QUALITY OF WORK LIFE (QWL) OF EMPLOYEES AFTER INTRODUCTION OF E-GOVERNANCE IN THE LOCAL BODIES OF NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT – AN ANALYSIS

K. Durga*   Dr. G. Rajendran

*Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Poompuhar College (Autonomous), Melaiyur, TamilNadu.
**Associate Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, Poompuhar College (Autonomous), Melaiyur, TamilNadu.

Abstract
Quality of Work Life of employees is one of the important factors for improving the productivity of employees in the local bodies for good governance. After implementation of e-governance in the local bodies, what is the degree of QWL of employees in the local bodies? To know the answer this question the study is conducted in Nagapattinam District. The result from this analysis various demographic factors and also implementation of e-governance impact the QWL of employees.

Keywords: Local body, E-governance, Quality of Work Life.

Introduction
Local bodies are the primary intuitions of local self-governance, which look after the administration of an area. Implementation of governing process in a manner essentially free of abuse and corruption and with due regards for the rule of law and also it refers participation, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision are necessary for good governance in the local bodies. In this regard the Central and State Government has initiatives electronic governance in all the government sectors.

Electronic Governance means the application of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the government process. It is the IT- shaped governance.   E-Governance is nothing but use of internet technology as a platform for exchanging information, providing services and transacting with citizens, businesses, and other arms of government.

The Quality of Work Life (QWL) has increased now a days through e-governance. It can reduce hardship of service delivery, reduction of occupational stress, development of employee skills and multiply productivity of employees, etc.,

Quality of Work Life (QWL) means the favourableness or unfavourableness of a total job environment of people. It is another way in which organizations recognize their responsibility to develop jobs and working conditions that are excellent for people as well as for economic health of the organisation. The major factors that influence the QWL are attitude, environment, opportunities, nature of job, people, stress level, career prospects, challenges, growth and development and risk involved and reward etc.

Review of Literature
M. Shamsul Haque (2002) has found e-governance has been useful for certain services enjoyed by the citizens. S.N. Sangita and Bikash Chandra Dasi (2005) has concluded e-governance has immense potentiality to promote efficient, effective, responsive and citizen – friendly services to the people and also corruption can be minimized to a large extent.

Rochita Ganguly (2010) suggested that the selected group of University employees perceived different aspects of their quality of work life as either uncongenial or they have had a certain amount of dilemma to comment on a few other aspects bearing the potential involving a slight trend of negative opinion.

Alireza Bolhari et al (2011) have suggested in their study the level of quality of work life is medium and needs managers' attentions to enhance. No significant relation was approved between gender and quality of work life, but relationships between quality of work life and age, work experience and income were approved.

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.

Statement of the Problem

For the improved services and efficient performance e-governance was introduced during the year 1998 in TamilNadu. In the local body administration also e-governance was adopted. How far the performances of the employees have been improved and the QWL prevailing after the introduction of e-governance are all unanswered questions today. To find out the answers to these questions the following objectives have been framed.

Objectives

- To analyse the factors relating to QWL of employees in the selected sample local bodies in the study area.
- To evaluate the impact of e-governance on the QWL of employees in the selected sample local body offices in the study area.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were framed and tested in this study.

- There is no relationship between the demographic variables of employees and QWL of employees in the local bodies of Nagapattinam district.
- Employees' QWL is not influenced by the implementation of e-governance in the local bodies of Nagapattinam district.

Methodology

The study is empirical in nature and hence survey method of study was adopted. Nagapattinam district has been identified and selected as the study area for conducting the research. Multi-stage random sampling has been used. From the sample local body offices 226 employees were taken as the sample respondents.

Both primary and secondary data were used. For collecting the primary data interview schedules were prepared and used. Certain relevant informations were collected from the records and registers of District Collectorate and also from the local body offices and Government websites in the form of secondary data.

The collected data were statistically analysed and tabulated with the help of SPSS. From the SPSS generated results the interpretation and inference were made properly. Percentage analysis, One-way ANOVA, Independent sample t-test, Correlation analysis and Reliability test have been used.

Analysis

Table 1.1, Independent sample T –Test for the demographic variables and QWL of employees

Demographic variables and QWL		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
										95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference		Lower	Upper
Gender	Equal variances assumed	16.364	.000	1.345	224	.180	37.307	27.741		-17.359	91.973
	Equal variances not assumed			1.250	135.261	.213	37.307	29.834		-21.695	96.309
Marital Status	Equal variances assumed	2.576	.110	3.319	224	.001	94.613	28.507		38.437	150.788
	Equal variances not assumed			3.466	140.690	.001	94.613	27.296		40.649	148.577
Terms of job	Equal variances assumed	39.689	.000	16.375	224	.000	399.841	24.417		351.725	447.958

	Equal variances not assumed			27.296	129.017	.000	399.841	14.648	370.859	428.823
Computer knowledge	Equal variances assumed	9.841	.002	-2.809	224	.005	-86.708	30.866	-147.531	-25.884
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.554	144.138	.001	-86.708	24.400	-134.936	-38.480

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level
Source: Computed from primary data

Table 1.2,ANOVA test for the demographic variables and QWL of employees

Demographic variables and QWL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Type of Local Body	Between Groups	215175.726	3	71725.242	1.796	.149
	Within Groups	8863987.549	222	39927.872		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Category of Job	Between Groups	5253429.183	2	2626714.592	153.110	.000
	Within Groups	3825734.091	223	17155.758		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Age	Between Groups	2358709.994	3	786236.665	25.972	.000
	Within Groups	6720453.280	222	30272.312		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Educational Qualification	Between Groups	1913425.464	4	478356.366	14.753	.000
	Within Groups	7165737.811	221	32424.153		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Family Members	Between Groups	42554.851	2	21277.426	.525	.592
	Within Groups	9036608.423	223	40522.908		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Monthly Salary	Between Groups	4629276.242	4	1157319.061	57.477	.000
	Within Groups	4449887.032	221	20135.235		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Work Experience	Between Groups	2133961.107	4	533490.277	16.976	.000
	Within Groups	6945202.167	221	31426.254		
	Total	9079163.274	225			
Level of computer knowledge	Between Groups	1227473.790	2	613736.895	15.714	.000
	Within Groups	6600518.652	169	39056.323		
	Total	7827992.442	171			
Years of experience in computer knowledge	Between Groups	1092566.296	3	364188.765	9.084	.000
	Within Groups	6735426.146	168	40091.822		
	Total	7827992.442	171			

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level
Source: Computed from primary data

Table 1.3, Correlation analysis for implementation of e-governance and QWL of employees

		Implementation of e-governance in the local bodies	Quality of Work Life of employees
Implementation of e-governance in the local bodies	Pearson Correlation	1	.148[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.026
	N	226	226
Quality of Work Life of employees	Pearson Correlation	.148[*]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	
	N	226	226
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Computed from the primary data

Findings and Discussions
The above table 1.1 and 1.2 shows that the significant values of most the demographic variables are less than the alpha value 0.05. So, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is relationship between the demographic variables of employees and QWL of employees in the local bodies of Nagapattinam district.

The table 1.3 shows that the correlation value is 0.148 and it is a positive correlation between these two variables. The significant value is 0.026 and it is less than the table value at 5% level. So, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, the QWL of employees is influenced by the implementation of e-governance in the local bodies of Nagapattinam District.

Conclusion
The introduction of technology in the Government Offices has been on the transition. Generally, the Government Offices were functioning with lesser number of employees than required. There has been monotony in the work of Government employees. There have been complaints, hues and cries about the attitude of Government employees toward the masses. The e-governance may be a cure for all these perils. The study in an attempt to portray the prevailing status of employees in the local bodies and this may open up new vistas for the formulation of Government polices pertinent to the procedure and implementation of welfare measures for the employees of the Government and also for modification of training methods for the employees in the Panchayats, Municipalities and Corporations who where hitherto not treated at par with the Government employees of other sectors.

Reference
1. Alireza Bolhari, Ali Rezaeean, Jafar Bolhari, Sona Bairamzdeh and Amir sultan, (2011), The Relationship between quality of work life and Demographic characteristics of Information technology Staffs, *International conference on computer communication and management,* Proc. Of CSIT Vol. 5, IACSIT press, Singapore pp 374-378.
2. 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
3. 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.
4. M. Shamsul Haque, (2002), E-Governance in India: its impacts on relations among citizens, politicians and public servants, International Review of Administrative Science, *IIAS, SAGE Publications,* Vol.68, pp. 231 – 250.
5. Rochita Ganguly (Mukherjee), (2010), Quality of work life and job satisfaction of a group of university employees, *Asian Journal of management Research,* pp. 209 – 216, ISSN: 2229-3795.
6. S. N. Sangita and Bikash Chandra Dasi, (2005), "Electronic governance and service delivery in India - theory and Practice", Institute for social and economic change.