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ABSTRACT

The quality of work life (QWL) is a wide term covering an immense variety of theories and management programmes and techniques. A high quality of work-life is essential for the organization to continue, to attract and retain employees (Sandrick, 2003). The aim of this paper is to determine the factors affecting the quality of work-life of the employees in the IT companies and to study the relationship between the satisfaction level and the quality of work-life (QWL). In the present study the investigator has chosen the Information Technology companies located in Chennai and based on the interview with the employees in the organization, a pilot study was conducted with the respondents in the total sample (N = 150). The factors contributive to quality of work-life includes work-life balance, Social Integration, Job security, Management Policies, Opportunity to develop and growth and communication at the work place. The result of this study clearly denotes that the employees in the IT companies are highly dissatisfied with transport facilities. The information collected from the survey will be useful to develop the work life of the employees in the Information technology companies.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The success of every organization is highly dependent on the utilization of organizational goals. To achieve organizational goal, individual goals have to be satisfied, in that Quality of work-life directly contributes to the utilization, development and achievement of organization and human resource goals. The research model for this study was based on the factors affecting Quality of work-life and the relationships between QWL and satisfaction of the employees in the IT companies.

The term quality of work-life bears upon the psychological of workers in varying degrees that might be either favorable or unfavorable to them. It was seen as the latest revolution in IT companies that was taking place in the relationship between employees and work. The basic premise of our Quality of Work Life (QWL) construct and measure is that employees bring a cluster of their wants to their employing organization and expect to enjoy a sense of Quality of Work Life (QWL) to the extent that these wants are satisfied through work in that organization, This is simply to say that they work for the organization owing to the favorable factors of employment. But due to various reasons the employees are forced to do the work and the organizations are missed to concentrate on work life of the employees. The basic wants are continued to diversify and change according to the evolution of the work system and standards of living of a workforce. Thus a definition by Suttle (1977) on the QWL as the degree to which workers are able to satisfy important personal needs through the experience of the employees in the organization is no longer relevant.
To summarize, QWL is viewed as a wide-ranging concept, Hence the paper is all about to measure the quality of work life of the employees in the work place through by the affected factors of Work life balance, Job security, Social Integration at the work place, Management Policies, Opportunity to develop and growth and communication at the work place.

So keeping, above fact in view, the present study has been pursued to achieve the following objectives.

2. OBJECTIVES

a) To examine the factors affecting the quality of work- life of the employees in the Information Technology companies in Chennai.

b) To study the nature of relationship between the factors affecting quality of work life and satisfaction level of the employees in the IT companies

c) To make suggestion based on the findings of the study.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Walton (1973) described eight major conceptual areas of quality of work life. These were adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, development of human competencies, growth and security, social integration, constitutionalization and total life space and social reliance. Other studies conducted on the quality of work- life include employment conditions, employment security, income adequacy, profit sharing, equity and other rewards, employee autonomy, employee commitment, social interaction, self- esteem, self- expression, democracy, employee satisfaction, employee involvement, advancement, relations with supervisors and peers and job enrichment (Chander and Singh, 1983)

Lawler (1982) defines Quality of work- life as job characteristics and work conditions. He highlights that Quality of work- life in the organization is to improve employees’ well-being and productivity. The most common interaction that relates to improvement of employees’ in an organization is the design of the job. Job design is to be able to provide high job satisfaction and this expected to be more productive in work culture in the work- life However, he accepted the fact that QWL is complex, because it comprises physical and mental well being of employees.

In the same vein Heskett, Sasser and Schlesinger (1997) define QWL as the feelings of the employees towards their jobs, colleagues and organizations that ignite a chain leading to the organizations’ growth and profitability. A good feeling towards their job means the employees feel happy doing work which will lead to a productive work environment. This definition, it concludes is that the satisfying work environment provides better QWL.

Lau, Wong, Chan and Law (2001) explained QWL as the favorable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities. Indirectly the definition indicates that an individual who is not satisfied with reward may be satisfied with the job security and to some extent would enjoy the career opportunity provided by the organization for their personal as well as professional growth.
The recent definition by Serey (2006) on QWL is quite conclusive and meets the contemporary work environment. It includes (i) an opportunity to exercise one’s talents and capacities, to face challenges and situations that require independent initiative and self-direction; (ii) an activity thought to be worthwhile by the individuals involved; (iii) an activity in which one understands the role the individual plays in the achievement of some overall goals; and (iv) a sense of taking pride in what one is doing and in doing it well. This issue of meaningful and satisfying work is often merged with discussions of job satisfaction, and believed to be more favorable to QWL of the peoples in the organisation.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is conducted in the Information Technology companies in Chennai. The total of 175 questionnaires was distributed in total in that 150 samples were collected. The employees from their residence and they volunteered to participate to answer the questions during their rest time in their regional language to the adopting convenient sampling methods through structured questionnaire. The tentative results and the questionnaire were tested using Cronbach alpha and the reliability coefficient have obtained more than 0.8 which is considered to be reliable for the variables. Both Primary and secondary data have been used for the present study.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>HS %</th>
<th>S %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>DS %</th>
<th>HDS %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the management counseling and the identification of the needs.</td>
<td>10 (6.6)</td>
<td>72 (48)</td>
<td>51 (34)</td>
<td>0 ( )</td>
<td>17 (11.3)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the corporate culture</td>
<td>17 (11.3)</td>
<td>77 (51.3)</td>
<td>29 (19.3)</td>
<td>21 (14)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the management discipline for better productivity</td>
<td>18 (12)</td>
<td>54 (36)</td>
<td>68 (45.3)</td>
<td>0 ( )</td>
<td>10 (66)</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the ergonomics work place (Comfortable chairs and work station to minimized physical problems)</td>
<td>32 (21.3)</td>
<td>71 (47.3)</td>
<td>37 (24.6)</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the canteen facilities</td>
<td>14 (9.3)</td>
<td>28 (18.6)</td>
<td>50 (33.3)</td>
<td>29 (19.3)</td>
<td>29 (19.3)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the transport facilities</td>
<td>11 (7.3)</td>
<td>26 (17.3)</td>
<td>49 (32.6)</td>
<td>31 (20.6)</td>
<td>33 (22)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the Health care programme conducted by your organization</td>
<td>15 (10)</td>
<td>73 (48.6)</td>
<td>50 (33.3)</td>
<td>5 (3.3)</td>
<td>7 (4.6)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Satisfied with the overall recruitment, selection and the induction programme given by your organization</td>
<td>19 (12.6)</td>
<td>58 (38.6)</td>
<td>44 (29.3)</td>
<td>25 (16.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.6)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Primary Data
Based on the above Table 1, the level of Satisfaction of the employees in IT companies is shown. It is clear from the table that the mean values ranging above 3.500 indicating that the respondents have scored “Satisfied” with respect of the management counseling and the identification of the needs. The variable statement (Satisfied with the overall recruitment, selection and the induction programme given by your organization) has mean value ranging to 3.420 indicating that the respondents have scored “Neutral” for this statement. The variable statement “Satisfied with the ergonomics work place (Comfortable chairs and work station to minimized physical problems)” having the highest mean value of 3.826 indicating that the respondents are “Highly Satisfied” and the variable statement “Satisfied with the transport facilities” having the lowest mean value of 2.67 indicating that the respondents are “Highly Dissatisfied”.

6. QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE AND SATISFACTION LEVEL

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

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

Table 2 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Change statistics sig factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Primary Data, sig at 5 % level
Dependent Variable: Satisfaction Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-efficient</th>
<th>Un-standardized Co-efficients</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>sig value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model Constant</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>5.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPD&amp;G</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-1.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>2.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Primary Data, sig at 5 % level


Independent Variables: Quality of work-Life

Table 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 value denotes in the independent variables are Work life Balance (.020), Management Policies (.470), Opportunity to develop and Growth (-.123), Job security (.191), Social Integration (.145) and Communication (.245). The standardized error estimated for this co-efficient is considerably less.
The t value for Management Policies (5.493), Job security (3.030) is high. It is also clear that the significant value for Work life balance, Opportunity to develop and Social Integration are accepted; other significant values for Management Policies, Job security and communication are rejected.

7. FINDINGS

- The variable statement “Satisfied with the ergonomics work place (Comfortable chairs and work station to minimized physical problems)” having the highest mean value of 3.826 indicating that the respondents are “Highly Satisfied”.

- The variable statement “Satisfied with the transport facilities” having the lowest mean value of 2.67 indicating that the respondents are “Highly Dissatisfied”.

- The significant value for Work life balance, Opportunity to develop and Social Integration are accepted. It is clear that there is a relationship between the QWL and satisfaction level in these variables. These are the most factors affecting the satisfaction of the employees in the IT companies.

- The significant values of Management Policies, Job security and communication are rejected. It is clear that there is no relationship between the QWL and satisfaction level in these variables. These are the favorable factors on the satisfaction of the employees in the IT companies.

8. SUGGESTIONS

- The management should provide transport facilities for the employees in the organization. So that employees feel comfortable and will get satisfaction on their working life The management should plan and prepare well in advance the QWL, so that they can make everyone will feel more involved in their work.

- The management should ask for the clarification, summaries and understand the employees’ feelings at work.

- Without any partiality, the management should recognize the achievements and celebrate the individual and team success in the organization.

- Discuss the specific issues with the team and get suggestions and ideas from the employees in the organization.

- The Human Resources Management must learn to manage effectively the people in the organization by improving QWL and support the management to conduct many programmes for the employees in the IT companies.
9. CONCLUSION

Effective strategic management is essential to govern and provide excellent QWL among IT employees. Thus, this analysis attempts to suggest the meaning and what makes up the QWL from the perspective of IT employees within the IT sector. A good management would encourage employees to be more productive while enjoying their work. Therefore, QWL is becoming an important human resource issue in IT organizations. With this environment, Technological advances further help organizations to implement these programs successfully. Organizations will enjoy the fruits of increasing productivity and profits through by implementing QWL programs in the organization. Eventually, the future work world will also have more encouragement and adopt the QWL programs. It is concluded that more detailed and specific models of QWL need to be developed. The role of the Human Resource Manager is evolving with the change in the competitive environment and the realization that Human Resource Management must play a more strategic role in the success of the organization assumes more importance.
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