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ABSTRACT
Quality of work life is an approach of work life that holds some principles like Job satisfaction, Trustworthiness, etc., towards the Organization. The objective of the study is to analyze the interrelationship between the quality of work life, Job satisfaction and Job Productivity among the employees of IT sector in Chennai region. A structured questionnaire have been used for primary data collection and the Secondary data are derived from the books, published articles and websites. KEYWORDS: Quality of work life, Job Satisfaction, Job Productivity

INTRODUCTION
Information technology industry is one of the important sectors which play a vital role in putting India on the global map. It also serves as a growth engine for the economy to increase the GDP and urban employment to achieve the vision of powerful India.

Quality of work life was first introduced during an international labor relations conference in 1972. QWL means favorable conditions prevailing in the work place which results in effective productivity of employees. It is essential for the smooth running and success of both the organization and the employees. It helps the employees to bring out good relationship between the worker and his environment. As QWL directly contributes towards the overall satisfaction and performance compatibility of employees at their individual and their organizational level the employers has to focus on the problems evolved while creating a human working environment. Skrovan (1980) describes QWL as a process of work organization which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organization’s environment methods and outcomes. This value based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals i.e., Enhanced effectiveness of organization and Improved QWL at work for employees. Job satisfaction and job productivity are some of the factors which are interrelated and interconnected. Some of the important variables which affect the quality of work life of the employees in IT sector are Family life, work life and social life of employees which must be properly balanced because these three are the divisions of human life.
QWL also redesigns the job by considering every human resource as valuable part of an organisation because the major strength of IT industry lies in the human resources who play an important role in their success. The IT sector provides a good QWL to make an employee satisfied and committed towards their work as their intellectual capacity serves as the capital for enhancing their growth. The QWL in IT industry greatly influences the satisfaction level, employee involvement, employee productivity and organisational commitment to a greater extent as compared to other industries. Akdere (2006), stated that based on the survey of working adults by New York Times (1998), 83% of working mothers and 72% of working fathers reported that they experienced conflicts between job demands and the desire to meet their families.

The Indian IT Scenario:
Indian IT continues to grow from strength to strength, witnessing high levels of activity - both onshore as well as offshore. Continuing pressure on cost bases at a time of growing competitiveness is driving companies to look at offshore outsourcing as a strategic alternative. Access to global talent, economies of scale, process engineering and enhancements, wage arbitrage, increased profit margins and improvements in quality are some of the gains that companies have realized. The following depicts the contribution of IT sector to GDP.

Some of the key drivers of the Indian IT-BPO industry include:
- Competitive pressures on client organisations.
- Ability of Indian vendor to ramp-up operations rapidly.
- Widening breadth of services.
- Shift towards high-value services.
- Sustained cost advantage-In spite of the rising elements of cost, Indian offshore operations provide cost savings of 40-50 percent.
- Delivery process enhancement and improvement.
- Access to an abundant skill pool-India has the largest English speaking IT talent pool in the world over.

The present research examines the relationship between QWL with job satisfaction and job productivity as the employee retention and attrition rates are higher in the IT sector. The HR manager in the knowledge based industry have multi task responsibility as they have to maintain the pool of talent people, which is essential for the growth of this sector.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**
1. To examine the level of employees QWL, job satisfaction and job productivity in IT industry.
2. To elicit the impact of QWL on job satisfaction and job productivity.

**LIMITATIONS**
The research is restricted to the women employees in IT sector of Chennai region only.
1. Personal bias of the respondents might influence the answers given by them.
2. Certain information which was confidential was not given to me.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**
A descriptive design has been adopted for this study. The population of the study included 125 women employees of IT sector in Chennai region. The samples were selected using stratified random sampling technique, to whom structured questionnaires were circulated for primary data collection.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25yrs – 30yrs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31yrs – 35yrs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36yrs – 40yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41yrs – 45yrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46yrs &amp; above</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inference:**
The above table infers that majority of 46% of the respondents are within the age group of 25yrs – 30yrs and only 6% of the respondents fall under the age group of 36yrs – 40yrs and 41yrs – 45yrs.
Table: 2
Experience of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Age</th>
<th>No.of.Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1yr</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1yr – 5yrs</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yrs – 10yrs</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10yrs – 15yrs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15yrs &amp; above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
The above table shows that 44% of the respondents are having 1yr – 5yrs of experience and only 5% of the respondents are having above 15yrs of experience.

Table: 3
Promotional policies are transparent & fair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Age</th>
<th>No.of.Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
The above table shows that majority of 32% of the respondents are satisfied and minimum of 10% are highly dissatisfied with the promotional policies.

Table: 4
Grievance handling procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Age</th>
<th>No.of.Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference:
The above table shows that majority of 26% of the respondents are Dissatisfied and only 21% of the respondents are highly satisfied with the grievance handling procedures followed in IT sector.
Table: 5
To find the significant difference between Income & Workload

Null Hypothesis (H0):
There is no significant difference between Income and Workload

Alternate Hypothesis (H1):
There is significant difference between Income and Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>WORKLOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculated Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Tabulated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2 = \frac{\text{(Observed - Expected)}^2}{\text{Expected}}$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rows (R-1)</td>
<td>5-1= 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns (C-1)</td>
<td>5-1=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOF – 4 * 4= 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result:
The above table shows that with 16 DOF, at 5% level of significance, Calculated value (28.114) > Tabulated value (26.296). Hence, the alternate hypothesis is accepted. Therefore it states that Income and Workload are dependent on each other.

Table: 6
To find the significant difference between marital status and Flexible working hours

Null Hypothesis (H0):
There is no significant difference between Income and Workload

Alternate Hypothesis (H1):
There is significant difference between Income and Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Flexible Working Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree of freedom | Calculated Value | Level of Significance | Tabulated Value
---|---|---|---
Rows (R-1) 5-1=4 | 42.97 | 5 | 26.296
Columns (C-1) 5-1=4 | DOF – 4 * 4= 16

**Result:**
The above table shows that with 16 DOF, at 5% level of significance, Calculated value (42.97) > Tabulated value (26.296). Hence, the Alternate hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Therefore it states that marital status and Flexible Working system are dependent on each other.

**Table: 7**
To find the relationship between Experience and Working Conditions

**Null Hypothesis H0:**
There is no significant difference between Experience and Working conditions.

**Alternate Hypothesis H1:**
There is a significant difference between the Experience and working conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X1^2</th>
<th>X2^2</th>
<th>X3^2</th>
<th>X4^2</th>
<th>X5^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Total number of items
N=25
Correlation factor (CF) = \frac{\sum x^2}{N} = \frac{1252}{25} = 50.88.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variables</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between the samples</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>V1 = C-1 5-1 = 4</td>
<td>216 / 4 = 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the samples</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>V2 = N – C 25 – 5 = 20</td>
<td>518 / 20 = 25.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 54/25.9 = 2.08
Calculated value = 2.08
Tabulated value = (V1=4, V2=20) Level of significance = 5% = 0.05
Therefore, Tabulated value = (4, 20) (0.05) = 2.87

**Inference:**
Since calculated value (2.08) < Tabulated value (2.87), Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference between experience and working conditions in the organization.

The variables used to measure the quality of work life in an organization:
• **Job Involvement:**
  It represents the amount of an individual’s involvement in the job. An individual spends more time and energy on the job based on the importance of the job in his life. Therefore, people with high job involvement are better motivated and more productive.

• **Job satisfaction:**
  Job satisfaction is the emotional response to a job situation which can be determined by how well outcome meet or exceed expectations. Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. Job satisfaction leads to increased productivity, positive attitude, decreased turnover and less absenteeism.

• **Sense of competence:**
  Sense of competence refers to the feelings of confidence that an individual has in his own competence. When an employee feels more competent he becomes more involved in his job and becomes better motivated.

• **Job performance:**
  Performance is what one person can make and he can make it a distinguished performance. It is the core objective of the organization because it increases the efficiency of the worker which maximizes his productivity at minimized cost.

• **Productivity:**
  Productivity is usually interpreted as an indicator of efficiency and it is viewed as the principal source of improving the living standards. The decline in productivity leads to decline in the technical ability of an employee.

**CONCLUSION**

The study focused on analyzing the impact of Quality of work life on the Job satisfaction and productivity of the employees in IT sector in Chennai region. Quality of work life is a positive attitude of every employee towards the organization and its values. As they give a powerful contribution to a company’s competitive position, they are recognized as an important asset more than any other variable. Chennai is the Hub for IT for its talented workforce and availability of resources. It has been found that the variable such as working conditions, work load, compensation, Grievance handling procedures, promotional policies, etc., has high level of satisfaction except flexible working system. Hence it is recommended that necessary steps be taken to provide flexible working hours which will enhance the satisfaction level and the productivity of the employees.
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