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Abstract: The success of any organization depends on many factors like how it recruits, motivates appraises retain its employees. Employees are internal Brand Manager who markets the organizations to attract internal customers that is the prospective employee. The hard truth is that in the modern era Quality of Work Life (QWL) has taken a back seat since most of the employees are expected to work even more harder. Research shows that in an developed county the employees expected to work for 12 to 15 hours a day as compared to 8 to 9 hours and such kind of trend is quite distressing. There has been a metamorphic changes occurring around the world with the advent of Information Technology which has contributed to the economy of the country and has given lot of employment opportunities hence the concept of Quality Work life has even more has become evident in this particular industry. In this paper we have tried to access that does QWL have any effect on job Performance. We collected a sample of IT Professionals and did a survey to find out the relationship between QWL and job performance.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The concept “quality of work life” was first introduced in 1972 during an international labor relations conference. It received a lot of attention after United Auto Workers and General Motors initiated a QWL program for work reforms for employee’s. Further more there were many studies conducted in this particular area. Many studies showed significant relationship between QWL and job satisfaction and Job performance. Rice [1] stated that there is a relationship between work satisfaction and Quality of People’s lives. He suggested that when it comes to work experiences the results can affect a person’s general quality of life, both directly and indirectly which can be seen clearly their effects on family relationship, and levels of health and energy and their general health in totality. Parus [2] stated that Work-life balance majorly affects five key areas: employee time saved, employee attrition, increased motivation and productivity; absenteeism, and decreased health care costs and stress-related illnesses which could be a major concern. In this literature it also gives insight that when there is lack of balance between work and non-work activities there are chances that the employees’ psychological and physical well-being get reduced as said by Sparks et al [3] Javermppa and Eloranthay [4] in his research stated that when work associated with much task variety, task prudence and skill development opportunities then it promotes the competency development among the workforce. There are various kinds of work, which are inherently interesting and provide many opportunities for competency development which in turn enhances Quality of Work Life.

The dimensions to Job Performance are Efficiency and Effectiveness. The competitiveness of an organization requires dynamic focus to ensure that employees are motivated enough to score high on performance. The new
market conditions demand high degree of dynamism in work performance which requires highly intensive work system and a great QWL

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Some of the foremost famous organizations of the earth practiced QWL in their organizations successfully. This success stories area unit brought out by variety of the authors. Robert F. Craver [5] stated in his study “American phonephone & Telegraphs (AT&T) Quality of labor Life Experiment – A sensible Case Study” and R.H. Guest [6] in his study on “Quality of labor Life- Learning from Terrytown” brings out glimpses of AT&T and Terrytown. S.K. Karala and S. Ghosh [7] in their article on “Quality of labor Life-Some Determinants” ana
yses various elements of QWL. K.C.D’Souza [8] in his article on QWL, his biological process viewpoint refers to quality of labor life as associate developing construct with innumerable new areas happening in it from time to time. C.L. Cooper [9] particularly talks concerning varied factors that influence quality of labor lifetime of managers in his

A. Job Performance

When researchers studied magnitude of job performance, they often measure or calculate job performance using one-sided supervisor ratings. Given that individual job performance is a multifaceted and a very complex structure it cannot be captured with such subjective assessments, therefore we included objective indicators of performance for the following reasons: First, rewards and recognition research highlights the effectiveness of an organizations objective performance measures in guiding employee behavior as the role expectations are clearly defined by Spreitzer [10] Second, objective was job performance measures limit both intentional and unintentional biases that occur in the process of performance evaluation. Mustapha et al [11]

B. Models of Job Performance

Many studies have examined the multidimensional and complex structure of "job performance". Among which the most acceptable theories are working performance given by JP Campbell [12]. He describes the work as a performance variable individually Campbell came up with a general model of individual differences in performance which in a time period became very influential. In his model, Campbell segregated the performance components (e.g., job specific task proficiency), determinants of job performance components and predictors of these determinants. Performance is what one person can make and he can make it a distinguished performance. Campbell et al have identified 8 major dimensions of performance: (1) specific tasks the job skills, (2) tasks non specific job skills, (3) tasks of writing and oral communication, (4) demonstrating effort; (5) maintaining personal discipline, (6) facilitation of pair and team performance, (7) supervision and (8) management and administration. In this and leadership skills, performance of the employee, lost time, turnover rate during training, promotion and satisfaction level of employees. Hunter & Hunter [13] in his research stated that lot of characteristics that might predict future job performance. List that includes past performance relative to the position currently held complete knowledge about the post, psychomotor skills, cognitive skill, social and attitude on post such as the need for learning, enthusiasm, and to control stress. Viswesvaran et al., [14] identified 10 dimensions of work performance: (1) overall
performance, (2) work performance or productivity, (3) quality (4) leadership, (5) communication skills (6) administrative powers (7) effort (8) interpersonal competence, (9) knowledge of the post (10) compliant or accepting authority. Witt et al. [15] identified 11 dimensions: quality of work, amount of work, self initiative, and good communication with customers, planning intrinsically, commitment towards the organization, job proficiency, allocation of job, interpersonal orientation, and self-determination and funds management. Literature survey tries to encompass many other factors, besides those which are mentioned above; organizational citizenship behavior refers behaviors that exhibit beyond the skills required by tasks as said by Organ [16]. Others pointed out the difference between task performance and contextual performance. Performance that takes the weight is defined by those compartment cares are formally recognized as part of the job and contribute directly or indirectly organizations technical basis. Contextual performance can be noted as behaviors that exhibit those behaviors that do not directly provide technical support activities, but rather the organizational surroundings, social and psychological as technical work is conducted (Motowidlo et al., Borman et al [17]. One more research developed for the US Navy by Murphy [18]. This model proposed classification of Job performance and this model has had a significantly broader outlook and breaks performance into only four dimensions namely task-oriented behavior, interpersonally oriented behavior, down-time behavior and destructive/ hazardous behavior. In addition to these models dividing performance into variables, others have identified various types of behavior making up performance.

![Fig.1 Conceptual Framework of QWL and Job Performance Conceptual Model and Hypothesis](image-url)
As it is shown in fig.1, the conceptual framework for the current research on quality of work is derived from Walton’s model. As defined by Walton quality of work life is an organization's ability to meet the individual essential needs. In his study he has mentioned. Eight dimensions of quality of work life on Walton's approach are presented, here by which includes (a) Adequate and fair compensation (b) Safe and healthy environment (c) Growth and security (d) Development of human capabilities (e) The total life space (f) Social integration (g) Constitutionalism and (h) Social relevance.

III. OBJECTIVES

The study focuses on following research questions: (i) Does QWL have any effect on Job Performance (ii) Which factors of QWL majorly contributes to Job Performance (iii) Does a positive correlation exists between QWL and Job performance

IV. RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

The research method used in the research was descriptive – correlation and its goal are to be applicable. From data point of view it is quantitative

V. SAMPLING

The study was undertaken on IT professionals working in Delhi NCR and Bangalore Region. The total sample size was 253 IT professional from the middle level cadre

VI. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The questionnaire was designed under three heads namely parts - Demographic details, Quality of Work Life (QWL), Job performance (JP). QWL questionnaire was based on the survey instrument of Russell Consulting Inc., (2005) which mostly covers the QWL components of Walton (1975). To measure the Job performance the instrument developed by the University of New Hampshire was used. The respondents were told to respond to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed on each item, the 5 point Likert scale is employed in the measurement of all the scales.

*Instruments for measuring (scales):* The research tool is a questionnaire consisted of two parts: Questionnaire based on QWL developed by Russel Consulting Inc and to determine the Job Performance developed by University of New Hampshire questionnaires’ reliability, the Cronbach’s Alfa technique was used and for its reliability

VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Respondents Profile

Respondent’s profile give an overview of respondents surveyed. The majority of respondents in this study were male as much as 63%. Most of the respondents was in the age group of has aged 25-30 years, close to 33%. Respondent’s characteristics by education shows that majority of respondents in this study were bachelor. Experience of
respondents indicated that majority of respondents in this study have a service life were having 2 to 6 years to experience as close to 46%. Maximum number of respondents were Post graduates as much as 52, Most of the employees take under survey were permanently employed and their stay with the current organization for at least two years.

B. Statistical population description

KMO & Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity is a measure of sampling adequacy that is suggested to identify the case to variable ratio for the analysis being conducted. In most academic and business studies, KMO & Bartlett’s test play an important role for accepting the sample adequacy. While the KMO ranges from 0 to 1, the world-over accepted index is over 0.6. Also, the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity relates to the importance of the study and thereby shows the validity and suitability of the responses collected to the problem being addressed through the study. For Factor Analysis to be recommended suitable, the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity must be less than 0.05. In my research the KMO value for QWL and Job Performance both had value above .6. Hence Factor analysis was not recommended.

C. KMO and Bartlett's Test of QWL Variables

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity were used to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis. The result of QWL variables was .902 as shown in Table 1.

D. KMO and Bartlett's Test of Job Performance Variables

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity were used to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis. The result of Job Performance variables was .730 as shown in Table 2.

E. Testing the hypothesis

In order to check the hypothesis we used the correlation test to measure the relationship between the variables. Results showed (Table 3 & 4) that there is a positive relationship between quality of work life and Job Performance, thus in this case the main thesis of the study is proved. The findings also proved that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between Participative Decision making, Nature of work, Rewards and Recognition, Work environment, Managerial Relationship, Performance enhancement with Job Performance.

VIII. THE RESULTS OF THE HYPOTHESES TESTS

Discussion

This research tried to find out the level of QWL and examine the impact of quality of work on Job Performance among information technology employees. Seven hypotheses were developed to test the hypotheses using Pearson tests. Of the seven hypotheses, all the seven were supported with data.

H1: There exists a positive relationship between QWL and Job Performance

The positive relationship between QWL and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.54, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). There has been researches wherein proved that a strong QWL in organization has a significant impact on Job Performance. As per these finding the first hypothesis has been proved wherein when organization take good measures to improve QWL the job Performance in return also improves.
H2: There is a significant relationship between Participative Decision making and Job Performance
There is a significant relationship between Participative Decision making and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.48, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). Researchers have showed Participation in decision making in organization results in much greater satisfaction of employees and increases their productivity and profit of the organization, and an increase in productivity and profit. It empowers the employer to achieve which in return empowers the employee to give his best.

H3: There is a significant relationship between Nature of Work and Job Performance
There is a significant relationship between Participative Decision making and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.47, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). The poor performance of the employees in organizations depends mainly on individual intention to work and give his full strength to organization to boast its performance and improve the results of those that are relating directly and indirectly to different people and organization and ultimately country economic state (Ryan et al., [19]. Nature of work and goals setting can enhance not only the level of performance but also can increase the satisfaction and the quality of performance as by Garg & Rastogi [20].

H4: There is a significant relationship between Rewards and Recognition and Job Performance
There is a significant relationship between Reward and Recognition and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.48, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). Entwistle [21] stated in his research that when an employee performs successfully, it leads to organizational rewards and as a result they are motivated to perform better. Most of the organizations require their employees to work according to the rules and regulations, and job standards. There has been researches conducted to find the relationship between reward and individuals were focused to increase the performance of employees as by Ciscel [22].

H5: There is a significant relationship between Work environment and Job Performance
There is a significant relationship between Reward and Recognition and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.48, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). A work environment can be defines as comprising many characteristic factors company culture, management styles, organisational hierarchies and human resources policies. With a great work environment and resources, an employee will be enabled. To give his best performance and engage him in to give in maximum contribution. Enablement has two key components:
1. Optimized roles. Employees are placed quite aligned with their positions, such that their skills and abilities are effectively put to good use.
2. Supportive environment. Work environment are structured to facilitate, rather than hinder, individual productivity. Employees should have the essential resources required to get the job done.
H6: There is a significant relationship between Managerial Relationship and Job Performance

There is a significant relationship between Managerial Relationship and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.49, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). Managerial relationship plays a very important role in enhancement performance of the employees Elangovan and Xie[23] stated in his research that perception of supervisors has an effect on many employee outcomes related to production. The supervisor is responsible for making sure that the work performed by subordinates effectively adds to the productivity of the organization. Therefore, if the employees are not able to perform duties somewhere the supervisor or the manager is responsible. Trust factor plays an important role for the relationship building which helps in the intentional increase in the duties and responsibilities of the employee. Elmuti [24] stated that when allowing the employees to enable them to perform duties a level of control and authority within an organization improves both individual motivation and organizational productivity.

H7: There is a significant relationship between Work Itself and Job Performance

There is a significant relationship between Managerial Relationship and Job Performance is supported by data (PC = 0.52, Sig. =0.000, p<0.05). This Hypothesis gave the highest correlation amongst all the factors of QWL, being one of the major determinants of QWL it encompasses various variables like challenging job, skills and abilities, right and adequate information, and task significance. The job which is interesting and full of challenges and provides status and pride makes the employee happy and increases his performance which helps him to develop multi skill.

IX. CONCLUSION

The purpose of study was to investigate the relationship between participative decision making, rewards recognition on employee, work environment, nature of job, managerial relationship and job itself. It was also found that QWL is positively and significantly related to employee job performance which in turn affects the organizational performance. It thus implies that if an organization has good QWL policies and system the sustainability and attrition can be managed well. The results are quite according to our hypotheses. Our research shows that all the variables of QWL have a significant relationship with job performance. However, this research was targeted to middle level managers. QWL factors may not be important to non-managerial and operational level where satisfying the basic needs, good wage system, and financial benefits still exist.

X. LIMITATION

The limitations for this study must also be stated. The data has been collected in Delhi-NCR and Bangalore region. Taking a wider area could have produced different results as it might vary from place to place. The number of female respondents in our study is less; also the sample size selected for the study is relatively small. There were number of respondents who refused to share their data. The sample is not representative of whole of the country. The technique of research used is survey design, had a comprehensive and more elaborate methods of data analysis were used for the analysis of quantitative data the results could be more generalizable.
REFERENCES


### APPENDIX

#### TABLE 1
**KMO AND BARTLETT’S TEST OF QWL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>0.902</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2
**KMO AND BARTLETT’S TEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</th>
<th>0.73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 3
**CRONBACH’S ALPHA TESTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Investigated dimensions</th>
<th>No of questions</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participative Decision making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rewards and Recognition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Managerial Relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performance Enhancement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge and Skill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
**CORRELATION ANALYSIS**
**THE RESULTS OF THE HYPOTHESES TESTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Job Performance, QWL</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Participative Decision Making, Job Performance</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Nature of Work, Job Performance</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Rewards and Recognition, Job Performance</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Work Environment, Job Performance</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Managerial Relationship, Job Performance</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Work Itself, Job Performance</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Positive correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>