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Abstract--- The management of those employees is the most important part of every manager’s job. Particularly, it is the specialized responsibility of the Human Resource Department of the organisation to manage its employees. In the search of improved productivity, innovation and quality enhancement, organizations are alike to determining the contribution of quality of work life. The main objective of this paper is to assess the influence of quality of work life in software industry, Bangalore. Data were collected from 100 respondent through questionnaire survey method. ANOVA were performed to analyze the data.

I. INTRODUCTION

The success of any business or industry is reliant upon its employees and they are the major components. A growing number of companies recognize that employees are more likely to choose a firm and stay there if they believe that it offers a high quality of work life (Shafi and Sritharan[1]). An employee turnover has found that “A high quality of work life is related to job satisfaction, which in turn is a strong predictor of absenteeism and turnover” (Hom and Griffeth[2]). It can also be said that it is appraisal of how safe and satisfied employees are in their jobs.

Quality of work life represents concerns for the human dimensions at work. It is the overall satisfaction derived by the people from their work. It also depicts a combination of these real concerns for human values in today’s society with awareness that all individuals devote the greater part of their mature lives to work, expending time, energy and physical and mental resources to this venture. It recognizes that work is the chief determinant of an individual’s freedom, growth and self-respect as well as their standard of living. Society has begun to comprehend that human resource refers to the only remaining plentiful natural resources and that both the individual and the society are capable of benefit from the full utilization.

Quality of work life entails the design of work systems that enhance the work life experiences of organizational members, thereby improving their commitment and motivating them to achieve organizational goals. Most often, this has been implemented through the design of jobs that afford workers more direct control over their immediate work environment. Campion and McClelland[3], in their work on interdisciplinary examination of the costs and benefits of enlarged jobs, say that “a firm’s investments in improving the quality of work life also pay off in the form of better customer service”. According to Lloyd et al[4], “Quality of work life is the degree to which members of a work organization are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organization”.

The main objective of the study is to assess the level of quality of work life existing in software industry in Bangalore.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Torbert[5] has studied the experimental selection process for a collaborative organization and established that participative decision making processes have been employed in the start-up of new settings which have taken a quality of work life approach to organization design. The author suggests that participative decision making process is the key for better quality of work life.

Lawler[6] in his study on measuring the psychological Quality of working life, proposes the effects of quality of work life, which include not only satisfaction, but also attitudinal and behavioral consequences. The author develops this view and adds employee’s attendance, physical and mental health, self-esteem, and personal and job related developments which are the main features of quality of work life in any organization.

Veronica et al[7]. has examined the effectiveness of a collaborative selection procedure employed by a new organization within the context of a quality of work life programme. The research is conducted in a new medical products plant. The organization since its inception has been specifically designed to accommodate ideas which are associated with attempts to improve the quality of work life. Features comprise plant layout, autonomous work groups, management training, application of participative management, and job enrichment.

III. METHODOLOGY

William and Zikmund[8] articulate that research design is a master plan specifying the methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing the needed information. There are numerous ways to study and undertake a research problem. This research on quality of work life comes under the category of descriptive study. Especially analyzing the quality of work life among software industry in Bangalore. The data were
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collected from 100 employees. ANOVA were performed to analyse the data.

The main variable in this study is Quality of work life and it has been measured by eight dimensions. They are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, growth and development, relation with other jobs, social assimilation, welfare activities, work itself and societal relevance.

IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Income is an important variable that determines an individual’s life style. Many studies have proved this result. However, the influence of income on quality of work life is very important wherein the research studies are very few. In order to find out the influence of income on different factors of quality of work life, ANOVA was performed and the results are shown in the below table. It is noted that income significantly influences all the factors of quality of work life (QWL), except growth and development.

With regard to adequate and fair compensation, income has significant result (F = 17.694; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ in their opinion about adequate and fair compensation. In order to check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees who earn Rs.30001 to Rs.40000 (mean = 4.32; SD = 0.80) significantly differ from others. As far as safe and healthy working condition is concerned, income has significant outcome (F = 9.280; p < 0.001). That is, employees in this industry differ based on their income level towards safe and healthy working condition. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees whose income is between Rs.30001 and Rs.40000 (mean = 3.99; SD = 0.20) significantly differ from other employees.

Regarding growth and development, income does not have any significant result (F = 1.128; p = 0.33). With reference to relation with other jobs, income has significant outcome (F = 13.448; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ with respect to their income towards relation with other jobs. That is, employees with different income groups do not have similar attitude towards relation with other jobs. In order to check the differing persons, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees who earn below Rs.10000 (mean = 3.68; SD = 0.84) significantly differ from employees who earn Rs.10000 to Rs.20000 (mean = 3.23; SD = 0.57) and Rs.30001 to Rs.40000 (mean = 3.30; SD = 0.71).

Table 1: Employees opinion on Factors of Quality of Work Life – Monthly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Monthly Income (Rs.)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Rs.10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Rs.10001-Rs.20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Rs.20001-Rs.30000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Rs.30001-Rs.40000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and Fair Compensation</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>17.69**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Healthy Working Condition</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>9.28**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with Other Jobs</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>13.44**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assimilation</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>7.35**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Activities</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>14.12**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>31.67**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Relevance</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>9.97**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life (overall)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>5.03**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 1% level.

As far as social assimilation is concerned, income has significant impact (F = 7.354; p < 0.001). That is, employees differ based on their income towards social assimilation of the organization. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees whose income is Rs.30001 to Rs.40000 (mean = 3.35; SD = 0.82) significantly differ from the employees whose income bracket is Rs.10001 to Rs.20000 (mean = 3.23; SD = 0.37). Regarding welfare activities, income has significant outcome (F = 14.128; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ with respect to their income towards their opinion about welfare activities followed in their organization. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees who earn Rs.30001 to Rs.40000 (mean = 4.11; SD = 0.55) significantly differ from other income categories of employees.

With respect to work itself, income has significant result (F = 31.687; p < 0.001). That is, based on the income, employees differ in their opinion towards work performed and the result shows that the employees whose income is Rs.20001 to Rs.30000 (mean = 4.08; SD = 0.59) significantly differ from the employees who earn less than Rs.10000 (mean = 3.46; SD = 0.46) and Rs.10000 to Rs.20000 (mean = 3.87; SD = 0.49).

As far as societal relevance is concerned, income has significant outcome (F = 9.972; p < 0.001). That is, employees differ based on their income towards societal relevance of the organization. To verify the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was applied and the result portrays that the employees who earn Rs.20001 to Rs.30000 (3.75; SD = 0.53) significantly differ from the employees whose income is less than Rs.10000 (mean = 3.43; SD = 0.79) and Rs.10000 to Rs.20000 (mean = 3.48; SD = 0.63).
VI. QUALITY OF WORK LIFE VS AGE

The employees’ opinion on various factors of quality of work life based on their age. With regard to adequate and fair compensation, age has significant result (F = 22.741; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ in their opinion about adequate and fair compensation. In order to check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 4.092; SD = 0.844) significantly differ from other age groups.

As far as safe and healthy working condition is concerned, age has significantly vary at 1% (F = 52.721; p < 0.001). That is, employees in this software industry differ based on their age towards safe and healthy working condition. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was applied and the result presents that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 (mean = 3.920; SD = 0.427) significantly differ from the employees who are below 30 years (mean = 3.007; SD = 0.855) and 41 to 50 years (mean = 3.61; SD = 0.760).

Regarding growth and development, age has significant result (F = 31.522; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ with respect to their age towards elevation and development of employees. Our result is also in line with the research conducted by Terek9.

** Table 2: Employees opinion on Factors of Quality of Work Life - Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Below 30</th>
<th>30 – 40</th>
<th>41 – 50</th>
<th>Above 50</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and Fair Compensation</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.390 .963</td>
<td>4.092 .844</td>
<td>3.731 .628</td>
<td>3.134 .365</td>
<td>22.741**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and Healthy Working Condition</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.026 1.051</td>
<td>3.920 .427</td>
<td>3.613 .760</td>
<td>3.810 .375</td>
<td>52.721**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Development</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.007 .855</td>
<td>3.666 .636</td>
<td>3.518 .664</td>
<td>3.307 .427</td>
<td>31.522**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with Other Jobs</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.528 .893</td>
<td>3.414 .558</td>
<td>3.605 .545</td>
<td>3.104 .717</td>
<td>5.744**</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assimilation</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.073 .622</td>
<td>3.595 .337</td>
<td>3.477 .527</td>
<td>3.274 .450</td>
<td>42.371**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Activities</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.519 .615</td>
<td>3.989 .519</td>
<td>3.583 .878</td>
<td>3.151 .119</td>
<td>36.091**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.717 .497</td>
<td>4.184 .546</td>
<td>3.695 .433</td>
<td>3.466 .437</td>
<td>48.458**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Relevance</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.216 .510</td>
<td>4.024 .372</td>
<td>3.320 .625</td>
<td>3.512 .332</td>
<td>120.212**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work Life (overall)</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>3.335 .571</td>
<td>3.861 .426</td>
<td>3.568 .583</td>
<td>3.345 .313</td>
<td>43.294**</td>
<td>&lt;0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level

In order to check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was used and the result depicts that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 3.666; SD = 0.636) significantly differ from the employees who are below 30 years (mean = 3.007; SD = 0.855) and above 50 years (mean = 3.307; SD = 0.427).

With regard to relation with other jobs, age has significant outcome (F = 5.744; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ with respect to their age towards relation with other jobs. That is, employees of all age groups do not have similar attitude in having relation with other jobs. In order to check the differing age groups, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result gives that the employees in the age group of 41 to 50 years (mean = 3.605; SD = 0.545) significantly differ from the employees whose age is above 50 years (mean = 3.104; SD = 0.707).

As far as social assimilation is concerned, age has significant result (F = 42.371; p < 0.001). That is, employees differ based on their age towards social assimilation of the organization. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was applied and the result divulges that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 (mean = 3.595; SD = 0.337) significantly differ from the employees who are below 30 years (mean = 3.073; SD = 0.622) and above 50 years (mean = 3.274; SD = 0.450).

Regarding welfare activities, age has significantly differ (F = 36.091; p < 0.001), which means that the employees vary with respect to their age towards their opinion about welfare activities followed by their organization. To check the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was used and the result shows that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 3.989; SD = 0.519) significantly differ from other age groups.

With regard to the work itself, age has significant result (F = 48.458; p < 0.001). That is, based on the age, employees differ in their opinion towards their work. In order to check the differing age group, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was performed and the result shows that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 4.184; SD = 0.372) significantly differ from the employees whose age is below 30 years (mean = 3.717; SD = 0.497).

As far as societal relevance is concerned, age has significant outcome (F = 120.212; p < 0.001). That is, employees differ based on their age towards societal relevance of the organization. To verify the mean difference, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was applied and the result gives that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 4.024; SD = 0.372) significantly differ from all other age groups.
Overall score for quality of work life is calculated based on all the factors. In order to check the overall quality of work life based on the age, ANOVA was used and the result shows a significant outcome (F = 43.294; p < 0.001), which means that the employees differ with regard to their age towards quality of work life. In order to find out the differentiating group, post-Hoc Bonferroni test was conducted and the result shows that the employees in the age group of 30 to 40 years (mean = 3.861; SD = 0.426) significantly differ from all other age groups. Tenning's findings is also supported our results.

VI. CONCLUSION

It could be concluded from the above results that the employees as far as income is concern, who earn above Rs.20000 per month have better quality of work life compared to others. However, organization should give importance to their employees who earn less than Rs.10000 because the mean score is found to be less than that of others except in one aspect, i.e. relation with other jobs.

As far as employees age factor is concern, it could be concluded that the employees who are in the age group of 30 to 40 have better quality of work life compared to others. However, organizations should give importance to their employees whose age is below 30 years to improve their quality of work life in software industry.
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