

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AS PERCEIVED BY EMPLOYEES OF AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY WITH REFERENCE TO SOUTH TAMIL NADU

J. Sahaya Shabu*, M. Prabakaran**

Abstract *This paper explores employee's perceptions about quality of work life in automotive Industry in South Tami Nadu. It also examines the level of Quality of work life, relationship between quality of work life and job performance and various dimensions of quality of work life of employees working in automotive industry. 310 automotive industry employees across the south Tamil Nadu was randomly selected as sample for the study and a well-structured questionnaire was given to them to collect the first hand information. The findings revealed that majority of the employees perceived level of quality of work life in automotive industry was moderate, the study also evident that there is a significant positive relationship exist between perceived quality of work life and job performance of the employees. The elements that are relevant to an individual's quality of work life include the physical work environment, autonomy at work, job satisfaction and security, training and development, compensation and rewards and organisational culture, administrative system and relationship between life on and off the job.*

Keywords: *QWL, Job Satisfactions, Job Performance, Work Life, Perception*

INTRODUCTION

“Human Resource Management helps in creating better rapport between the management and the subordinates. It helps subordinates to realize individual and organizational goals.”

HRM is an organizational function that deals with people-related issues such as Compensation, Hiring, Performance Management, Organizational Development, Safety, Welfare, Benefits, Employee Engagement, Communication, Management, and Training. Organizations cannot build great teams of professionals without great people. The main tasks of the human resources management (HRM) team include talent recruitment, training, performance evaluation, employee motivation, workplace communication, and occupational safety. Organizations without a proper human resource management structure will suffer serious problems in managing their normal activities. As a result, today's businesses must invest significant effort and energy into building a strong and effective HRM.

An organization's success is highly dependent on how it attracts, recruits, motivates and retains its employees. Organizations today need to be more flexible to develop their talent and enjoy engagement. Organizations must therefore adopt strategies to improve the “quality of work” (QWL) of their employees in order to meet both organizational goals

and employee needs.

The term (QWL) refers to the favorable or unfavorable of the overall work environment for people. The QWL program is another way organizations recognize their responsibility to develop good workplaces and working conditions for both people and the economic well-being of the organization. Serey (2006) defines QWL is fairly consistent and best reflects the modern working environment. This definition refers to meaningful and challenging work that emphasizes the 4 C's: Concern, Consciousness Capacity and Commitment. 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) activities that are rewarding to those involved; (iii) activities that include understanding the role individuals play in achieving overall goals; (iv) I take pride in what I do and how well I do it. This issue of meaningful and satisfying work is often confused with the discussion of job satisfaction and is seen as more informative for QWL.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The automotive industry is the most important engine of our growing economy. A robust transportation system plays an important role in the country's rapid economic and industrial development. India's well-developed automotive

* Assistant Professor, Xavier Institute of Business Administration, St. Xavier's College (Autonomous) Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Palaymkottai, Tamil Nadu, India. Email: jjshabu@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Xavier Institute of Business Administration, St. Xavier's College (Autonomous) Affiliated to Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, Palaymkottai, Tamil Nadu, India. Email: prabaharmp@gmail.com

industry is adept at playing this catalytic role, producing a wide variety of vehicles. The automotive industry includes the automobile and auto parts sector. Includes passenger cars. Light, medium and heavy commercial vehicles. Multi-purpose vehicles such as jeeps, scooters, motorcycles, tricycles and tractors. Automotive parts such as engine parts, drivetrain and transmission parts, suspension and brake parts, electrical, body and chassis parts. Growing middle-income and young population is creating strong demand in the Indian market. The total production volume of passenger cars, three-wheelers, two-wheelers and four-wheelers in June 2022 was 2,081,148 units. India has a huge opportunity for electric and self-driving cars by 2030. India's automotive sector is expected to attract more foreign investment by 2030. The Indian government has announced his PLI program of Rs 2,593.8 billion (US\$ 3.49 billion) for automobiles and auto parts in September 2021.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

QWL has been described as a friendly work environment that supports and promotes well-being by providing employees with rewards, job security, opportunities for advancement, etc. Hackman (1980) recognized that the work environment that's able to satisfy employees' individual needs is considered to give a positive interaction impact, which can lead to a great QWL.

Cunningham and Eberle (1990) emphasized that individual needs are met when organizational rewards such as: B. Compensation, promotion, recognition, and development meet their expectations. Factors related to the quality of an individual's work life include tasks, the physical work environment, the social environment within the organization, management systems, and the relationship between work and non-work life.

Chan and Einstein (1990) explained that QWL reflects people's experience at work, their relationships with other people, their work environment, and their effectiveness at work.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions 2002 explains that the QWL is a multi-dimensional structure of many interrelated factors whose conceptualization and measurement require careful consideration. It is related to job satisfaction, job engagement, motivation, productivity, health, safety, job security, skill development and work-life balance. Work-life quality is the process by which an organization responds to employee needs and develops mechanisms that enable employees to participate fully in decisions that shape their work-life. In a study by Saraji and Dargahi (2006), QWL improves employee satisfaction, enhances learning in the workplace, and helps employees better manage their work

by conducting descriptive and analytical research. It is described as a comprehensive department-wide program aimed at helping individuals transition and change.

According to research by Che Rose et al. (2006 A) QWL programs help solve work-related problems, build collaboration, improve work environments, carefully restructure tasks, and improve human resource outcomes and pay-outs.

Hosseini and Jorjatki (2010) found that job satisfaction, job performance and work balance are not only important variables for improving quality of work life, but also quality of life (QWL) and work system. Quality is also the most interesting way to create motivation and an important way to enrich the workplace. Motivation of employees and managers that paying more attention to fair wages, growth opportunities and continuous promotion will improve employee performance and QWL of social security worker in Tehran.

According to Rethinam (2008), QWL is a multidimensional construct comprised of a number of interrelated factors that necessitate careful consideration in order to conceptualise and measure. It is linked to job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety, and well-being, job security, competence development, and a balance between work and non-work life, and he concluded that QWL is challenging for both individuals and organisations. However, based on the literature, QWL can be viewed as a broad concept that includes job satisfaction, participative management, and improving the work environment.

COMPONENTS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

The elements that are relevant to an individual's quality of work life include the task, the physical work environment, social environment within the organization, administrative system and relationship between life on and off the job (Cunningham & Eberle, 1990).

QWL is a multi-dimensional construct, made up of a number of interrelated factors that need careful consideration to conceptualize and measure. It is associated with job satisfaction, job involvement, motivation, productivity, health, safety and well-being, job security, competence development and balance between work and non-work life as is conceptualized by European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living Conditions, 2002).

Rethinam (2008) and Serey (2006) explained QWL is quite conclusive and best meet the contemporary work environment. The definition was related to meaningful and satisfying work. 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.

According to Lau and Bruce (1998), QWL is a dynamic multidimensional construct that currently includes concepts such as job security, reward systems, opportunities for training and career advancement, and participation decision making. According to Kalra and Ghosh (1984), studies show that in the Indian context, environmental factors such as physical environment, safety, and other working conditions, as well as relational factors such as work group relations and labor-management relations, are more important in terms of QWL.

From the literature survey, following 9 important components of quality of work life were considered for the literature review.

- Work environment
- Organization culture and climate
- Relation and co-operation
- Training and development
- Compensation and Rewards
- Facilities
- Job satisfaction and Job security
- Autonomy of work
- Adequacy of resources

Lau et al. (2001) explained QWL as the favourable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities. According to Winter et al. (2000) QWL for academicians as an attitudinal response to the prevailing work environment and posited five work environment domains that include role stress, job characteristics, supervisory, structural and sectoral characteristics to directly and indirectly shape academicians experiences, attitudes and behaviour.

The task, the physical work environment, the social environment within the organisation, the administrative system, and the relationship between life on and off the job are all relevant to an individual's quality of work life. Eberle and Cunningham (1990). Kirkman (1989) defines QWL as an integrated improvement plan designed to improve the working environment and meet the individual needs of employees. According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), a work environment that can meet employees' personal needs such as skill variety, task identity, task significance,

autonomy, and feedback provides a positive interaction effect, which leads to an excellent QWL.

Certo (2004) study shows that quality of work life is the degree of opportunity of workers to make decisions that influence their work situation. The greater the opportunity of workers to make such decisions, the higher the quality of work life. According to Cavry (1995) Organizational features such as policies and procedures, leadership style, operations, and general contextual factors of setting, all have a profound effect on how staff views the quality of work life

According to Rose, Beh, Jegak and Idris (2006 B) study QWL is associated with career development and career is evolving from such interaction of individuals within the organizations. Robbins et al. (2002), Bandura et al. (1988) in their study they explained Human care can also increase staff's self-confidence and self-efficacy, and actively overcome the difficulties.

Skrovan (1983) and American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) defined the QWL as a process for the working organization, which enables the employees at each hierarchy to actively participate in building the organization environment, developing organizational model so as to produce the organizational achievements. This process is based on the two goals together 1) To improve organizational efficiency and 2) To improve the quality of working life.

Mirvis and Lawler (1984) highlighted that Quality of working life was associated with satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life" as; safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement. Oshagbemi, Sloane and Williams, who highlighted differences in remuneration aspects received by the employee will suddenly affect their work satisfaction and work performance. Drobnic et al. (2010) suggest that employees that have secured jobs and pay would feel comfortable at the work place and this affects their quality of life. Meeting socially determined needs and fair compensation can create an appropriate work environment (Weisboard, 2007). According to Saraji and Dargahi (2006) the Nursing Work life Satisfaction survey results showed that Pay and Autonomy were the two most important components of nurses' quality of work life.

Sayeed and Sinha (1980) investigated the connection between QWL, job stress, and performance. According to the findings, higher QWL leads to greater job satisfaction. According to Lashbrook's (1997) research, leadership style has a significant impact on employee job satisfaction. According to Bogler (2002), different leadership styles will stimulate different working environments and have a direct impact on employee job satisfaction. According to Watson et al. (2003) research, many different aspects of the job, such as pay, promotions, supervision, fringe benefits, coworker

support, and excessive working hours, are associated with job satisfaction.

Pelsma et al. (1989) found that psychological distress and morale contributed equally to teachers QWL. They determined that in the work climate of an occupation, QWL can be assessed by combining the amount and the degree of stress and the degree of satisfaction experienced by the individual within his/her occupational role. Noor and Abdullah (2012) and Koonmee et al. (2010) study indicate that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and quality of work life. Job satisfaction is found to carry more weightage in explaining the relationship among job satisfaction, job involvement and job security with quality of work life.

A dramatic change of workforce in contemporary work environment has revealed a significant amount organization change (Watson et al., 2003). organization change such as downsizing, rightsizing and outsourcing have adversely affected employees' loyalty, morale, motivation and perceived job security. Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (1996) survey highlighted that job security is the most controversial issue in contemporary work environment. Job security, the central aspect of QWL represents strength of the organizations to provide permanent and stable employment regardless of the changes in work environment. Drobnic et al. (2010) suggest that employees that have secured jobs and pay would feel comfortable at the work place and this affects their quality of life.

Robins (1989) suggests that QWL is 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. According to Scully et al. (1995) greater autonomy on job enhances the acquisition and utilization of knowledge whilst greater participation is held to promote cognitive growth via increased knowledge transfer among employees.

Feuer (1989) and Che Rose et al. (2006) explained people also conceive of QWL as a set of methods, such as autonomous work groups, job enrichment and high-involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of workers.

Rethinam (2008) study highlights, If the organization provides the appropriate authority to design work activities to the individual employees, then it is highly possible that the work activities can match their employees needs that contribute to the organizational performance.

According to Speitzer et al. (1997) study Staff's perceived significance of work and decision-making power in psychological empowerment can improve satisfaction and eliminate tension. Saraji and Dargahi (2006) explained the Nursing Work life Satisfaction survey results showed that

Pay and Autonomy were the two most important components of nurses' quality of work life.

Resources should match with stated objectives; otherwise, employees will not be able to attain the Objectives. This results in employee dissatisfaction and lower QWL. According to Chelte (1983) adequacy of resources has to do with enough time and equipment, adequate information and help to complete assignments.

OBJECTIVES

- To find out the level of Quality of Work Life as perceived by the employees.
- To find out significant difference between the mean scores of employees perception of Quality of Work Life with respect to background variables.
- To find out significant differences in the mean scores of employees work performance with respect to background variables.
- To find out significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and the Work Performance of employees.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study is to explore the employee's perception of Quality of work life in the organization. The study helps to understand what good quality work life means to employees and how it affects the companies It helps to understand how good working conditions help employees to work more efficiently. 'Quality of Work Life' emphasises on how an employee and employer should keep a proper balance between their work and family. It emphasises how people can keep balance by making their work timings flexible. About 310 employees both male and female, senior and junior workers have responded to this present study. The QWL is measured in the dimensions such as Work Environment, Autonomy at Work, Job satisfaction and Security, Training and Development, Compensation and Reward, Organizational Culture. The present study is descriptive in nature, a structure and standardized questionnaire was used to collect information from the respondents. Convenience sampling techniques was adapted for sample selection.

HYPOTHESES

- There is no significant difference between the mean scores of employee's perception of Quality of Work Life with respect to background variables.
- There is no significant differences in the mean scores of employee's work performance with respect to background variables.

- There is no significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and the Work Performance of employees.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents based on Personal Data

Sr. No	Variable	Category	Count	Percentage
1	Gender	Female	120	38.7
		Male	190	61.3
2	Age	40 & below	141	45.5
		41 & above	169	54.5
3	Marital status	Married	241	77.7
		Unmarried	69	22.3
4	Years of Experience	10 & below	172	55.5
		11 & above	138	44.5
9	No. Dependents	4 and below	179	57.7
		5 and above	131	42.3

Differential Analysis

Null Hypothesis - 1

There is no significant difference between employees in perception of Quality of Work Life and its dimensions with reference to Gender.

Table 2: Difference between Employees in Perception of QWL with Reference to Gender

Dimension	Variable	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Work Environment	Female	120	50.80	10.96	1.09	Not significant
	Male	190	49.49	9.33		
Autonomy at work	Female	120	50.13	9.41	0.19	Not significant
	Male	190	49.92	10.38		
Job satisfaction and Security	Female	120	51.55	9.30	2.23	Significant
	Male	190	49.02	10.32		
Training and Development	Female	120	50.67	9.35	0.96	Not significant
	Male	190	49.58	10.39		

Dimension	Variable	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Compensation and Reward	Female	120	50.13	12.50	0.96	Not significant
	Male	190	49.92	8.07		
Organisational Culture	Female	120	50.27	10.99	0.16	Not significant
	Male	190	49.83	0.34		
QWL	Female	120	50.86	10.12	1.20	Not significant
	Male	190	49.46	9.91		

(At 5% level of significance the table value of 't' is 1.96).

It is very clear from the above table that the calculated 't' value for Job satisfaction and security is greater than the table value. Therefore there is significant difference between employee's perception of Job satisfaction and job security. Comparing the mean scores the female have better perception of job satisfaction and job security than the male employees.

Null Hypothesis - 2

There is no significant difference between the perception of employees in Quality of Work Life and its dimensions with reference to Age.

Table 3: Difference between Employee's Perception of QWL with Reference to Age

Dimension	Variable	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Work Environment	40 & below	141	48.24	9.54	2.89	significant
	41 & above	169	51.47	10.16		
Autonomy at work	40 & below	141	50.13	9.16	0.61	Not significant
	41 & above	169	49.69	10.67		
Job satisfaction and Security	40 & below	141	49.82	10.29	0.29	Not significant
	41 & above	169	50.15	9.78		
Training and Development	40 & below	141	49.22	12.03	1.22	Not significant
	41 & above	169	50.65	7.89		
Compensation and Reward	40 & below	141	49.32	8.72	1.12	Not significant
	41 & above	169	50.57	10.95		

Dimension	Variable	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Organisational Culture	40 & below	141	48.24	9.79	2.86	Significant
	41 & above	169	51.47	9.96		
QWL	40 & below	141	48.74	10.04	2.03	Significant
	41 & above	169	51.05	9.87		

(At 5% level of significance the table value of 't' is 1.96).

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' values for Work Environment, Organizational Culture and

Quality of Work Life in Total are greater than the table value. Therefore there is significant difference between employees perception of Quality of Work Life with reference to Age. Comparing the mean scores the employees who are 41 and above age perceived better Quality of Work Life than the employees who are 40 and below age. In other dimensions there is no significant difference between workers in their perception of QWL.

Null Hypothesis - 3

There is no significant difference between the employee's perception of Quality of Work Life and its dimensions with reference to Marital Status.

Table 4: Difference between Employee's Perception of QWL with Reference to Marital Status

Dimension	Category	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Work Environment	Married	241	49.65	10.13	1.20	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	51.23	9.49		
Autonomy at work	Married	241	49.76	10.20	0.83	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	50.83	9.28		
Job satisfaction and Security	Married	241	49.31	9.89	2.27	Significant
	Unmarried	69	52.42	10.07		
Training and Development	Married	241	49.37	7.63	1.46	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	52.21	15.58		
Compensation and Reward	Married	241	49.96	10.18	0.14	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	50.14	9.41		
Organisational Culture	Married	241	49.83	9.58	0.52	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	50.61	11.41		
QWL	Married	241	49.42	9.37	1.68	Not significant
	Unmarried	69	52.02	11.79		

At 5% level of significance the table value of 't' is 1.96)

It is concluded from the above table that the calculated 't' value for Job Satisfaction and Security is greater than the table value. Therefore there is significant difference between employee's perception of Job Satisfaction and Security with respect to marital status. Comparing the mean scores the unmarried employee's perception is better than the married employees towards Job Satisfaction and Security. But for the

other dimensions the employees do not significantly differ in their perception of QWL with respect to marital status.

Null Hypothesis - 4

There is no significant difference between employee's perception of Quality of Work Life and its dimensions with reference to Year of Experience.

Table 5: Difference between Employee's Perception of QWL with Reference to Year of Experience

Dimension	Category	Count	Mean	SD	't' value	Result
Work Environment	10 & below	172	49.36	9.71	1.25	Not significant
	11 & above	138	50.79	10.34		
Autonomy at work	10 & below	172	50.19	9.61	0.37	Not significant
	11 & above	138	49.76	10.50		
Job satisfaction and Security	10 & below	172	50.01	9.96	0.01	Not significant
	11 & above	138	49.99	10.09		

Dimension	Category	Count	Mean	SD	't' value	Result
Training and Development	10 & below	172	49.35	11.62	1.34	Not significant
	11 & above	138	50.81	7.47		
Compensation and Reward	10 & below	172	49.59	8.56	0.79	Not significant
	11 & above	138	50.52	11.56		
Organisational Culture	10 & below	172	49.05	9.93	1.88	Not significant
	11 & above	138	51.19	10.00		
QWL	10 & below	172	49.32	10.01	1.34	Not significant
	11 & above	138	50.85	9.96		

(At 5% level of significance the table value of 't' is 1.96).

From the table it is evident that the 't' values for all the dimensions such as Work Environment, Autonomy at Work, Job Satisfaction and Security, Training and Development, Compensation and Reward, Organisational Culture and QWL in total are less than the table values. Therefore the employees do not significantly differ in their perception of

QWL with reference to years of experience.

Null Hypothesis - 5

There is no significant difference between employee's perception of Quality of Work Life and its dimensions with reference to number of dependents.

Table 6: Difference between Employee's Perception of QWL with Reference to Number of Dependents

Dimension	Variable	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Work Environment	4 and below	179	48.73	9.25	2.58	Significant
	5 and above	131	51.74	10.73		
Autonomy at work	4 and below	179	51.30	9.79	2.69	Significant
	5 and above	131	48.23	10.05		
Job satisfaction and Security	4 and below	179	50.19	9.75	0.38	Not significant
	5 and above	131	49.75	10.37		
Training and Development	4 and below	179	49.33	10.49	1.41	Not significant
	5 and above	131	50.91	9.25		
Compensation and Reward	4 and below	179	49.72	10.82	0.60	Not significant
	5 and above	131	50.39	8.79		
Organisational Culture	4 and below	179	48.74	10.02	2.63	Significant
	5 and above	131	51.72	9.74		
QWL	4 and below	179	49.56	9.72	0.90	Not significant
	5 and above	131	50.60	10.38		

(At 5% level of significance the table value of 't' is 1.96).

It is concluded from the above table that the calculated 't' values for Work Environment, Autonomy at Work and Organisational Culture are greater than the table values. Therefore there is significant difference between employee's perception of Work Environment, Autonomy at Work and Organisational Culture. Comparing the mean scores the employees who have 5 and above dependents, perceive better Work Environment and Organizational Culture. But

the employees who have 4 and below dependents perceive better Autonomy at Work.

Hypothesis - 6

There is no significant difference between employees in their work performance with reference to background variables.

Table 7: Difference between Employees in Their Work Performance with Reference to Background Variables

Variables	Categ-ories	Count	Mean	SD	't' Value	Result
Gender	Female	120	52.44	12.89	3.09	Significant
	Male	190	48.46	7.26		
Age	40 & below	141	47.03	4.67	5.29	Significant
	41 & above	169	52.47	12.34		
Marital status	Married	241	50.83	10.84	3.94	Significant
	Unmarried	69	47.09	5.36		
Years of Experience	10 & below	172	47.60	5.08	4.51	Significant
	11 & above	138	53.00	13.30		
No. Dependents	4 and below	179	49.63	8.59	0.73	Not significant
	5 and above	131	50.51	11.67		

It is observed from the above table that the calculated 't' values for work performance of employees with reference to Gender, Age, Marital Status and Years of experience are greater than the table values. Therefore the employees significantly differ in their Work Performance with reference to Gender, Age, Marital Status and Years of experience. Comparing the mean scores the female, workers who are 41 and above age, the married workers and the workers who have put up 11 and above years of experience show better work performance than their counter parts.

Correlation Analysis

Null Hypothesis - 7

There is no significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and Work Performance of employees with reference to background variables.

Table 8: Correlation between QWL and Work Performance with Reference to Background Variables

Variables	Categories	Count	'R' Value	Table Value	Result
Gender	Female	120	0.187	0.139	S
	Male	190	0.378	0.139	S
Age	40 & below	141	0.081	0.139	S
	41 & above	169	0.489	0.139	S
Marital status	Married	241	0.327	0.088	S
	Unmarried	69	0.301	0.235	S
Years of experience	10 & below	172	0.149	0.139	S
	11 & above	138	0.481	0.139	S
No Dependents	4 and below	179	0.275	0.139	S
	5 and above	131	0.357	0.139	S

(At 5% level of significance).

The table shows a significant result that there is a positive significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and the Work Performance of employees.

Null Hypothesis - 8

There is no significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and Work Performance of employees.

Table 9: Correlation between QWL and Work Performance

Total Sample	Count	'R' Value	Table Value	Result
Employees	310	0.141	0.088	S

Significant positive correlation is found between Quality of Work Life and Work Performance of employees.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Majority of the employees perceived moderate Quality of Work Life. This finding is further supported by the previous research by Manouchehr et al. (2013) revealed that the Iranian EFL teachers experience medium and low level of QWL. Again the result of the present research contradicts the previous research by Swarnalatha (2014) reports that 69% and 31% of workers perceived high and low QWL. Further Saraji and Dargahi (2006) states that majority of the employees were dissatisfied with job security.

There is significant positive relationship exists between Quality of Work Life and Work Performance. The present result is further conformed by the previous studies that Seelan, Rethinam and Ismail (2008) records job satisfaction and job security is associated with QWL of IT employees. Again Muftah and Lafi (2011) reports that there is significant positive relationship between QWL and employee satisfaction. The study undertaken by Khadiye Rahmaty

Nia, Maryam Maleki (2013) produces similar result that there is a significant positive relationship between QWL and organizational Commitment. Behnam Talebi et al. (2012) also supports this finding states that there is significant and positive relationship between job security, work environment, autonomy at work and employee effectiveness.

There is significant difference between employee's perception of Job satisfaction and job security with respect to their gender. The female have better perception of job satisfaction and job security than the male employees. Nair (2013) supports this result says that there is significant difference between college teachers in their QWL and women teachers reported to show high level of job satisfaction. This indicates that the job security that is the tenure of women professional work life depends on the social environment that is the action against harassment, giving up leisure time or activities for work. This study was supported by previous research found that the social environment and job security were consistent (Rasool Davoudi & Seyed Hossein Mousavi, 2012). Employers can no longer promise job security, but they can help people maintain the skills they need to remain viable in the job market. Chandranshu 2012 There is a negative correlation between Job security and Work stress Valarmathi and Balakrishnan (2013) find that there is significant difference in the mean opinion for training among the varied gender.

There is significant difference between employees perception of Quality of Work Life and its dimensions-Work Environment, Organizational Culture and Quality of Work Life in Total with reference to Age. The employees who are 41 and above age perceived better Quality of Work Life than the employees who are 40 and below age. Very similar result was arrived by Stephen (2012) states that employees of small scale industries perceived the QWL variables such as autonomy at work, work environment and fringe benefits.

There is significant difference between employee's perception of Job Satisfaction and Security with respect to marital status. The unmarried employee's perception is better than the married employees towards Job Satisfaction and Security. Valarmathi and Balakrishnan (2013) recorded that there is significant difference in the mean opinion for job security among the varied designations.

There is significant difference between employee's perception of Work Environment, Autonomy at Work and Organisational Culture with respect to number of dependants. The employees who have 5 and above dependents, perceive better Work Environment and Organizational Culture. But the employees who have 4 and below dependents perceive better Autonomy at Work. This shows that job security that is the job tenure and fear of losing the job does have a greater impact on job autonomy

of IT professionals. This finding is supported by previous researches on career anchors which found the relationship between the job security and the job autonomy (Ronel, 1990) of the various factors that contribute to organizational success, job autonomy and control are important for sustaining and improving employee contribution to the organization. Job autonomy is one of the required factors for creating a supportive work environment (Mary, Vikram, Nancy & Borich, 2012).

There is a positive significant correlation between Quality of Work Life and the Work Performance of employees with respect to all the background variables such as gender, age, years of experience, marital status and number of dependants. Previous studies show that the work environment influenced by the job performance (Alla, Helena & Simona, 2008). The research by Nyagechi, 2013 on work environment factor that affect QWL revealed that poor safety and health, work pressure or stress and provision of inadequate working tools are environmental aspects that bring about poor quality of working life experiences. Hosseini (2010) registers that quality of work life is related to performance. Kulkarni (2013) states that training and development is one of the important features of QWL. Wyalt and Wah (2001) conclude that personal growth and autonomy is associated with QWL of employees of all categories.

CONCLUSION

Many aspects affect the management of human resources. One such aspect is Quality of Work Life (QWL). It is a philosophy, a set of principles, which 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. The elements that are relevant to an individual's quality of work life include the physical work environment, autonomy at work, job satisfaction and security, training and development, compensation and rewards and organisational culture within the organization, administrative system and relationship between life on and off the job. When quality of life improves the work performance also will improve.

REFERENCES

- Adhikari, D. R., & Gautam, D. K. (2010). Labor legislations for improving quality of work life in Nepal. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 52(1), 40-53.
- An, J. Y., Yom, Y. H., & Ruggiero, J. S. (2011). Organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness in Korean University hospitals. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 22, 22-30.
- Arulsenthilkumar, S., Saravananaraj, M. G., & Punitha, N. (2013). Quality of work life for employees in super

- markets with reference to Coimbatore. *Abhinav, National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*, 1(2).
- Asgari, M. H., & Dadashi, M. A. (2011). Determining the relationship between quality of work life (QWL) and organizational commitment of Melli Bank Staff in West domain of Mazandaran in 2009-2010. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(8), 682-687.
- Beaudoin, L. E., & Edgar, L. (2003). Hassles: Their importance to nurses' quality of work life. *Nursing Economics*, 21, 106-113.
- Talebi, B., PakdelBonab, M., Zemestani, G., & Aghdami, N. (2012). Investigating the relationship between the employees quality of work life and their effectiveness in Banking. *Europe Journal of Experimental Biology*, 2(5), 1839-1842.
- Bhanugopan, R., & Fish, A. (2008). The impact of business crime on expatriate quality of work-life in Papua New Guinea. *Australian Human Resources Institute*, 46(1), 68-84.
- Bragard, I., Dupuis, G., Razavi, D., Reynaert, C., & Etienne, A. M. (2012). Quality of work life in doctors working with cancer patients. *Occupational Medicine (London)*, 62(1), 34-40.
- Chen Huang, C. (2005). The effect of quality of work life on organizational commitment. Human resource management. Quoted in Asgari, Mohammad Hadi and Dadashi, Mohammad Ali (2011) determining the Relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Organizational Commitment of Melli Bank Staff in West Domain of Mazandaran in 2009-2010. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(8), 682-687.
- Cheung, F. Y. L., & Tang, C. S. K. (2009). Quality of work life as a mediator between emotional labor and work family interference. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24, 245-255.
- Chitra, D., & Mahalakshmi V. (2012). A study on employees perception on quality of work life and job satisfaction in manufacturing organization an empirical study. *International Journal of Trade and Commerce*, 1(2), 175-184.
- Connell, J., & Hannif, Z. (2009). Call centers, quality of work life and HRM practices - An in-house/outsourced comparison. *Employee Relations*, 31(4), 363-381.
- Cole, D., Robson, L. S., Lemieux-Charles, L., & Mcguire, W. (2005). Quality of working life indicators in Canadian health care organizations: A tool for healthy healthcare work places. *Occupational Medicine*, 5(1), 54-59.
- Efraty, D., & Sirgy, M. (1990). The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioral responses. *Social Indicators Research*, 22(1), 31-47.
- Elizur, D., & Shye, S. (1990). Quality of work life and its relation to quality of life. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 39(3), 275-291.
- Emadzadeh, M. K., Khorasani, M., & Nematizadeh, F. (2012). Assessing the quality of work life of primary school teachers in Isfahan city. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 438-448.
- Kashani, F. H. (2012). A review on relationship between quality of work life and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Bank and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(9), 9523-9531.
- Hannif, Z., Burgess, J., & Connell, J. (2008). Call centers and the quality of work life: Towards a research agenda. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(2), 271-284.
- Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of work life and human resource outcomes. *Industrial Relations*, 30(3), 1991. 469-479.
- Hossain, M. M. (2000). Job satisfaction of commercial banks women employees in Bangladesh - A comparative study of private and public sectors. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 347-361.
- Hosseini, S. M. (2010). Quality work life (QWL) and its relationship with performance. *Advanced Management Science*, 1, 559-562.
- Hsu, M., & Kernohan, G. (2006). Dimensions of hospital nurses' quality of working life. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 54(1), 120-131.
- Hsu, M. Y., & Kernohan, G. (2006). Dimensions of hospital nurses' quality of working life. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 54, 120-131.
- Kalra, S. K., & Ghosh, S. (1984). Quality of work life: A study of associated factors. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, 45-54.
- Khadje et al. (2013) A study of the relationship between QWL and organise commitment. *International Journal of Research in Organisational between and Human Resource Management*, 4.
- Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P., & Carayon, P. (2008). Quality of working life and turnover intention in information technology work. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 18, 409-423.
- Laschinger, H. K., Finegan, J., Shamian, J., & Almost, J. Testing Karasek's demands-control model in restructured healthcare settings: Effects of job strain on staff nurses' quality of work life. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 31, 233-243.
- Lau, R. S. M. (2000). Quality of work life and performance: An ad hoc investigation of two key elements in the service profit chain model. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11(5), 422-437.

- Lewis, D., Brazil, K., Krueger, P., Lohfeld, L., & Tjam, E. (2001). Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life. *Leadership in Health Services, 14*, 9-15.
- Pallavi, M., & Kulkarni, P. (2013). A literature review on training & development and quality work life researcher's world. *Journal of Art Sciences & Commerce, 4*.
- Manoucheehr, M. (2013). Relative advantage of producing agricultural crops in Ardabil province (Iran). *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research, 13*(7).
- Mirsepasi, N. (2006). The mutual impact of productivity and QWL. *Economics and Management Journal, 17*.
- Nadler, D. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1983). Quality of work life: Perspective and direction. *Organizational Dynamics, 11*(3), 20-30.
- Nayeri, N. D., Negarandeh, R., Vaismoradi, M., Ahmadi, F., & Faghihzadeh, S. (2009). Burnout and productivity among Iranian nurses. *Nursing & Health Sciences, 11*(3), 263-270.
- Nayeri, N. D., Salehi, T., & Noghabi, A. A. A. (2011). Quality of work life and productivity among Iranian nurses. *Contemporary Nurse, 39*(1), 106-118.
- Rossmiller, R. A. (1992). The secondary school principal teachers' quality of life. *Educational Management and Administration, 20*, 132-146.
- Nair, S. (2013). A study on the effect of quality of work life on organisational citizenship behaviour. *Integral Review – A Journal of Management, 6*, 34-46.
- Schouteten, R. (2004). Group work in a Dutch home care organization: Does it improve the quality of working life? *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 19*, 179-194.
- Scobel, D. N. (1975). Doing away with the factory blue. *Harvard Business Review, 53*, 132-142.
- Sheel, S., Sindhwani, B. K., Goel, S., & Pathak, S. (2012). Quality work life employee performance and career growth opportunities: A literature review. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2*(2).
- Sirgy, J. M., Efraty, D., Siegal, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of QWL based on need satisfaction and spill over theories. *Social Indicators Research, 55*(4), 241-302.
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research, 55*, 241-302.
- Sornalatha, K. (2014). An analytical study of quality of work life of the middle level manages in service industries in Tamilnadu. *The International Journal of Management, 3*(1).
- Straw, R. J., & Heckscher, C. C. (1984). QWL: New working relationships in the communication industry. *Labor Studies Journal, 9*, 261-274.
- Turner, B. A., & Chelleadurai, P. (2005). Organization and occupational commitment, intention to leave and perceived performance of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management.*
- Turner, B. A., & Pack, S. (2007). Multi-dimensional commitment of intercollegiate student-athletes: Its effects on intention to leave and satisfaction. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education, 1*(2).
- Valarmathi, H., & Balakrishnan. (2013). Quality of work life in textile sector in and around Coimbatore District. *Journal of Business Management and Social Science Review, 2*(2).
- Van Laar, D., Edwards, J. A., & Easton, S. (2007). The work-related quality of life scale for healthcare workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 60*, 2007, 325-333.
- Walton, R. E. (1980). Improving the QWL. *Harvard Business Review, 19*(12), 11-24.
- Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). Trouble at Mill, "Quality of Academic work life issues within a comprehensive Australian University". *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(3), 279-294.
- Zare, H., Haghgooyan, Z., & Asl, Z. K. (2012). Determining and prioritizing the criteria and scales of quality of work life (QWF) by AHP method. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 27*(3), 346-359.