

A Study on Quality of Work Life of the It Employees

Dr. Smitha Sambrani¹, Gopisetty Hemalatha²

¹Assistant Professor, Dept. of Business Management, OU

²Research Scholar, Dept. of Business Management, OU

ABSTRACT

The present study aims at understanding the perception of employees towards QWL and the association between demographic variables and latent variables of QWL. The data is collected from the top five IT companies located in Hyderabad i.e. TCS, INFOSYS, WIPRO, IBM, Google. Further the reliability and validity of the Questionnaire is tested by Cornbach's alpha. A detailed analysis is perused in exploring the association of the variables Quality of work life and Demographic variables. A strong positive correlation is found between the variables Quality of work life and Demographic variables.

Key Words: Quality of work life, IT companies, Demographic variables.

I. INTRODUCTION

IT industry is one of the influencing industry on the India economy. The NASSCOM reports suggest that by 2020, IT industry will generate revenue \$300 billion. The core resource of Indian IT industry is its human resources. So, managing and improving these human resources enhances the industry growth. The human resources /IT professionals have to be efficiently handled for the improvement of the industry. The Quality of work life is one of the major factors that influence the retention of the employees. Many studies suggest that the employees committed and satisfied with satisfactory Quality work life conditions.

II. QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

“QWL is a process of work organizations which enable its members at all levels to actively; participate in shaping the organizations environment, methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organizations and improved quality of life at work for employees.”—The American Society of Training and Development

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

(Muñoz de Bustillo Llorente & Fernández Macías, 2005) studied that the working life factors like wages, working hours, job quality effect job satisfaction, with reference to Spain.

(Gayathiri & Ramakrishnan, 2013) analyzed that performance of nurses in hospitals are determined by organizational structures, interdisciplinary collaboration, increased knowledge and specialization, advancement of technology, new health problems and health care policy, and sophistication in medical education.

(Basher Rubel & Kee, 2014) conducted a study in Bangladesh and found that QWL as antecedent of job satisfaction and performance of employee. The major factors influencing QWL are compensation and benefits, supervisor behavior and work life balance.

(Krueger et al., 2002) conducted a study in Canada on 5,486 full, part and casual time (non-physician) staff and found that the co-worker and supervisor support; teamwork and communication; job demands and decision authority; organization characteristics; patient/resident care; compensation and benefits; staff training and development; and impressions of the organization had a great impact on job satisfaction.

(Hosseinabadi, Karampourian, Beiranvand, & Pournia, 2013) investigated the effect of implementation of quality circles on nurses' quality of work-life and job satisfaction. This study confirms the effectiveness of quality circles in

improving quality of work-life and job satisfaction of nurses working in EMS, and offers their application as a management method that can be used by EMS managers.

IV. NEED OF THE STUDY

According to Walton (1975), “dissatisfaction with working life is a problem which affects almost all workers at one time or another, regardless of position or status”. The intellectual capital of IT industry is its human resources, there are many dissatisfying factors with their working life i.e. long working hours, lack flexible work hours, different time horizons to work, adaptability to new software packages, work-life conflicts etc.,. In the present study an attempt is made to understand the perceptions of IT employees, towards Quality of work life.

V. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study the perception of employees on Quality work life in select IT companies.
2. To study the relationship between QWL (one dependent variable) and several independent variables (demographic and QWL variables) IT industry.

Hypotheses of the Study

H0: There is no association between Demographic variables and Quality of work life.

H1: There is association between Demographic variables and Quality of work life.

Research Methodology

The present study is conducted at Hyderabad city, where top five IT companies with population above 5000 has been randomly chosen. The information was collected from five IT companies i.e. TCS, INFOSYS, WIPRO, IBM, Google. The sample is selected by convenience sampling methodology. A structured questionnaire designed by Richard E Walton (1974) was given to the employees of the selected IT companies for primary data collection. The pilot study is performed on a sample of 66 employees in chosen companies.

DATA ANALYSIS

Reliability Test:

The cornbach's alpha is used to test the reliability and validity of the Questionnaire. The overall Cornbach's alpha is 0.853 for 51 items indicates that the questionnaire is reliable for study.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.853	51

ANOVA

Descriptives

quality of work
life

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error			Minimum	Maximum
26-30	27	84.5556	15.44801	2.97297	78.4445	90.6666	66.00	107.00
31-35	39	90.0769	9.60642	1.53826	86.9629	93.1910	71.00	103.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	486.382	1	486.382	3.205	.078
Within Groups	9711.436	64	151.741		

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	486.382	1	486.382	3.205	.078
Within Groups	9711.436	64	151.741		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 3.205 at $p = 0.078$. The $p > 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is rejected and alternate hypotheses is accepted i.e. there is a significant difference in Quality of work life across the demographic variable age.

H01b: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables gender of the IT professionals

Descriptives

quality of work
life

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
male	39	90.6923	11.04334	1.76835	87.1125	94.2721	71.00	107.00
female	27	83.6667	13.55331	2.60834	78.3052	89.0282	66.00	100.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	787.510	1	787.510	5.356	.024
Within Groups	9410.308	64	147.036		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 5.356 at $p = 0.024$. The $p < 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is accepted. There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables gender of the IT professionals

H01c: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables marital status of the IT professionals.

Descriptives

quality of work life

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
single	27	88.3333	11.79635	2.27021	83.6669	92.9998	71.00	107.00
married	39	87.4615	13.14663	2.10515	83.1999	91.7232	66.00	103.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.126	1	12.126	.076	.783
Within Groups	10185.692	64	159.151		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is .076 at $p = 0.783$. The $p > 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is rejected and alternate hypotheses is accepted i.e there is a significant difference in Quality of work life across the demographic variable marital status.

H01d: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables education of the IT professionals.

Descriptives

quality of work life

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
ug	30	89.4000	12.82670	2.34182	84.6104	94.1896	69.00	107.00
pg	36	86.5000	12.29286	2.04881	82.3407	90.6593	66.00	103.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	137.618	1	137.618	.875	.353
Within Groups	10060.200	64	157.191		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 0.875 at $p = 0.353$. The $p > 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is rejected and alternate hypotheses is accepted i.e there is a significant difference in Quality of work life across the demographic variable education.

H01e: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables position of the IT professionals.

Descriptives

quality of work life

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
team member	18	84.0000	7.49117	1.76569	80.2747	87.7253	71.00	92.00
team leader	33	90.7273	15.37708	2.67681	85.2748	96.1797	66.00	107.00
project manager	15	86.0000	8.80746	2.27408	81.1226	90.8774	81.00	103.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	591.273	2	295.636	1.939	.152
Within Groups	9606.545	63	152.485		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 1.939 at $p = 0.152$. The $p > 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is rejected and alternate hypotheses is accepted i.e there is a significant difference in Quality of work life across the demographic variable position.

H01f: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables salary of the IT professionals

Descriptives

quality of work life

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
15000-30000	9	74.6667	13.00000	4.33333	64.6740	84.6594	66.00	92.00
30000-45000	9	96.6667	5.00000	1.66667	92.8233	100.5100	90.00	100.00
45000-60000	9	82.0000	.00000	.00000	82.0000	82.0000	82.00	82.00
60000-75000	9	77.6667	7.36546	2.45515	72.0051	83.3283	69.00	86.00
above 75000	30	93.9000	11.15518	2.03665	89.7346	98.0654	71.00	107.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4603.118	4	1150.780	12.547	.000
Within Groups	5594.700	61	91.716		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 12.547 at $p = 0.000$. The $p > 0.05$. Therefore null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables salary of the IT professionals. Salary of the employee doesn't affect the Quality of work life.

H01g: There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables experience of the IT professionals

Descriptives

quality of work life

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
2-4 years	30	82.2000	12.07562	2.20470	77.6909	86.7091	66.00	100.00
4-6 years	33	91.5455	11.00026	1.91490	87.6449	95.4460	71.00	107.00
6-8 years	3	1.0300E2	.00000	.00000	103.0000	103.0000	103.00	103.00
Total	66	87.8182	12.52555	1.54179	84.7390	90.8973	66.00	107.00

ANOVA

quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2096.836	2	1048.418	8.153	.001
Within Groups	8100.982	63	128.587		
Total	10197.818	65			

The F value is 8.153 at $p = 0.001$. The $p < 0.05$. Therefore null hypotheses is accepted. There is no significant difference in Quality work life across the demographic variables experience of the IT professionals. Experience of the employee doesn't affect the Quality of work life.

Regression of demographic variables and QWL variables

A multiple Regression is chosen to assess the relationship between one dependent variable and several independent variables. It provides estimates of the unique contribution for prediction of each of the independent variables using the equation of a straight line (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Multi Regression is an extension of Bi-variate correlation (Manning & Munro, 2007).

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig.
1	.997 ^a	.995	.993	.71744	.995	630.326	15	50	.000

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig.
1	.997 ^a	.995	.993	.71744	.995	630.326	15	50	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), experience in current company, SHWC, Qualification of employee, WTLS, Gender of employee, marital status of employee, SI, designation, salary of employee, Age of employee, SWL, OFD, OFGS, AFC, c

From the above table it is evident that the Demographic and QWL variables have a strong QWL Scores ($R^2 = 0.995$) i.e. Demographic and QWL variables explain 99.5% of the variance in QWL score.

The strength of association of the demographic and QWL variables with respect to QWL score can be known through the coefficients of the linear regression. From the below table it can be noticed that 14 variables (demographic and QWL variables) have impact on Quality of Work Life in a significant way at ($p < 0.005$), except the marital status where $p > 0.005$.

From the standardized coefficients we can notice that the Constitutionalism (1.116), Opportunity for Growth and Support (0.772), Designation (0.736) is having a strong positive impact on QWL score. Among the negative contributors Age (-0.863) is having a great impact on Quality of Work Life.

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	21.938	1.851		11.852	.000
	AFC	.985	.077	.481	12.780	.000
	SHWC	-.411	.102	-.097	-4.048	.000
	OFD	-1.884	.135	-.497	-13.928	.000
	OFGS	3.307	.164	.772	20.121	.000
	SI	-1.452	.091	-.648	-15.884	.000
	c	5.472	.273	1.116	20.047	.000
	SWL	.984	.078	.304	12.584	.000
	WTLS	1.571	.055	.439	28.730	.000
	Age of employee	-15.120	.757	-.863	-19.977	.000
	Gender of employee	2.854	.395	.163	7.229	.000
	marital status of employee	.743	.410	.042	1.811	.076
	Qualification of employee	2.656	.395	.154	6.722	.000
	designation	8.979	.441	.736	20.342	.000
	salary of employee	2.822	.246	.490	11.476	.000
	experience in current company	-2.847	.423	-.191	-6.732	.000

a. Dependent Variable: JS

The estimation for Quality of Work life Score =

$$21.938 + .985 \cdot AFC - .411 \cdot SHWC - 1.884 \cdot OFD + 3.307 \cdot OFGS - 1.452 \cdot SI + 5.472 \cdot C + .984 \cdot SWL + 1.571 \cdot WTLS - 15.120 \cdot Age + 2.854 \cdot Gender + 2.656 \cdot Qualification + 8.979 \cdot Designation + 2.822 \cdot Salary - 2.847 \cdot Experience$$

CONCLUSION

Quality of work life is explained by Demographic variables and Latent variables under study up to 99.5 % , which can known from the R Square value (0.995). A detailed analysis is perused in exploring the association of the variables Quality of work life and Demographic variables. A strong positive correlation is found between the variables Quality of work life and Demographic variables. So IT industry has to concentrate on its intellectual capital for enhancing its

growth. By providing a satisfactory Quality work life they make employees committed and satisfied. It is found that that QWL in IT industry influences Job satisfaction, job involvement, Organizational commitment, Tenure to greater extent compared to other industry. Absenteeism, minor accidents, grievances and quits can be reduced by improving QWL. The companies with effective QWL can efficiently attract and retain employees. Thus, QWL stimulates the employee job satisfaction and operational productivity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Basher Rubel, M. R., & Kee, D. M. H. (2014). Quality of work life and employee performance: Antecedent and outcome of job satisfaction in partial least square (PLS). *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 31(4), 456–467. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.31.04.142>
- [2] Gayathiri, R., & Ramakrishnan, L. (2013). Quality of Work Life – Linkage with Job Satisfaction and Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention ISSN (Online)*, 2(1), 2319–8028. <https://doi.org/231908028>
- [3] Hosseinabadi, R., Karampourian, A., Beiranvand, S., & Pournia, Y. (2013). The effect of quality circles on job satisfaction and quality of work-life of staff in emergency medical services. *International Emergency Nursing*, 21(4), 264–270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2012.10.002>
- [4] Krueger, P., Brazil, K., Lohfeld, L., Edward, H. G., 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 Services Research*, 2(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-2-6>
- [5] Muñoz de Bustillo Llorente, R., & Fernández Macías, E. (2005). Job satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of work. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 34(5), 656–673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2005.07.027>