A PARAMETRICAL STUDY ON THE PERCEPTION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EMPLOYEES TOWARDS QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE, PERFORMANCE AND SATISFACTION AT WORK PLACE

G. S. Indumathi and R. Thamil Selvan***

Abstract: *Quality of work-life always supports and promotes employee's performance and it is related to job satisfaction, which in turn is a strong predictor of absenteeism and labour turnover and also it enables them to enhance their productivity for better Organizational and individual goal to attain. In the contemporary world, every IT company strives to pay more attention to the quality of work-life that provides its employees with better processes of humanization along with material upliftment through technical means and thereby makes their lives wholesome. In this study, the researcher focuses on the affecting QWL factors such as Stress, Leadership, Work-life-Balance, Opportunity to develop and growth, Adequate and fair compensation, Social integration and Communication at work place of the employees in Information Technology companies. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the QWL with performance and satisfaction. Based on the interview with employees in the organization, the convenient sample of 300 respondents was taken. In this study the researcher applied the statistical tools like Descriptive Analysis, ANOVA and Regression. The result of this study clearly proves the employee's resolve to sick on in their job in the same firm has its well founded affirmation on the quality of work life ideated and extended to its employees.*

Key Words: *Quality of Work-Life (QWL), Information Technology (IT), Job Satisfaction (JS), Performance.*

INTRODUCTION

The quality of work-life (QWL) is a wide term covering an immense variety of theories, management program and techniques. The term Quality of Work-Life (QWL) has different meanings for different people. It is specifically related to the level of happiness a person derives from his/her career. Each person has different wants and needs which develop different sensibilities when they take to their careers; the quality of their work- life is determined by the organizational involvement in gratifying their requirements of sorts. The requirements for high "quality of work-life" vary from person to person. Regardless of their standards, those with a high quality of work-life generally make enough to live comfortably, find their work interesting, and achieve a level of personal satisfaction or fulfillment

* Research Scholar, Sathyabama University, *E-mail: indhumathiprakashppt38@gmail.com*

** Associate Professor, Sathyabama University, Chennai-600119, *E-mail: drrts2007@gmail.com*

from the jobs that they do. Those who have a low quality of work- life are generally inert, unwilling and unhappy with their work. Hence successful organizations support and provide facilities to their people to help them balance the scales. In this process, organizations are coming up with new and innovative ideas to improve the quality of work and quality of work- life of every individual in the organizations. The work must not cause the employee any physical discomfort or mental anguish. The employees must feel as though they are doing something enjoyable or at least not unpleasant. Thus QWL approach motivates people by satisfying not only their economic needs but also their social and psychological ones. The optimum design of improving the quality of work- life to meet unsteady circumstances brought on in the workplace by changes in the organization and creating work-life balance will all eventually create more contented employees that contribute to high performance, high efficiency in work in the work place and success for both an individual and organization in achieving goals.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

QWL (Quality of Work Life) is viewed as a wide-ranging concept. The premise of argument in this study rests on the nature of factors affecting the quality of work-life and the perception of employees concerned with regard to performance and satisfaction. Shamir, B. and I. Salomon, 1985, in their study regard QWL as a wide-ranging concept that includes an individual's job-related well-being and the extent to which work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences. Quality of Work-Life development programs are the way in which organizations recognize their responsibility to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for employees to work as well as for the economic health of the organization to achieve goals. Hence in this study the researcher aims to examine the factors affecting Quality of work life of the employees, study the level of performance and satisfaction of the employees, examine the relationship between the affecting factors of Quality of work life, self evaluation of performance and satisfaction of the employees. This study facilitates in evolving suggestion for improving QWL by recommending ways to reduce absenteeism, and labour turn-over from the work place. The organizations are definitely persuaded to adopt strategies to improve the QWL so that both the employees and the employed are satisfied in respective endeavors.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Quality of work-life promotes and maintains employee performance, satisfaction and organizational effectiveness to achieve goals. Brown (1983) in his study showed that employees' initial suspicions of organizational management and researcher exploitation were re-affirmed by the lack of instant solutions to survey results. Fascinatingly, they found from the study that it disguised that all

groups, regardless of how well they scored on the survey, wanted action and saw action as determining the success of the survey. Hartley and Barling (1998), concluded that "if employees do not see direct benefits from their taking part in Survey then organization-wide optimism and distrust may rise, jeopardizing the use and benefit of future surveys". But Considine, Gillian and Callus, Ron (2001) in their study identified the factors which affect overall quality of working life: gender favoritism at the workplace, level of stress experienced at work , fascinating and enjoyable work, just and reasonable pay, anxiety of losing one's job in the next 12 months, trust in superior management, , recognition of efforts by immediate boss, future career prediction, quantity of control over work, health values at work, stability between the work and family life, quantity of work to be done and job security. Barroso and Sandelowski (2001) in their study observed that qualitative data gathered during the use and assessment of a quantitative instrument "can enlighten and partly close the gaps between meaning and measurement of Quality of Work life". Rose *et al.* (2006) in their study reviewed that the elements are significant to an individual's quality of work life which contain the task, administrative system , the physical work environment, the social environment within the organization, and a association between life on and off the job. Chan and Wyatt, (2007) the quantity of time and energy people spend at the workplace has increased to a great level. Therefore, it is very vital for employees to be satisfied about their life. The psychological and spiritual well-being of employees hinges on the work-place atmosphere because workers are sensitive to that aspect. Dolan *et al.*, 2008, in their study on the Quality of work concluded that this is a major issue for employees, and how this issue is both of intellectual and practical significance in organisations. So, it is not any inference that thousands of studies have revolved around the concept of job satisfaction and stress as core concepts. Subrahmanian and Anjani, 2010, in their study on the strengthened working conditions in organizations, harped on the aspect of promoting meaning to work. Lack of opportunity to perform meaningful work is at the origin of disappointment among engineers. Those who have more autonomy at workplace feel more satisfied with their work life. Underutilization of worker's skill and expertise cause low quality of work life and suggestes job enrichment programme to correct the problems of worker's skill and expertise. Tabassum *et al.* (2011) in their study observed the Quality of Work Life as indispensable in an organization. Hence, the employees who contribute to the stabilization of the organisation should be treated with self-respect and esteem.

4. METHODOLOGY

In this present study, research was conducted in the Information Technology companies with 375 questionnaires; and 300 samples were eventually collected with convenient sampling methods. The study was conducted in Tamil Nadu. Based on the survey of NASSCOM report for the Financial Year of 2012-2013, the Top 5 IT companies were selected for the study, they are the Tata Consultancy

Services, Infosys Technology Ltd, Wipro Technologies (Wipro Ltd.), HCL Technologies Ltd and Technology Mahindra Ltd. The employees volunteered to participate to answer the questions during their rest time in their regional language. In this study, the researcher applied the statistical tools such as Descriptive Analysis, ANOVA and Regression. The tentative results of the questionnaire were tested using Cronbach alpha and the reliability coefficient were obtained and more than 0.8 of this was considered reliable for the variables. Both Primary and secondary data were used for the present study.

Table 4.1
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Test for Testing Validity for the Variables in the Questionnaire

Nature	Sno	Variables	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Independent	1	Quality of work life (QWL) influencing factors	
	1A	Stress	0.811
	1B	Leadership	0.861
	1C	Work-life balance	0.798
	1D	Opportunity to develop and growt	0.801
	1E	Adequate and fair compensation	0.825
	1F	Social Integration at the work place	0.847
	1G	Communication at the work place	0.898
Dependent	2	Performance	0.799
	3	Job satisfaction	0.800

5. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 5.1.1
Satisfactional Level

Sno	Particulars	HS %	S %	N %	DS %	HDS %	Mean	SD
1.	Satisfied with the management counseling and identification of the needs.	99 (33.3)	58 (19.3)	50 (16.6)	54 (18.6)	39 (12.9)	3.730	.718
2.	Satisfied with corporate culture	50 (16.6)	116 (38.6)	88 (29.3)	38 (12.6)	8 (2.9)	3.60	1.095
3.	Satisfied with the management discipline for better productivity	108 (36)	136 (45.3)	36 (12)	0 ()	20 (6.7)	3.73	.869
4.	Satisfied with the ergonomics work place (Comfortable chairs and work station to minimized physical problems)	146 (48.6)	100 (33.3)	30 (10)	10 (3.3)	14 (4.8)	3.89	.792

contd. table 5.1.1

Sno	Particulars	HS %	S %	N %	DS %	HDS %	Mean	SD
5.	Satisfied with canteen facilities	22 (7.3)	52 (17.5)	62 (20.6)	66 (22)	98 (32.6)	2.98	1.25
6.	Satisfied with transport facilities	0 ()	34 (11.4)	20 (6.6)	102 (34)	144 (48)	2.80	1.08
7.	Satisfied with the Health care programme conducted by organization	74 (24.6)	142 (47.5)	64 (21.3)	18 (6)	2 (0.6)	3.64	.581
8.	Satisfied with the overall recruitment, selection and the induction programme of organization	58 (19.3)	154 (51.3)	34 (11.4)	42 (14)	12 (4)	3.43	1.07

Sources: Primary Data
[HS-Highly satisfied, S- Satisfied, N- Neutral, DS- Dissatisfied, HDS- Highly Dissatisfied]

Based on the above Table 5.1.1, the level of Satisfaction of the employees in IT companies is shown. The statement "Satisfied with the ergonomics work place (Comfortable chairs and work station to minimized physical problems)" having the highest mean value 3.89 indicating that the respondents are "Highly Satisfied" . It is clear from the table that the mean values ranging above 3.73 indicate that the respondents have scored "Satisfied" with respect to management- counseling and management-discipline. The statement "Satisfied with the overall recruitment, selection and the induction programme given by the organization" has mean value ranging of 3.43 and this indicates that the respondents have scored "Neutral" for this statement and the statement "Satisfied with the transport facilities" with the lowest mean value 2.80 indicates that the respondents are "Highly Dissatisfied". It is also clear that the standard deviation is very high 1.25 in canteen facilities and very low .581in the Health care programme conducted by the organization.

Table 5.1.2
Performance Level

Sno	Particulars	HS %	S %	N %	DS %	HDS %	Mean	SD
1.	There is concern for the quality of output (as expected by the norms of the organization)	146 (48.6)	100 (33.5)	30 (10)	10 (3.3)	14 (4.6)	3.86	1.108
2.	Fillip given to capacity, skill, knowledge relating to job	154 (51.3)	58 (19.4)	42 (14)	34 (11.3)	12 (4)	3.66	1.059
3.	Conducive atmosphere prevails for efforts to meet the targets	144 (48)	102 (34)	34 (11.4)	20 (6.6)	0 ()	3.63	1.080
4.	Motivation prevails upon individuals in the group.	116 (38.6)	88 (29.6)	50 (16.6)	38 (12.6)	8 (2.6)	3.23	1.100

contd. table 5.1.2

Sno	Particulars	HS %	S %	N %	DS %	HDS %	Mean	SD
5.	The management takes initiatives in job-related matters.	22 (7.3)	52 (17.5)	62 (20.6)	66 (22)	98 (32.6)	2.98	1.238
6.	There is the management's participative contribution in managing critical situation.	142 (47.5)	74 (24.6)	64 (21.3)	18 (6)	2 (0.6)	3.63	1.149
7.	Efforts to be taken towards optimum utilization of available resources.	136 (45.4)	108 (36)	20 (6.6)	36 (12)	0 ()	3.21	1.108
8.	The management takes cognizance of competent.	28 (9.3)	54 (18.6)	58 (19.3)	58 (19.3)	102 (33.5)	3.70	.924

Sources: Primary Data

[HS-Highly satisfied, S- Satisfied, N- Neutral, DS- Dissatisfied, HDS- Highly Disatisfied]

Based on the above Table 5.1.2, the level of performance of the employees in IT companies is shown. It is clear from the table that the mean values ranging above 3.86 indicates that the performance of the respondents have scored "High" with respect to the Quality output and atmosphere. The statement "There is the management's participative contribution in managing a critical situation "has mean value ranging of 3.63 and this indicates that the performances of the respondents have scored "Neutral" for this statement and the statement "The management takes initiatives in job-related matters" has the lowest mean value 2.98 and this indicates that the performance of the respondents is very Low. It is also clear from the table that the standard deviation is very high 1.238 in the management initiatives in job-related matters and very low .924 in the management takes cognizance of competent.

5.2. Anova Statistics

Based on the above Table 5.2, the factors affecting the quality of work-life of the employees in IT companies are shown. It is clear from the ANOVA Table 5.2 the except stress, work-life balance and opportunity to develop and growth, all other factors of Quality of work life such as Leadership, communication, Adequate and fair compensation and Social integration have significant difference between the Quality of work-life factors. It is also evident that the Mean value ranging above 3.4 indicates that the respondents are "satisfied" in leadership variables. Other three variables (Stress, work life balance and opportunity to develop and growth) have mean value at 3.015, which indicates that respondents are not satisfied. Hence it is concluded that QWL factors such as stress, work-life balance and opportunity to develop and growth place are the most affecting factors of QWL of the employees in IT companies.

Table: 5.2
Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life

| Sno | Particulars | Opinion | | | | Mean value | F value | Sig P value |
		Always %	Often %	Sometimes %	Rarely %			
1.	Stress at work	116 (38.7)	151 (50.3)	21 (7.0)	12 (4)	3.015	2.226	.084
2.	Leadership	99 (33)	33 (11)	166 (55.3)	2 (0.7)	3.413	2.791	.040*
3.	Work life balance	146 (48.7)	77 (25.7)	61 (20.3)	16 (5.3)	3.215	2.244	.082
4.	Opportunity to develop and growth	12 (4)	24 (8)	108 (36)	156 (52)	3.770	1.272	.280
5.	Communication	28 (9.3)	22 (7.3)	119 (39.7)	131 (43.7)	3.645	2.866	.036*
6.	Adequate and fair compensation	12 (4)	121 (40.3)	128 (42.7)	39 (13)	3.781	4.622	.003**
7.	Social Integration	16 (5.3)	61 (20.3)	77 (25.7)	146 (48.7)	3.188	2.677	.031*

Sources: Primary Data, *Significant at 5 % level and **Significant at 1 % level

5.3. Regression Analysis

Table 5.3.1
Quality of Work-life and Performance Level

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant relationship between the Quality of work-life and the performance level of the employees in the IT companies.
Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is a significant relationship between the Quality of work-life and the performance level of employees in the IT companies.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error	Change statistics sig factors p value
1	.788	.621	.697	.318	.000

Sources: Primary Data , sig at 5 % level and **Significant at 1 % level
Dependent Variable: Performance level

| Model Constant | Unstandardized Co-efficients | | t value | Sig p value |
	B	Std.Error		
STRS	-.133	.083	1.318	.188
LDSHP	.030	.043	3.732	.000**
WLB	-.235	.085	.437	.662
OPTD&G	.480	.069	3.133	.002**
COMM	.111	.055	2.700	.007**
ADQ&FCMP	.155	.069	4.505	.000**
SI	.430	.071	5.169	.000**

Sources: Primary Data , *significant at 5 % level and **Significant at 1 % level
Predictors: STRS- Stress,LDSHP- Leadership, WLB- Work life balance, OPTD&G- opportunity to develop and growth, COMM- communication, ADQ&FCMP- adequate and fair compensation, SI- Social Integration; *Independent Variables:* Quality of work-Life

Table 5.3.1 represents the Regression Analysis between the Quality of work-life and performance level of the employees in IT companies. The estimated regression co-efficient represents both the type of relationship and strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The co-efficient value denoted in the independent variables are Leadership (3.732), opportunity to develop and growth (3.133), communication (.111), adequate and fair compensation (2.700) and Social Integration (5.169),. The standardized error estimated for this co-efficient is considerably less.

The significant value for stress and work life balance is accepted and there is no significant relationship between the QWL and performance. There is significant difference between quality of work-life and performance level in the other factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration.

Table 5.3.2
Quality of Work-life and Satisfactional Level

Null Hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference between the Quality of work-life and the satisfactional level of the employees in the IT companies.
Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is significant difference between the Quality of work-life and the satisfactional level of the employees in the IT companies.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error	Change statistics sig p value
1	.758	.601	.567	.501	.000**

Sources: Primary Data , sig at 5 % level and **Significant at 1 % level
Dependent Variable: satisfaction level

	Co-efficient			
Model Constant	*Unstandardized Co-efficients*		t value	sig p value
	B	Std.Error		
STRS	-.103	.052	1.874	.061
LDSHP	.010	.051	3.544	.000**
WLB	-.255	.046	-1.382	.168
OPTD&G	.294	.560	2.252	.025
COMM	.021	.034	4.505	.000**
ADQ&FCMP	.126	.067	3.133	.002**
SI	.123	.580	3.863	.000**

Sources: Primary Data , sig at 5 % level and **Significant at 1 % level

Predictors: STRS- Stress, LDSHP- Leadership, WLB- Work life balance, OPTD&G- opportunity to develop and growth, COMM- communication, ADQ&FCMP- adequate and fair compensation, SI- Social Integration

Independent Variables: Quality of work-Life

Table 5.3.2 represents the Regression Analysis between the Quality of work-life and Satisfactional level of the employees in the IT companies. The estimated regression co-efficient represents both the type of relationship and strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The co-efficient t value denoted in the independent variables are Leadership (3.544), opportunity to develop and growth (2.252), communication (4.505), adequate and fair compensation (3.133) and Social Integration (3.863). The standardized error estimated for this co-efficient is considerably less.

The significant value for stress and work life balance are accepted, there is no significant relationship between the QWL and performance. There is significant difference between quality of work-life and performance level in factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration.

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the table 5.1.1 the statement "Satisfied with the transport facilities" having the lowest mean value 2.80 indicates that the respondents are "Highly Dissatisfied". The table 5.1.2 explains that the statement "The management takes initiatives in job-related matters" having the lowest mean value 2.98 indicates that the performance of the respondents is very Low. In the table 5.2 it is concluded that QWL factors such as stress, work-life balance and opportunity to develop and growth place are the most affecting factors of QWL of the employees in IT companies. From the above table 5.3.1 it is clear the significant difference between quality of work-life and performance level in factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration. In the table 5.3.2 There is significant difference between quality of work-life and performance level in the factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration.

7. SUGGESTIONS

Considering the results, some suggestions can be proposed. The employees in the IT companies are doing more than their usual job duties and provide performance that is beyond expectations. The management should take necessary steps to have the balance in their work place. The management should avoid applying organizational justice in all dimensions to achieve more organizational citizenship behavior. They should make accurately performance feedback system to every employee for enhancing their satisfaction. As employees' problems should be considered as organization's problem, creating suitable facilities for improving employees' learning can be a next recommendation. Motivating people by creating suitable situation and atmosphere for working, thanking them and associating

them in decision making process will improve the performance. This further suggests that a successful family life carries over into one's career and makes one more satisfied with personal achievements.

8. CONCLUSION

The degree of performance and satisfaction is related to the degree of QWL in which the individual believes his or her success criteria have been met, especially if the individual places great importance on these criteria which include stress, leadership, work and non-work-life balance, opportunity to develop, adequate and fair compensation, social integration. This supports the materialistic work ethic that places strong emphasis on IT corporate power, income and personal growth as parts of their careers. It can also be concluded from the data, that the individual's family life correlated with his/her level of QWL. The fact that is worthy of conclusion is the importance of career opportunity to develop individuals to achieve the organizational goals. In the current context, the emphasis is on Stress, leadership and opportunity in career mobility as potential success indicators. Further, this is related to having a pleasant successful home environment from spousal and family support that is highly valued where career balance is expected to provide some impact as found in this study. By taking into account the managers' and executives' met expectations of their career development, QWL can be improved through harmonious organizational climate that can be psychologically dynamic.

References

Barroso, J. & Sandelowski, M. (2001), In the Field with the Beck Depression Inventory. *Qualitative Health Research* 11: 491–504.

Brown, L. D. (1983), Organizing Participatory Research: Interfaces for Joint Inquiry and Organizational Change. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* 4: 9–19.

Chan, Ka Wai and Wyatt, Thomas A., (2007), Quality of Work Life: A Study of Employees in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13(4), 501-517.

Considine, G., and Acirrt, R. C. (2001), "The Quality of Work Life of Australian Employees-the Development of an Index" Working Paper-73, University of Sydney.

Dolan, S.L., Garcia, S., Cabezas, S., & Tzafrir, S.S., (2008), Predictors of Quality of Work and Poor Health among Primary Health-care Personnel in Catalonia. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 21(2), 203- 218.

Hartley, J. & Barling, J. (1998), Employee Attitude Surveys. In: K. Whitfield and G. Strauss (eds.), *Researching the World of Work: Strategies and Methods in Studying Industrial Relations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rose, R., Beh, L., Uli, J., & Idris, K., (2006), An Analysis of Quality of Work Life and Career Related Variables. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 3(2), 2151-2159.

Shamir, B. and I. Salomon, (1985), Work-at-home and the Quality of Working Life. *Acad. Manag.*, 10: 455-64.

Subrahmanian, Mu, Anjani, N., (2010), Constructs of Quality of Work Life– A Perspective of Textile and Engineering Employees, *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 299-307.

Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., and Jahan, K., (2011), A Comparative Analysis of Quality of Work Life among the Employees of INCs and MNCs Banks in Bangladesh. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 17–33.