

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS AT WORKPLACE

Shiney Chib

Datta Meghe Institute of Management Studies, Nagpur, India.

ABSTRACT

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is be defined as “The Quality of the relationship between the man and task at workplace”. QWL has gained prominence in the Organizational Behavior as an indicator of the overall of human experience in the work place. QWL refers to the relationship between a worker and his environment, adding the human dimension to the technical and economic dimensions within which the work is normally viewed and designed. QWL focus on the problem of creating a human working environment where employees work co – operatively and achieve results collectively. QWL refers to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement and commitment individuals experience with respect to their line at work. QWL is the degree of excellence brought about work and working conditions which contribute to the overall satisfaction and performance primarily at the individual level but finally at the organizational level. QWL provides a more humanized work environment. It attempts to serve the higher – order needs of workers as well as their more basic needs.

1.0 Introduction

QWL means “The degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experience in the organization”. QWL has gained deserved prominence in the Organizational Behavior as an indicator of the overall of human experience in the work place. It plays a key role in any organization and has an effect on the people, their work, performance and self development as well as organization’s development. It basically refers to relationship between the employees and the ecosystem in which he works. It focuses on creating a working environment where employees work co – operatively and achieve results collectively.

2.0 Literature Review

QWL is an important factor that affects job satisfaction at work. QWL programmes have two objectives: to enhance the productivity and the satisfaction of employees. QWL is the quality of the content of relationship between employees and their total working environment with human dimensions added to the usual technical and economic ones (Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher, 2007).

Although employers clearly need to consider labour relations from strategic perspective, union representatives must do so even more if they are to keep their unions viable for tomorrow’s organizations. Labour and capital need to cooperate and create a win- win relationship in post LPG era. The HR professionals should play the active role to synergize the roles of labour and capital and to build a relationship based on concepts such as respect to each other, team effort, joint goal setting and problem solving through direct participation, performance based reward, transparency in communication, prompt

grievance redress, etc. which are more challenging in practical aspects and both the actors has to think of these measures for industrial peace, progress and prosperity (Satrya and Parasuraman, 2007).

QWL is defined as the favorable conditions and environments of a workplace that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing them with rewards, job security, and growth opportunities. The continuous effort to bring increased labor-management cooperation through joint problem solving to improve organizational performance and employee satisfaction are key aspects of QWL.

The unions can play a constructive role in QWL effort by sustaining and even enhancing its relevancy as a legitimate institution which represent the rights and interests of the workers. This encourages unions to take collaborative course and minimize adversarial and competitive tactics which brings employee satisfaction and better QWL in the work place. Unions must adopt more proactive and creative roles in the work place and discard their largely reactive strategy to employer initiatives. For this, organizations should start involvement of unions in participation process by establishing cohesive, supportive organized groups based on an educational strategy that analyses the work processes of the plant or office and comes up with a programme of reforms aimed at increasing individual autonomy, skills, social support, and empowerment(Hewlett, S., Luce, C., Shiller, P., & Southwell, S,2005).

Good employee relations provide fair and consistent treatment to all employees so that they will be committed to the organization. Companies with good employee relations are likely to have an HR strategy that places a high value on employees as stakeholders in the business. Employees who are treated as stakeholders have certain rights within the organization and can expect to be treated with dignity and respect. The management should also give employees the freedom to air grievances about management decisions. Effective employee relations require cooperation between managers and employee relations representatives (Gomez-Mejia, 2006). QWL as a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.

QWL has been well recognized as a multi-dimensional construct and it may not be universal. The key concepts captured and discussed in the existing literature include job security, better reward systems, higher pay, opportunity for growth, and participative groups, among others (Clarke, M., Koch, L., & Hill, E,2004). The QWL is a wide term covering an immense variety of programmes, techniques, theories and management styles through which organizations and jobs are designed so as grant employees more autonomy, responsibility and authority than is usually done. It is a comprehensive, department- wide program designated to improve employee satisfaction, strengthening workplace learning and helping employees. A high QWL is essential for organizations to continue, to attract and retain employees

Many factors contribute to QWL which includes adequate and fair remuneration, safe and healthy working conditions and social integration in the work organization that enables an individual to develop and use all his or her capacities; it holds that people are the most

important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making valuable contribution and they should be treated with dignity and respect (Sandrick, 2003). QWL, can be is measured by the feelings that employees have toward their jobs, colleagues, and companies, would ignite a chain effect leading to an organisation's growth and profitability in the end.

To improve the QWL of the employees, companies are now emphasising on cordial employee relations and adopting a human resource strategy that places high value on employees as organisational stakeholders. In addition, companies with strong employee relations initiatives will benefit because their workforce is highly motivated to expend their best efforts. It involves providing fair and consistent treatment to all employees so that they will be committed to the organization. Thus, good employee relations help in developing satisfied, committed and productive work force that lead towards overall effectiveness of an organisation (Johnsrud, L. 2002).

The literatures on QWL have focused on its impact on productivity, job satisfaction, industrial relations, performance based award, grievance redress, transparency, working environment, job security, employee development, individual autonomy, fair wages, safe and healthy working conditions and social support. It is all about the relationship among human, work and the work place.

3.0 Objectives of the Study

This study tries to find out the relevance of QWL with national environment and that too with a private company. The main focus of the study is whether the above factors play the key role and the contribution of each as a QWL and organizational performance index. At the same time it aims at studying the various parameters of QWL employees, how QWL leads to high job satisfaction and the factors related to organizational performance.

4.0 Model Formulation

The concept of QWL refers to the various factors at work place, which is already mentioned in the summary of the Literature Review. The study focuses on the quality work life of employees in general and not according to their designations. Based on the review of relevant literature, the researcher has formulated two models.

4.1 Model: 1

OP = f {QWL, JS, WAGPOL, COMPOL, Union}

Organization performance depends on QWL, job satisfaction, wage policy, company policy and union participation.

4.2 Model: 2

JS = f {QWL, OP, WAGPOL, COMPOL, Union}

QWL depends on organization performance, job satisfaction, wage policy, company policy and union participation.

Where:

- OP = Organizational Performance
- QWL = Quality of Work Life
- JS = Employee Job Satisfaction

- WAGPOL = Company wage policy
- COMPOL = Company policy
- UNION = Union

5.0 Sample Design

Population of the study : Manufacturing Unit (private sector), Nagpur, India
 Sample frame : middle level and low level people.
 Sample size : 150 employees

6.0 Data Collection

6.1 Primary Data

Primary data is collected through structured questionnaire. It has a total of 31 items related to 6 variables, namely organizational performance, job satisfaction, QWL, wage policy, company policy and union policy. The details are given as below.

6.2 Tool Used: Survey Process and Procedure

Structured questionnaire is designed by the researcher for collecting the data from the respondents. The questionnaire was classified into following measurements:

- 1 **Organizational performance:** The variables regarding organizational performance were measured by a 5-point Likert-scale ('1' strongly disagree to '5' strongly agree). The variables include the items of Q2, Q9, Q10, Q26, Q27, and Q28.

Items	Items Description
Q2	To me, not many workers quit or leave their jobs in this organization
Q9	Workers are getting over time benefits
Q10	Workers are getting yearly profit benefits
Q26	We received attendance allowances
Q27	We receive production allowances
Q28	Workers are getting yearly wage increment.

- 2 **Employees Job satisfaction:**

Job satisfaction was measured with five variables. These items were measured by a 5 point Likert scale ('1' Strongly disagree to '5' Strongly agree). Those items are: Q1, Q3, Q14, Q20, Q21, Q25 and Q29.

Items	Items Description
Q1	My job is safe and secure in this organization.
Q3	Workers are not afraid of losing their job.
Q14	I am satisfied with company provident fund.
Q20	My supervisor is very supportive.
Q21	I am satisfied with organizational induction/orientation/job related training.
Q25	Workers have the right to put their voice to top management.
Q29	I am satisfied with work related technology

- 3 **QWL**: QWL was measured with ten items. Those items are: Q8, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q22, Q23, Q30, and Q31. All those items were measured by using a 5-point Likert scale ('1' strongly disagree to '5' strongly agree).

Items	Items Description
Q8	I am satisfied with company health and safety policy.
Q11	Working lunch is provided at subsidized rates.
Q12	Workers are getting transport facilities by the organization.
Q13	Female workers are getting their maternal leave with salary.
Q22	Job related training programs are regularly provided by the management.
Q23	Workers have the right to put their voice to top management.
Q30	I am satisfied with work related technology
Q31	House rent is provided by the organization.

- 4 **Wage policy**: The variables regarding wage policy in DEPZ enterprises were measured by two items by using a 5-point Likert scale. The items were Q4, Q5, Q15 and Q16.

Items	Items Description
Q4	I am getting wages according to my skill, knowledge, ability and experiences.
Q5	Worker's wages in my organization is determined according to the market rates.
Q15	My performance is evaluated and rewarded.
Q16	I am satisfied with performance related pay.

- 5 **Company policy**: Company policy was measured with six variables. These variables items were measured by using a 5-point Likert scale. Those were Q6, Q7, Q19, and Q24.

Items	Items Description
Q6	My duty and responsibility is clear.
Q7	Workers are aware of company policy/organizational performance.
Q19	Work direction is clear and make sense.
Q24	Workers are issued memos/warnings for mistakes.

- 6 **Union**: Union was measured with two items. These variable items were measured by using a 5-point Likert scale. These were Q17 and Q18.

Items	Items Description
Q17	I am a member of labour union.
Q18	To me workers association is a part of management.

6.3 Reliability Test

Cronbach's alpha is computed using SPSS scale reliability programme for each set of constructs. The value of Cronbach's alpha is .8185, which shows that the tool used for collecting the data satisfies the reliability test.

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Table

Factor	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Overall 31 items	31	.8185

6.4 Statistical Analysis of Data

Collected data were analyzed by using statistical tools like regression and correlation analysis and the software used was SPSS 17.

6.5 Respondent's Profile

Survey findings showed that among the respondents, 80% were male and 20% were female. From the job categories, there were 26.7% were helper, 28.7% were operators, 18% were supervisor, 15.3 % were production officer, 7.3% were quality controller and 3.3% were store keeper. According to survey, the mode of recruitment is dominated by media advertisement recruitment (42.7%) where multiple sources of job vacancies announcement were circulated. One of the major findings in this survey is that a significant portion of the respondents (i.e., 92.7%) opined that they are the appointment letter from the employer. It has been observed during survey time that workers get the appointment letter for 2 years as probation period and then the confirmation letter is given as per their performance.

The Mean SD table shows that Wage policy has the highest mean and is 4.23 and the least mean is of company policy.

Mean SD Table of Variables

Items	Items Description	Mean	Std. Deviation
V1	Organizational Performance	4.05	.382
V2	Job Satisfaction	3.81	.35
V3	Quality of Worklife	3.84	.68
V4	Wage Policy	4.23	.44
V5	Company Policy	3.60	.42
V6	Union participation	4.09	.741

Correlation Table of Variables of QWL & OP

Correlations							
		OP	JS	QWL	WP	CP	UN
OP	Pearson Correlation	1	.482**	.501**	.720**	.442**	.281**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150

JS	Pearson Correlation	.482**	1	.426**	.506**	.212**	.212**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.009	.009
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150
QWL	Pearson Correlation	.501**	.426**	1	.380**	.210**	.286**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.010	.000
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150
WP	Pearson Correlation	.720**	.506**	.380**	1	.415**	.227**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.005
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150
CP	Pearson Correlation	.442**	.212**	.210**	.415**	1	.356**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.009	.010	.000		.000
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150
UN	Pearson Correlation	.281**	.212**	.286**	.227**	.356**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.009	.000	.005	.000	
	N	150	150	150	150	150	150
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).							

Correlation Analysis is used to test the Hypotheses. The correlation table above shows that the values obtained are significant at 0.01 level (2 tailed). Correlation exists between Job satisfaction and Organizational Performance, QWL, Wage Policy, Company Policy, Union Participation. Correlation exists between QWL and Organizational Performance, Job Satisfaction, Wage Policy, Company Policy and Union Participation. Correlation exists between Wage Policy and Organizational Performance, Job Satisfaction QWL, Company Policy, Union Participation. Correlation exists between Company Policy Organizational Performance, QWL, Job Satisfaction, Wage Policy, Union Participation. Correlation exists between Union Participation and Organizational Performance, Job satisfaction, QWL, Wage Policy, Company Policy.

Regression Results Testing the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Performance/Model 1

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.777(a)	.604	.590		.244342027	.000

Regression result has been used to test the **Model 1** to measure with the variables of job satisfaction, wage policy, company policy, union, QWL and organizational performance. The correlation of coefficient is (+.777). The R-square adjusted is 0.604. Thus, the model composing of job satisfaction, company wage policy, company policy, union, and QWL can explain about 59 % of the total variation in organizational performance and also the result is statistically significant at the level of 0.01.

Correlation Table for Independent Variable for Model 1

Coefficients(a)						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.484	.274		1.767	.079
	JS	.089	.069	.083	1.303	.195
	QWL	.195	.052	.228	3.769	.000
	WP	.454	.058	.523	7.884	.000
	CP	.135	.054	.150	2.486	.014
	UN	.020	.045	.026	.445	.657

a. Dependent Variable: OP

Based on the sample size some of variables OP (organizational performance: Q2, Q9, Q10, Q26, Q27, and Q28), QWL (Quality of work life: Q8, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q22, Q23, Q30, Q31, Q32 and Q33), JS (Job satisfaction: Q1, Q3, Q14, Q20, Q21, Q25 and Q29), WAGPOL (wage policy: Q4, Q5, Q15 and Q16), COPOL (company policy: Q6, Q7, Q19, and Q24 and UNION (Union: Q17, Q18). QWL is significant relationship with organizational performance. Wage Policy is highly significant with organizational performance and the level of significant was 0.01. It explained 52.4% of total variance. Job satisfaction has a positive and significant relationship with organizational performance at the level of .01 that explained 8.3% of total variance. Company policy has positive and significant relationship with organizational performance at the level of 0.01 that explained 15% of total variance. Union also has a positive relationship with organizational performance at the level of 0.01% that explained 2.6% of total variance.

Regression Results Testing the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Employee Job Satisfaction/Model 2-Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig.
1	.575 ^a	.331	.308	.295111965	.000

Regression result has been used to test the relationship between the variables of organizational performance, wage policy, company policy, union, QWL and employee job satisfaction. The correlation of coefficient is (+.575). The R-square adjusted is .331. Thus, the variation in employee job satisfaction can be explained about 33.1% by the model consisting of organizational performance, company wage policy, company policy, union, and QWL and also the result is statistically significant at the level of 0.01.

Correlation Table for Independent Variable for Model 1

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.485	.311		4.777	.000
	OP	.130	.100	.140	1.303	.195
	QWL	.181	.064	.227	2.826	.005
	WP	.265	.080	.329	3.312	.001
	CP	-.044	.067	-.053	-.666	.507
	UN	.038	.054	.052	.694	.489

a. Dependent Variable: JS

The coefficient Table above reports that Wage Policy is highly positive significant relationship with employee job satisfaction and it has explained 32.9% of total variance. Similarly, QWL has a positive and significant relationship with employee job satisfaction at the level of 0.01, thus explained 22.7% of total variance. Wage policy also have a positive significant relationship with employees job satisfaction thus can explain 32.9% of total variance. Company policy has a negative relationship with employees' job satisfaction at the level of .01. Union has a positive relationship but not significant with employee job satisfaction. All the five variables in Model 2 is account for 69.5% of total variance.

7.0 Discussion

The study revealed that the Model: 1, that is Organization performance depends on QWL, job satisfaction, wage policy, company policy and union participation, stands true.

7.1 Model: 1

$$OP = f \{QWL, JS, WAGPOL, COMPOL, Union\}$$

Regression result has been used to test the **Model 1** to measure with the relation of organizational performance with the other variables like, QWL, job satisfaction, wage policy, company policy and union participation. The correlation of coefficient is (+.777). The R-square adjusted is .604. Thus, the model composing of job satisfaction, company wage policy, company policy, union, and QWL can explain about 59 % of the total variation in organizational performance and also the result is statistically significant at the level of 0.01. QWL is significant relationship with organizational performance. Wage Policy is highly significant with organizational performance and the level of significant was 0.01. It explained 52.4% of total variance. Job satisfaction has a positive and significant relationship with organizational performance at the level of .01 that explained 8.3% of total variance. Company policy has positive and significant relationship with organizational performance at the level of 0.01 that explained 15% of total variance. Union also has a positive relationship with organizational performance at the level of 0.01% that explained 2.6% of total variance.

7.2 Model: 2

JS = f {QWL, OP, WAGPOL, COMPOL, Union}

Regression result has been used to test the relationship between job satisfaction and QWL, organizational performance, wage policy, company policy and union participation. The correlation of coefficient is (+.575). The R-square adjusted is .331. Thus, the variation in employee job satisfaction can be explained about 33.1% by the model consisting of organizational performance, company wage policy, company policy, union, and QWL and also the result is statistically significant at the level of .01. The coefficient Table 4.7 reports that Wage Policy is highly positive significant relationship with employee job satisfaction and it has explained 32.9% of total variance. Similarly, QWL has a positive and significant relationship with employee job satisfaction at the level of .01, thus explained 22.7% of total variance. Wage policy also have a positive significant relationship with employees job satisfaction thus can explain 32.9% of total variance. Company policy has a negative relationship with employees' job satisfaction at the level of .01. Union has a positive relationship but not significant with employee job satisfaction. All the five variables in Model 2 is account for 69.5% of total variance.

8.0 Conclusion

The findings of the study conducted revealed that QWL has significant relationship with organizational performance. The QWL variables included company health and safety policy, worker free lunch, workers transport facility, maternal leave with salary for female workers, providing job related training, availability of leave, family life, living accommodation by employer, living in own hire house, and healthy & hygienic living accommodation. Thus the hypothesis on the positive relationship between QWL and organizational performance is accepted. But this finding seems to suggest that for non-managerial and operational workers, QWL may not be as important as other factors as they still have to first satisfy their basic needs which can be achieved by having good wages and financial benefits, etc.

This study also revealed that QWL has a positive and significant relationship with employees' job satisfaction. Employees satisfactions items were included job safety & security, worker not afraid of losing job, worker satisfied with provident benefit, supportive supervisor, organizational induction, workers voice to top management, and satisfies with work related technology. It has been noticed that most of the variables have positive correlation with employees' satisfaction. As employees' job satisfaction is positively related to organizational performance, it is important that managers should try to develop a strong connection between QWL and employee job satisfaction and eventually organizational performance.

It was also found that QWL is positively and significantly related to employee job satisfaction. As employee job satisfaction is found significantly and positively related to organizational performance, it is thus implied that the managers should try to develop a stronger connection between the QWL and employee satisfaction and organizational performance. The present study suggests that QWL and organization performance practice at company is good and encouraging.

9.0 Suggestions

The researcher would like to give the following recommendations.

- Workers voice need to be addressed and participation in policy level decision making should be enhanced. Dialogue culture among the employer and employees needs to be introduced. It is an effective tool for organizational culture change and for performance improvement and also reduces the dissatisfaction and unrest of firm production.
- Legal aspect and social compliance has to be reviewed and monitored regularly and correction measure to be taken in time to time.
- Appointment letter has to be issued for all level employees and career prospect to be ensured.
- Paternal leave to be introduced along with maternity leave benefits for women.
- Transport and housing facilities to be enhanced for all.
- To ensure Employees satisfaction and QWL in, Employers need to embrace a certain level of employment security, job safety, free from job anxiety, reasonable wage, family day/leisure life, social life enjoyment opportunity, and participation in decision making.
- Team work activities to be developed for more productivity/performance/Training to be introduced in all level for performance and job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

Allen, T. D. (2001), Family-Supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **58(3)**, 414-35.

Blair-Loy, M., and Wharton, A. S. (2002), Employees' Use of Work–family Policies and the Workplace Social Context, *Social Forces*, **80(3)**, 813-45.

Boles, J., Howard, W., & Donofrio, H. (2001), An Investigation into the Interrelationships of Work–family Conflict, Family–work Conflict and Work Satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, **13(3)**, 376-91.

Callister R. R, 2006 The Impact of Gender and Department Climate on Job Satisfaction *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 2006, **31(3)**, pages 367-375.

Camman, C., (2009), “Productivity of Management through QWL Programs”, In Frombun, Editor, *Strategic Human Resource Management*, New York: Wiley.

Capelli, P. (2000), A Market-driven Approach to Retaining Talent, *Harvard Business Review*, **78(1)**, 103-11.

Che Rose, R; Beh L.S, Uli, J, Idris K. 2006, An Analysis of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Career- Related Variables, *American Journal of Applied Sciences* **3(12)**:2151-2159.

Clarke, M., Koch, L., & Hill, E. (2004), The Work–family Interface: Differentiating Balance and Fit. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, **33(2)**, 121-40.

De Cieri, H., Holmes, B., Abbott, J., & Pettit, T. (2005), Achievements and Challenges for Work/Life Balance Strategies in Australian Organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **16(1)**, 90-103.

Dixon, M. and Sagas, M. 2007. The Relationship between Organizational Support, Work Family Conflict, and the Job-life Satisfaction of University Coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, **78**, 236-247.

Edwards, J.R., Rothbard, N.P. 2000, "Mechanism Linking Work and Family: Clarifying the Relationship between Work and Family Constructs", *Academy of Management Journal*, **25** pp.178-99.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., Black, W.C., (2000), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Prentice-Hall Inc., 5th Edition, pp1177-118.

Hewlett, S., Luce, C., Shiller, P., & Southwell, S. (2005), *The Hidden Brain Drain: Off-ramps and On-ramps in Women's Careers*, Harvard Business Review Research Report, Centre for Work-life Policy, New York.

Ho, C., & Alcorso, C. (2004), Migrants and Employment. Challenging the Success Story, *Journal of Sociology*, **40(3)**, 237-59.

http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETTRADE/Resources/InternalTraining/Zakir_Hossain_Paper.pdf.

<http://ezinearticles.com/?Job-Performance-and-Satisfaction&id=290072>

Johnsrud, L. 2002. Measuring the Quality of Faculty and Administrative Work Life: Implications for College and University Campuses, *Research in Higher Education*, **43(2)**, pp. 379 – 95.

Krueger P, Brazil K, Lohfeld L, Edward HG, Lewis D, Tjam E. 2002 Organization Specific Predictors of Job Satisfaction: Findings from a Canadian Multi-site Quality of Work Life Cross-sectional Survey. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2002; 2:6.

Rhoades, L and Eisenberger, R. 2002. Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **87(4)**, August 2002, Pages 698-714.

Wanous, J .P. Reichers, A. E and Austin, J. T., 2000, "Cynicism about Organizational Change: Measurements, Antecedents and Correlates," *Group & Organization Management* **5**, 132-153.