



A STUDY ON E-GOVERNANCE INFLUENCES ON THE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE (QWL) OF EMPLOYEES WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LOCAL BODIES OF NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT

K. Durga* Dr. G. Rajendran**

*Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Poompuhar College (Autonomous), Melaiyur, Tamil Nadu.

**Associate Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, Poompuhar College (Autonomous), Melaiyur, Tamil Nadu.

INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) refers to the favourableness or unfavourableness of a total work environment of employees. QWL means having good supervision, good working conditions, good pay and benefits and an interesting, challenging and rewarding job. In work place for improving the working system the following measurement criteria of QWL is important which are i) Adequate Income and Fair Compensation, ii) Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, iii) Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, iv) Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, v) Social Integration in the Work Organisation, vi) Constitutionalism in the Work Organisation, vii) Work and the Total Life Space and viii) Social Relevance of Work Life.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Hanita Sarah Saad et al. (2008) have found the salary perceived, support of colleagues, satisfaction with the administration, works and non work conflict have been proven to directly affect or are predictive of job satisfaction, financial rewards and fringe benefits like medical coverage would likely contribute to their level of job satisfaction.

Mohammed J Almalki et al (2012) have mentioned in their study family needs of employees, working hours, autonomy of practice, management and supervision, professional development opportunities, working environment, attitudes of public towards employees and salary are important factors to assess the QWL.

Ali Mohammed Mosadeghrad (2013) has found the factors to measure the level of QWL of employees are pay, benefits job promotion and management support, job proud, job security and job stress.

Gayathri, R and Lalitha Ramakrisnan (2013) have identified the factors of QWL of employees such as the work place setting, intervening policy factors and psychology of employees that the work process of employees.

Hajieh Rajabi Farjad and Shahrnaz Varnous (2013) have taken us the QWL factors are salary and allowances, health security and work conditions, growth opportunities and future development, balance between work and other life aspects, cooperation and significant social aids, social cohesion in work, development of human capabilities.

OBJECTIVES

- To study the E-governance influences on the Quality of Work Life of employees in the Local bodies of Nagapattinam District.
- To make related findings and suggestions

HYPOTHESIS

The following null hypothesis was framed and tested for analyzing this study and the hypothesis has more sub hypotheses.

- Quality of work life of employees is not influenced by the implementation of e-governance in the local bodies of Nagapattinam District.

METHODOLOGY

The study discusses the e-governance influences on the QWL of employees in the Local bodies of Nagapattinam District. The study is empirical in nature and further survey method has been adopted. Multi-state random sampling has been adopted for the study purpose. Nagapattinam District has been selected as a study area and 226 employees of local bodies in the study area have been taken as sample respondents. For this study purpose primary data and secondary data have been used. Interview schedules were prepared and used for the collecting the primary data. Records of the local bodies and Government websites were used for collecting the secondary data. The collected data were analysed and interpreted properly with the help of SPSS. Percentage analysis, One-way ANOVA, Independent sample t-test, Correlation analysis and Reliability test were used as the statistical tools for analysing the study.



ANALYSIS

Table 1.1, ANOVA test for implementation of e-governance and QWL of employees in the local bodies of Nagapattinam District

E-governance measurements and QWL of employees		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Punctuality of service	Between Groups	1639756.608	4	409939.152	12.178	.000
	Within Groups	7439406.667	221	33662.474		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Time taken to finish the work	Between Groups	1276334.425	4	319083.606	9.037	.000
	Within Groups	7802828.850	221	35306.918		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Service Quality	Between Groups	440509.629	4	110127.407	2.817	.026
	Within Groups	8638653.646	221	39088.931		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Service Quantity	Between Groups	2400332.758	4	600083.189	19.857	.000
	Within Groups	6678830.517	221	30220.953		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Customer delight	Between Groups	614767.196	4	153691.799	4.013	.004
	Within Groups	8464396.078	221	38300.435		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Work involvement	Between Groups	371969.964	4	92992.491	2.360	.054
	Within Groups	8707193.310	221	39399.065		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Career Growth	Between Groups	1601586.443	4	400396.611	11.834	.000
	Within Groups	7477576.832	221	33835.189		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Training for e-mode services	Between Groups	402261.766	4	100565.442	2.561	.039
	Within Groups	8676901.508	221	39261.998		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Reduction of Stress	Between Groups	4895410.623	4	1223852.656	64.648	.000
	Within Groups	4183752.652	221	18931.007		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Reduction of paper work	Between Groups	3475887.071	4	868971.768	34.273	.000
	Within Groups	5603276.204	221	25354.191		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Transparency	Between Groups	682412.426	4	170603.106	4.490	.002
	Within Groups	8396750.849	221	37994.348		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Recovery of mistakes	Between Groups	2154051.632	4	538512.908	17.185	.000
	Within Groups	6925111.642	221	31335.347		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Data searching	Between Groups	737629.942	4	184407.486	4.886	.001
	Within Groups	8341533.332	221	37744.495		
	Total	9079163.274	225			

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Source: Computed from the Primary data

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

From the above table the significant values are less than the alpha value 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, the Quality of Work Life (QWL) of employees is influenced by the implementation of e-governance in the local of bodies of Nagapattinam District. It indicates the most of the e-governance variables which are punctuality of service, time taken to finish the work, service quality, service quantity, customer delight, career growth, training for e-mode services, reduction of



stress, reduction of paper work, transparency, recovery of mistakes and data searching are highly influencing the QWL of employees in the local bodies in the study area.

CONCLUSION

The study is related to the e-governance influence on the QWL of local body employees in Nagapattinam District. From the findings the QWL of employees is influenced by the implementation of e-governance in local bodies. Local bodies are the first institution to serve the people and the employees are very important for serving the citizen effectively in the local bodies. Hence, if the QWL of employees is improved the performance of employees will also improve. Through the e-governance the Government to Government G2G, Government to Employees G2E and Government to Citizens processes are improved and e-governance is playing a major role in the local bodies. The implementation of e-governance in the local bodies has given a great impact on the employees QWL. Proper training, infrastructural facilities related to the e-governance, proper work system to the employees in the online will help to improve the QWL of employees in the local bodies.

REFERENCE

1. Hanita Sarah Saad, Ainon Jauhariah Abu Samah and Naurita Juhdi, (2008), Employees' Perception on Quality of Work life and Job Satisfaction in a private Higher learning Institution, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 4, No.3, June 2008, pp. 23 – 34.
2. Mohammed J Almalki, Gerry FitzGerald, Michele Clark, (2012), quality of work life among primary health care nurse in the Jazan region, Saudi Arabia: A cross-sectional study, *Human Resource for Health*.
3. Ali Mohammad Mosadeghrad, (2013). Quality of working life: An antecedent of employee turnover intention, *International Journal of Health policy and Management*, 2013, 1 (X), pp. 1 – 10, <http://ijhpm.kmu.ac.ir>.
4. Gayathiri, R and Dr. Lalitha Ramakrishanan, (2013), Quality of work life – Linkage with job satisfaction and performance, *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, Vol. 2, Issue 1, January 2013, pp. 01 – 08, ISSN: (online) 2319-8028, ISSN: (Print) 2319-801X.
5. Hajieh Rajabi Farjad and Shahrnaz Varnous, (2013). Study of Relationship of Quality of work life (QWL) and organisational commitment, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research Business*, Institute of interdisciplinary Business research, January 2013, pp. 449 – 456, ijcrb.webs.com.