.637	.299	3,344
Social	-.070	.064	-.115	-1104	.271	.286	3498
Esteem	-.013	.059	-.022	-.220	.826	.324	3091
Actualisation	-.026	.057	-.043	-.449	.654	.330	3029
Knowledge	-.016	.048	-.030	-.332	.740	.375	2,669
Management	.054	.045	.109	1,203	.230	.374	2674
Leisure	.097	.052	.193	1874	.062	.293	3,413
	.043	.038	.087	1115	.266	.513	1948

Sources: Primary data is processed, 2016

$R^2 = 0,078$

$R^2 = 0,050$

$F = 2.798$

From the estimation of nine dimensions of QWL partially on productivity, dimensions positive and significant impact is the dimension of management with significant value 0,062. While eight other dimensions not affect partial significant to productivity, however if the ninth dimension is incorporated into a satisfaction score against QWL the workforce is the effect of positive and significant. The results of this study found that satisfaction of labor against management is an important dimension influence on QWL. This shows that the majority of the workforce is felt that by having a good manager, standards

and procedures already well defined, as well as disciplinary procedures are applied equally and fairly to all workers who work at the hotel it will increase productivity at work. Besides the prevailing democratic management at each of its workforce also makes workers feel comfortable to work more productively. Test R^2 is one of the test equipment to see how big the overall variation of independent variables can explain the variation of the dependent variable. The estimation results of the model indicate that the *adjusted R-square* of 0.050. Ha 1 This means that the independent variables can explain the dependent variable

by 50 percent, the remaining 50 percent is explained in outside the model equations.

Testing the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable simultaneously (together), F test that is by comparing the value of F arithmetic with F table. If F count larger than F table then H_1 H_0 accepted and rejected it means all big variables simultaneously significant effect on the dependent variable. But if F count is smaller than F table then H_1 H_0 is rejected and accepted means all independent variables simultaneously no significant effect on the dependent variable. F value table used (df₁) of k-1 = 8-1 = 7, while for (df₂) is nk = 308-7 = 301, criteria test ($\alpha = 5$ percent), $F_{(0,05)} = (7; 400) = 2.03$, while the value of F arithmetic = 2.798. Thus F count larger than F table, it means that H_1 H_0 accepted and rejected, which means that all independent variables simultaneously significant effect on the buzzer bound miscellany.

Testing the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable partially used t test, namely by comparing t arithmetic with t table. If t is greater than t table, then H_1 H_0 accepted and rejected it means the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable. Conversely, if t is smaller than t table then H_1 H_0 is rejected and accepted meaning independent variable has no significant effect on the dependent variable. T table used by (df) as big as nk-1 = 308-8-1 = 299 or ∞ , the test criteria ($\alpha = 10$ percent), $t_{0,10} = 1.645$.

Of the estimated 9 QWL dimension to productivity with OLS, the importance of the right t count for each independent variable partial namely t dimensions Management amounting to 1,874 bigger than t table 1.6 45 this shows accepted that H_1 and H_0 is rejected it means the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable dimensions Management means partially significant effect on the variable productivity. Meanwhile, the t value other dimension is the dimension of 1.575 Health and Safety, Economic and Family dimension of -0.472, Social dimension of -0.115, amounting Choice -0,0,22 dimension, the dimension of Self Actualization of -0.449, -0.332 dimensions of Knowledge, Creativity and Aesthetics dimensions of 1.203, Leisure time dimension of 1,115, is smaller than t table 1.6 45 means H_1 H_0 is rejected and accepted meaning of Health and Safety dimensions, dimensions of the Economic and Social dimension Family, Self Actualization dimension dimensional dimensions Choice of Knowledge, Creativity and Aesthetics dimension partially no significant effect on productivity.

Model Estimation Results Productivity and QWL

For the results of model estimation coefficient equations Productivity is further expressed in the following equation:

$$P = 7.643038 + 0.061928 \text{ Edu} - 0.067989 \text{ Trn} - 0.008538 \text{ Exp} - 0.092955 \text{ Age}$$

$$(4.223091) (0.173380) (0.036466) (0.010005) (0.081800)$$

$$+ 1.433338 \text{ Sts} + 0.112203 \text{ QWL} + 0.300163 \text{ W}$$

$$(0.930104) (0.036880) (0.045347)$$

$$R^2 = 0.192164$$

$$R^2 = 0.173314$$

$$F = 14.367651$$

Remarks:

() = Standard Deviation

P = Productivity

Edu = Length of Education

Trn = Number PTraining

Exp = total experience

Age = age

Sts = Employment Status, D = 1 workers remain, D = 0 contract or casual workers.

QWL = *Quality of worklife*

W = Wages

From the estimation model of productivity, there are two variables are positive and significant impact on productivity variable is the variable Quality of Work Life (QWL) positive effect at 11.22 percent with a significance value 0.0024 (less than 0, 10) and a variable wage (W) positive effect at 30.16 percent with a significance value of 0.000 (smaller than 0, 10).

Variable Quality of Work Life (*Quality of worklife*) positive and significant effect on productivity means higher satisfaction value of labor would work environment associated with 9 dimensions of QWL then productivity will be greater.

Variable Wage (W) positive and significant impact on productivity means higher wage levels, the productivity will increase. It can be indicated that the main motivation tool to increase the productivity of labor is the wage increase. This is consistent with the theory and the results of previous studies that there is a strong relationship between wages and labor productivity, that reward positive effect on labor productivity.

Furthermore, from the results of model estimation productivity by 3 SLS method there are three variables did not significantly affect the productivity variable is the variable of Education (Edu) positive effect amounting to 6.19 percent but did not significantly affect the productivity with significant value 0.7211 (greater than 0, 05), variable experience (Exp) negative effect of (-0.85) per cent and do not significantly affect the productivity with a significance value of 0.3898 (greater than 0.05), the variable Age (Age) negative effect of (-9, 29) percent and does not significantly affect the productivity with significant value 0.2563 (greater than 0.05) and variable Employment Status (Sts) amounted to 143.33 percent positive effect but not significant effect on productivity with significant value 0.1238 (greater than 0.05).

Variable Education (Edu) effect is positive but not significant effect on productivity means that with the addition of the level of education does not necessarily affect the increase in productivity. Variable Experience (Exp) and no significant negative effect on productivity. Similarly, the Age (Age) and no significant negative effect on productivity. Variable Job Status (Sts) but not significant positive effect on the productivity of this means that although the status still yet certainly improve labor productivity are increasingly improving their productivity. In contrast with the status of contract and casual or in other words, daily or weekly, it makes the workforce to increase its productivity in order to survive to keep working on the hotel.

Furthermore result estimation model SLS productivity by 3 methods, there is one variable that significant but negative effect of variable experience (Exp) with significant value 0.0627 (less than 0.10) but has a negative effect (-6.79) percent. This is an important finding in this study because of the experience effect on productivity but its influence is inversely proportional to

productivity. This means that if experience increased productivity decreases, or high productivity despite lacking experience. This could be due to improper training areas of work and disrupt the work of the main labor.

The estimation results of the model indicate that the *adjusted R-square* of 0.173314 percent, This is means that the independent variables can explain the dependent variable by 17, 33 percent, 82.6 remaining 7 percent is explained outside the model equations.

F value table used (df_1 of $k-1 = 8-1 = 7$, while for (df_2) is $nk = 308-7 = 301$, criteria test ($\alpha = 5$ percent), $F_{(0,05)} = (7; 400) = 2.03$, while the value of F count = 14.367651. Thus F count larger than F table, it means that H_1 H_0 accepted and rejected, which means that all independent variables simultaneously significant effect on dependent variables.

From the estimation model of productivity with 3 SLS method, then obtained t count for each independent variable, namely the partial count variable t Training (Trn) of -1.8 64 430, variable Job status (Sts) amounted to 1 541 051, variable *Quality of worklife* (QWL) amounted to 3.042359 and variable wages (W) by 6.6 19220 greater than t table 1.645, this shows that H_1 received and H_0 is rejected it means the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable means variable Training (Trn), variable Job status (Sts), variable *Quality of worklife* (QWL), variable wages (W) partially significant effect on the variable Productivity (P). Meanwhile the value of the variable Education (Edu) of 0, 357 180 , variable experience (Exp) amounted to - 1.864430 and variable Age (Age) amounted to -1, 136 371, is smaller than t table 1.645 means that H_1 rejected and H_0 acceptable means variable Education (Edu), variable Training (Trn), variable experience (Exp) and variable Age (Age) partially no significant effect on productivity variable (P).

Analysis

Ninth significant QWL dimensional concept to explain the concept of QWL overall. From the ninth dimension, the dimension of the most dominant influence on the concept of QWL is a social dimension, while the results of the estimated nine dimensions of QWL partially on productivity, the dimensions of which are positive and significant management dimension. While eight other dimensions no significant effect partially to productivity, however if the ninth dimension is incorporated into a satisfaction score against QWL the workforce is the effect of positive and significant. The results of this study found that satisfaction of labor against management is an important dimension influence on QWL , This shows that the majority of the workforce is felt that by having a good manager, standards and procedures already well defined, as well as disciplinary procedures are applied equally and fairly to all workers who work at the hotel it will increase productivity at work. Besides the prevailing democratic management at each of its workforce also makes workers feel comfortable to work more productively.

Furthermore, in the estimation model of productivity there are two variables are positive and significant effect on the variable productivity is variable Quality of Life Work (QWL) and variable wages (W). Variable Quality of Life Working positive and significant effect on productivity means that the

higher the satisfaction of the workforce will work environment associated with 9 dimensions of QWL namely in terms of Health and Safety, Economic and Family, Social Choice, Self Actualization, Knowledge, Creativity and Aesthetics, Management and Leisure. then productivity will be greater. The results support the Walton (1975) about the QWL is defined as a balance between the desire or interest in working with corporate social responsibility. These results are also consistent with the results of research Pilatti (2014) Santercole (1993), (French, 1990), Luthans (1998), Lau and May (1998), Jawell and Siegall (1998) Kondalkar (2009) and Rosa Naude (2010), which states that the QWL strong influence on the productivity of labor. *Quality of work life* associated with a high level of satisfaction of individuals who enjoy forms of work organization. *Quality of Work life* as feelings of employees towards work, relatives and organizations that lead to the growth and profitability of the organization. Feeling good about his work means employees feel happy to do the work that will lead to a productive work environment.

Furthermore Wages variable (W) positive and significant impact on productivity means higher wage levels, the productivity will increase. This could indicate that the tool main motivation for increasing the productivity of labor is the increase in wages. Wages are high then people will feel fulfilled to meet their needs so that he can devote his concentration on his work and the results can be as expected. Result research also supports research History Hellerstein (1999), Van Biesebroeck (2011), Bande (2004), Cashell (2004) and Bernhard (2013).

Furthermore estimation model of productivity there are four variables did not significantly effect on the variable productivity variable Education (Edu), variable experience (Exp), variable Age (Age) and variable Employment Status (Sts). variable Education (Edu) positive effect but not significant effect on productivity means that with the addition of the level of education does not necessarily affect the increase in productivity. This is one of the research findings, that in Palembang, workers who work in the hospitality sector, educational factors and work experience no significant impact on the productivity of the labor force. Education and work experience is considered merely a kind of administrative requirements (diploma and certificate) in wage increases, but not necessarily both of these factors increase the productivity. Implying that education has been reached by prospective workers must also be provided with training to improve their skills so that when entering the labor market, with an educational background which is owned also have special skills in the hospitality field.

Another variable is Age (Age) negative and not significant to productivity. It is indicated that if the age increases, the ability to be on the wane with age will be reduced agility. In another study age is an approximation of the experience. Variables Job Status (Sts) positive effect but not significantly to the productivity of this means that although the status still does not make the workforce more and increase their productivity, but rather labor contract status and casual or in other words, daily or weekly, making such workers have no guarantee to remain at the hotel working place, so that productivity will be higher and showed a higher performance than workers with permanent status.

Furthermore estimation model of productivity there is one variable that significant but negative effect of variable training (Trn). This is a finding in the study because the training effect on productivity but its influence is inversely proportional to productivity. This means that if pe exercise increases productivity decreases, or high productivity although raining less. From the result of the deepening of the research it can be considered due to improper training of field work and interfere with a major work of labor. So despite substantial training but have no impact on hospitality services. Besides result of deepening through interviews with a sample of research, there is boredom experienced by workers who have worked long enough in the hotel, the training routine followed in the end it actually does not add to their productivity while also wages received by workers who had long work, did not experience a significant increase, so although equipped with the increase knowledge and new skills, but not accompanied by wage increases, then it will positively impact the productivity of the workforce. The findings of this study actually supports the findings of Menon (2010), where the research results stated that the respondents do not consider education and training into a factor of major affecting productivity and more importantly is the individual characteristics of its own .

Based on the results of the estimate, cross tabulation and results of observational studies in guessing the main factors that give effect negatively on the education and training on productivity in the workplace include the quality of the work environment, the structure of the organization and processes, assignment of workers in places that do not conform with the qualifications them and the lack of incentives such as money *service*, payroll system that does not increase even though the old work and the status of such workers as permanent employees. It also received training materials do not necessarily correspond with the areas of work that was involved, so that despite the training, but productivity is still low. Another factor is the technique of delivering the training material should also be improved in order to create understanding in accordance with expectations of the training.

The findings of this has important policy implications that need for measures to enhance the positive effects of training on productivity. It seems that there is a closer relationship between the needs of education and training in the labor market. In addition to providing students with theoretical knowledge, educational institutions must provide students with the skills and knowledge. Overall, the findings of this study indicate that the positive effects of pe training on productivity will be greater in the organization who are willing to invest in a supportive working environment. At the same time, workers also have to invest in an increase in *skill* them. In line with this hotel must consider salary increases in long-term employees working at the hotel, because although the amount of training given quite a lot and done regularly, if not accompanied by an increase in welfare is certainly not going to improve the productivity of the workforce, mainly to department *house keeping* and *food and beverage service* and wages earned are comparatively lower than other departments whereas this department is spearheading hospitality services, which services they are doing will be felt directly by consumers.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the issues and objectives of the study, and are associated with the analysis of the results of research and discussion, it can be concluded as follows :

1. From the ninth most significant dimensions of QWL describes QWL variables are social dimensions.
2. Dimensions QWL significant effect on productivity is the dimension of Management.
3. QWL variables and wages significantly positive effect on productivity. Factors *human capital* such as education, experience, age and employment status did not significantly affect labor productivity in industry hotel in Palembang. Meanwhile variable exercise significant negative effect on productivity.

REFERENCES

- [1] Becker, G.S. 1976. *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- [2] Bernhard Mahlberg , Inga Freund , Jesús Crespo Cuaresma , Alexia Prskawetz. 2013. *Ageing, productivity and wages in Austria*. International Journal of Labour Economics. 22 (2013) 5–15. Vienna : Austria.
- [3] Blanchard. P. Nick and Thacker, James W. 2004. *Effective Training*, Pearson. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [4] Cascio,W.F. 1992. *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Worklife, Profits*, 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill. New York.
- [5] Cashell, Brian W. 2004. *Productivity and Wages*. Congressional Research Service. Cornell University.
- [6] Dwyer, L. & Kim, C. 2003. *Destination competitiveness: determinants and indicators*. Current Issues in Tourism, 6 (5): 369-414.
- [7] French. 1990. A New History of French Literatur Cultural Studies. Vol. 1. Part 3. No. 3.
- [8] Harrison, Peter, Andrew Sharpe and Jean-François Arsenault. 2008. *The Relationship Between Labour Productivity and Real Wage Growth in Canada and OECD Countries*. Centre For The Study of Living Standar Journal.
- [9] Hellerstein, David Neumark, Kenneth R. Troske. 1999. *Wages, Productivity, and Worker Characteristics: Evidence from Plant-Level Production Functions and Wage Equations*. Author(s): Source: Journal of Labor Economics. Vol. 17, No. 3.
- [10] Isaac and Michael. 1981. *Model CIPP*.www.google.com
- [11] Kondalkar, V.G. 2009. *Organization Development*. New Delhi : New Age International. Limited, publisher.
- [12] Konmee, K., Singhapakdi, A., Virakul, B., & Lee, D.J. 2010. Ethics institutionalization, quality of work life and employees jobrelated outcomes: A survey of human resoure managers in Thailand. Journal of Business Research, 63, 20-26.
- [13] Lau, R.S.M. & May, B.E. 1998. *A Win-Win Paradigm for Quality of work Life and Business Performance*. Human resource Development Quartely: Proquest Psychology Journals.
- [14] Luthans , Fred. 1998. *Organizational Behavior*. Eighth Edition. MC Graw-Hill. p. 205.
- [15] Menon, Maria Eliophotou. 2010. *The Link Between Education and Productivity : The Employers Perspective*. International Conference On Applied Economics .
- [16] Peshave, A. Milind and Gujarathi, Rajashree, DR. 2014. Impact of Employment Practices Adopted By Hotels on Productivity of Its Employees: A Comparative Study Between Hyderabad and Bangalore Cities. India : Research Scholar, University of Pune.
- [17] Pilatti, Alberto, Diogo José Horsta, Evandro Eduardo Brodayb, Roberto Bondarickc, Luis Filippe Serped. 2014. *Quality of Working Life and Productivity: An Overview of the Conceptual Framework*. International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR) Volume 2, Issue 5, June 2014, PP 87-98 ISSN 2349-0330 (Print) & ISSN 2349-0349.

- [18] Polachek, Solowon, W. 2004. How the Human Capital Model Explains Why the Gender Wage Gap Narrowed. IZA DP No. 1102.
- [19] Rosa, Naudé. 2010. Quality of work life of front office employees in selected accommodation establishments. Disertation. Potchefstroom.
- [20] Santercole, Gina Marie. 1993. *Quality of work life in the hotel industry*. Rochester Institute of Technology : RIT Scholar Works.
- [21] Van Biesebroeck, Johannes. 2011. *Wages Equal Productivity. Fact or Fiction? Evidence from Sub Saharan Africa*. World Development Vol. 39, No. 8, pp. 1333–1346, 2011. K.U.Leuven, Belgium: CEPR, United Kingdom.
- [22] Walton, R.E., 1975. Criteria for Quality of Working Life. In L.E. Davis, A.B.Cherns and Associates (Eds.) *The Quality of Working*. New York: TheFree Press, Life, 1: 91-104.
- [23] Ward, K., Grimshaw, D., Rubery, J., Beynon, H. 2001, "*Dilemmas in the management of short term work agency staff*", Human Resource Management Journal, Vol. 11 No.4, pp.3-21.
- [24] Wiens-Tuers, B.A. and Hill, E.T. 2002. "*Do they bother? Employer training of temporary workers*", Review of Social Economy, Vol. 60, pp. 543-66.fe

AUTHORS

First Author – Inanda Karina Astari Fatma, Graduate Student PhD, Study Program : Science of Economic, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia. Email : inanda727@gmail.com

Second Author – Syamsurijal Abdul Kadir. Faculty Of Economics, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia

Third Author – Tatang Abdul Madjid Sariman Faculty Of Economics, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia

Fourth Author – Saadah Yuliana, Faculty Of Economics, University of Sriwijaya Palembang, Indonesia