

A Study on Employees Perception of Information Technology Companies Towards Quality of Work -life, Performance and Satisfaction- A Parameters 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 companies strive 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 Quality of Work-Life factors such as stress, Leadership, Work life Balance, Opportunity to develop and growth, adequate an fair compensation, Social integration and communication at work place of the employees in the Information Technology companies. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the Quality of Work-Life with performance and satisfaction. Based on the interview with the 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 stick 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.*

***Keyword:** 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 programmes and techniques. The term Quality of Work-Life (QWL) has different meanings for different people. It is specifically related to the level

* Research Scholar, Sathyabama University, E-mail: indhmathiprakashp38@gmail.com

** Associate Professor, Sathyabama University, Chennai-600 119, E-mail: drrts2007@gmail.com

of happiness a person derives from his/her career. Each person has different wants and needs it develops different sensibilities when they take to their careers; the quality of their work- life is determined by the organizational involvement in gratifying their requirement 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 from the jobs that they do. For those who have a low quality of work- life are generally unable, unwilling and unhappy with their work. Hence successful organizations support and provide facilities to their people to help them to 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 he is 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 quality of work- life to meet unsteady circumstances, brought on in the workplace by changes in the organization, creating work-life balance will all eventually create more contented employees that contribute to high performance, high efficiency to work in the work place and success for both individual and organization to achieve goal.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

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 the employees concerned with regard to the performance and satisfaction. According to Shamir, B. and I. Salomon, 1985, in their study, QWL is 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 economic health of the organization to achieve goals. Hence in this study the researcher aim, to examine the factors affecting Quality of work life of the employees, to study the level of performance and satisfaction of the employees and to examine the relationship between the affecting factors of Quality of work life, self evaluation of performance and satisfaction of the employees. The present study facilitates to 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 stratified their respective endeavors.

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), in this study their end result are "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 in the Considine, Gillian and Callus, Ron (2001) in their study the factors which affects overall quality of working life, were 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 the family life, quantity of work to be done and job security. Barroso and Sandelowski (2001) in their study the researcher experimented 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) in their study the quantity of time and energy people spent at the workplace has increased to a great level. Therefore, it is very vital for employees to be satisfied about their life. As work occupies an necessary place in many people's lives, now-days the conditions at the work place are likely to affect not only their physical but also their psychological and spiritual well-being. Dolan *et al.*, 2008, in their study the Quality of work life is a major issue for employees, and how organizations compact with this issue is both of intellectual and practical significance. 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 the flanking to strengthened working conditions in the organization, there are plenty of proof to highlight the suggestion of sovereignty and participation at work to promote the meaning to work. Lack of opportunity to perform meaningful work is at the origin of disappointment among engineers and 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 suggested job enrichment programme to correct the problems of worker's skill and expertise. Tabassum *et al.* (2011) in their study the researcher observed the Quality of Work Life a set of principles, philosophy, in which people are the very

most significant resource in the organization as they are responsible, trustworthy, and capable of making valuable contribution and they should be treated with self-respect and esteem.

METHODOLOGY

The Information Technology sector in India has been divided in to four sectors, such as Information Technology services, Information Technology Enabled Services (ITES)/Business process outsourcing (BPO), Software and product Engineering and Hardware. Among the above sectors, Information Technology Services have been selected for the study. Here by based on the employers rank list for the year 2012-2013 announced by National Association of Software and Services Companies (NASSCOM), five corporate companies namely Tata Consultancy Services Ltd., Infosys Technology Ltd., Wipro Technologies Ltd., HCL Technologies Ltd., and Technology Mahindra Ltd., are selected for the study. Employees working in each corporate are selected in convenient sampling method. The present study the researcher collected data from the employees of the above said IT companies in Chennai city, Tamil Nadu, India with structured 375 questionnaires were distributed and 300 samples were eventually collected with convenient sampling methods. In this study the researcher applied the statistical tools like 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 which was considered to be reliable for the variables. Both Primary and secondary data were used for the present study.

Table 1
Cronbach Alpha Reliability Test for testing Validity for the Variables in the Questionnaire

<i>Nature</i>	<i>Sno</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha Value</i>
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

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 2.1
Satisfactional Level

<i>Sno Particulars</i>	<i>HS%</i>	<i>S%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>DS%</i>	<i>HDS%</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Satisfied with the management counseling and the 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 the 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
5. Satisfied with the canteen facilities	22 (7.3)	52 (17.5)	62 (20.6)	66 (22)	98 (32.6)	2.98	1.25
6. Satisfied with the transport facilities	0 ()	34 (11.4)	20 (6.6)	102 (34)	144 (48)	2.80	1.08
7. Satisfied with the Health care programme.	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.	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 2.1, 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 indicating that the respondents have scored "Satisfied" with respect of the management counseling and management discipline. The statement "Satisfied with the overall recruitment, selection and the induction programme given by your organization" has mean value ranging to 3.43 indicating that the respondents have scored "Neutral" for this statement and the statement "Satisfied with the transport facilities" having the lowest mean value 2.80 indicating that the respondents are "Highly Dissatisfied". It is also clear that the standard deviation is very high in canteen facilities 1.25 and very low in the Health care programme conducted by your organization .581.

Based on the above Table 2.2, 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 indicating that the performance of the respondents have scored "High" with respect of the Quality output and atmosphere. The statement "There is the management's participative contribution in managing critical situation" has mean value ranging to 3.63 indicating that the performances of the respondents have scored "Neutral" for this statement and the statement "The management takes initiatives in job-related matters" having the lowest mean value 2.98 indicating that the performance of the respondents are very Low. It is also clear from the table that the standard deviation

Table 2.2
Performance Level

<i>Sno Particulars</i>	<i>HS%</i>	<i>S%</i>	<i>N%</i>	<i>DS%</i>	<i>HDS%</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
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
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 Dissatisfied]

very high 1.238 in the management takes initiatives in job-related matters and very low .924 in the The management takes cognizance of competent.

3. ANOVA STATISTICS

Table 3
Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life

<i>Sno</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Opinion</i>				<i>Mean value</i>	<i>F value</i>	<i>Sig P value</i>
		<i>Always %</i>	<i>Often %</i>	<i>Sometimes %</i>	<i>Rarely %</i>			
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

Based on the above Table 3, the factors affecting quality of work-life of the employees in IT companies are shown. It is clear from the ANOVA Table 5.2, 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 are having significant difference between the Quality of work life factors. It is also evident that the Mean value ranging above 3.4 indicating that the respondents are “satisfied” in the leadership variables. Other three variables (Stress, work life balance and opportunity to develop and growth) have mean value ranging lower 3.015 indicating the respondents are not satisfied for these variables. 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 the IT companies.

4. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table 4.1
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 significant relationship between the Quality of work-life and the performance level of the employees in the IT companies.

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

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

<i>Model Constant</i>	<i>Un-standardized Co-efficient</i>		<i>t value</i>	<i>Sig p value</i>
	<i>B</i>	<i>Std.Error</i>		
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 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 value denotes 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 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 the other factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration.

Table 4.2
Quality of Work-life and Satisfactional Level

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

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): There is significant difference between the Quality of work-life and the satisfaction level of the employees in the IT companies.

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

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

Dependent Variable: satisfaction level

<i>Model Constant</i>	<i>Co-efficient</i>			
	<i>Un-standardized Co-efficient</i>	<i>Std.Error</i>	<i>t value</i>	<i>sig p value</i>
	<i>B</i>			
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 Satisfaction 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 denotes 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 the factors like leadership, opportunity to develop and growth, communication, adequate and fair compensation and Social Integration.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the table 5.1.1 the statement "Satisfied with the transport facilities" having the lowest mean value 2.80 indicating that the respondents are "Highly Dissatisfied". The table 5.1.2 explained that the statement "The management takes initiatives in job-related matters" having the lowest mean value 2.98 indicating that the performance of the respondents are 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 the IT companies. From the above table 5.3.1 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. 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

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, for this the management should take necessary steps to have the balance in their work place. The management should avoid applying the organizational justice in all dimensions to achieve more organizational citizenship behavior. Management 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.

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. QWL supports the materialistic work ethic that place 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 individual 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, QWL 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 heightened through harmonious organizational climate that serves as a psychological dynamism.

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., & Tzafirir, 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.

