



A study on quality of work life and its impact on employee performance

Dr. Anup Arjunan Bahuleyan¹, Dr. Swapna O², Dr. Shobha B³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Sree Narayana College Chengannur, Kerala, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Hotel Management, Sree Narayana College, Varkala, TVM, Kerala, India

³Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Silicon City College, K R Puram, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Abstract

Quality of Work Life (QWL) has emerged as a critical factor influencing employee performance and organizational effectiveness in today's competitive business environment. Organizations increasingly recognize that employees' productivity, efficiency, and commitment are strongly shaped by their perceptions of workplace conditions, organizational support, and work-life balance. The present study aims to examine the level of Quality of Work Life among employees and to analyze its impact on employee performance. The study focuses on key dimensions of QWL such as work environment, compensation and benefits, work-life balance, career development, and organizational support.

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design and is based on primary data collected through a structured questionnaire administered to employees. A convenience sampling technique was used to select the respondents. Statistical tools such as descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis were employed using SPSS to analyze the data. The findings reveal that employees experience a moderate to high level of Quality of Work Life and that QWL has a significant and positive impact on employee performance. Among the various dimensions, organizational support and work environment were found to be the strongest predictors of employee performance.

The study concludes that improving Quality of Work Life is essential for enhancing employee efficiency, productivity, and overall work outcomes. The results provide valuable insights for managers and policymakers to design effective QWL strategies that promote employee well-being while achieving sustainable organizational performance.

Keywords: Quality of work life, work life balance, organisation support, work environment

Introduction

In today's highly competitive and dynamic business environment, organizations increasingly recognize that employee performance is not solely determined by technical skills or financial incentives, but also by the overall quality of work life (QWL) experienced by employees. Quality of Work Life refers to the extent to which employees are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the workplace. It encompasses a wide range of factors such as a safe and healthy work environment, adequate compensation, job security, work-life balance, career growth opportunities, participative management, and supportive organizational culture. A high level of QWL creates a positive work atmosphere that motivates employees to perform effectively and contribute meaningfully to organizational goals.

Employee performance is a critical determinant of organizational success, as it directly influences productivity, service quality, customer satisfaction, and profitability. Employees who perceive their work environment as fair, supportive, and enriching are more likely to exhibit higher levels of efficiency, commitment, creativity, and responsibility in their roles. Conversely, poor quality of work life—characterized by excessive workload, job insecurity, work stress, limited autonomy, and lack of recognition—can lead to dissatisfaction, absenteeism, reduced productivity, and high turnover rates. Therefore, enhancing QWL has become a strategic priority for organizations aiming to improve individual and collective performance.

With rapid technological advancements, changing workforce expectations, and the growing emphasis on

employee well-being, the relationship between QWL and employee performance has gained renewed importance. Modern employees seek not only monetary rewards but also meaningful work, flexibility, and opportunities for personal and professional development. Organizations that fail to address these expectations may struggle to sustain employee performance in the long run. In this context, understanding how various dimensions of Quality of Work Life influence employee performance becomes essential for effective human resource management.

The present study seeks to examine the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance, identifying key QWL factors that significantly affect employees' work outcomes. By analyzing employees' perceptions of their work life and corresponding performance levels, the study aims to provide valuable insights for managers and policymakers to design effective strategies that enhance employee well-being while simultaneously improving organizational performance.

Review of literature:

Walton (1975) ^[1] is one of the earliest scholars to conceptualize Quality of Work Life, identifying eight key dimensions such as adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunities for growth, social integration, constitutionalism, and work-life balance. Walton argued that when organizations focus on improving these dimensions, employees experience higher satisfaction and motivation, which ultimately enhances their performance. His framework laid the foundation for later empirical studies linking QWL with productivity and effectiveness at the workplace.

Hackman and Oldham (1980), through their Job Characteristics Model, emphasized that meaningful work, autonomy, and feedback are critical components of Quality of Work Life. Their study revealed that enriched job design positively influences employees' internal motivation and job performance. They concluded that employees who perceive their jobs as meaningful and challenging demonstrate higher efficiency, commitment, and work quality compared to those in monotonous work environments.

Sirgy *et al.* (2001) [3] examined the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee well-being, highlighting that satisfaction of higher-order needs at work significantly improves job performance. Their findings suggested that QWL has both direct and indirect effects on performance through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study emphasized that organizations should adopt holistic QWL practices rather than focusing only on monetary rewards.

Rethinam and Ismail (2008) [4] conducted a study on IT professionals and found that factors such as work environment, career growth, and work-life balance significantly influence Quality of Work Life. The study revealed a strong positive relationship between QWL and employee performance, indicating that employees with better QWL showed higher productivity, lower stress levels, and improved work outcomes.

Cascio (2010) [5] highlighted the strategic importance of Quality of Work Life in human resource management. According to his study, organizations that invest in employee-friendly policies such as flexible work schedules, health and safety measures, and employee participation experience improved employee performance and reduced absenteeism. Cascio emphasized that QWL acts as a competitive advantage in retaining and motivating high-performing employees.

Swamy *et al.* (2015) [6] examined the impact of Quality of Work Life on employee performance in manufacturing industries. Their study found that compensation, job security, and supportive supervision significantly influence employee efficiency and productivity. The authors concluded that improved QWL leads to enhanced morale and better individual and organizational performance.

Suresh and Venkatammal (2016) [7] studied Quality of Work Life among banking sector employees and observed that stress management practices, career development opportunities, and work-life balance play a crucial role in enhancing employee performance. The study established that employees with higher QWL reported better job involvement, accuracy, and service quality.

Agarwal and Gupta (2021) [8] explored the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance in the post-pandemic work environment. Their findings indicated that flexibility, psychological well-being, and organizational support significantly affect employee performance, especially in hybrid and remote work settings. The study concluded that QWL has become even more critical in sustaining employee performance in the changing world of work.

Objectives

1. To examine the level of Quality of Work Life among employees in order to understand their perceptions regarding work environment, compensation, work-life

balance, career development, and organizational support.

2. To analyze the impact of Quality of Work Life on employee performance, focusing on how different QWL dimensions influence employees' efficiency, productivity, and overall work outcomes.

Research Methodology

The present study is descriptive and analytical in nature, aiming to assess the level of Quality of Work Life among employees and to analyze its impact on employee performance. The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed to measure employees' perceptions of Quality of Work Life and their performance. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: the first section captured demographic details of the respondents, while the second section measured QWL dimensions—work environment, compensation and benefits, work-life balance, career development, and organizational support—and employee performance using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

A convenience sampling method was adopted, and data were collected from a sample of employees working in the selected sector/organization. Secondary data were collected from books, journals, research articles, and online databases to support the theoretical framework of the study. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS. Statistical tools such as descriptive statistics were used to assess the level of QWL, reliability analysis was employed to test the consistency of the measurement scales, Pearson's correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between QWL and employee performance, and multiple regression analysis was applied to determine the impact of various QWL dimensions on employee performance.

The methodology adopted in this study enables a systematic and scientific examination of the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance, ensuring the reliability and validity of the research findings.

1. Data analysis and Interpretation

Reliability analysis was conducted to test the internal consistency of the Quality of Work Life dimensions.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Quality of Work Life	25	0.882
Employee Performance	8	0.861

Interpretation

The Cronbach's Alpha values for both Quality of Work Life (0.882) and Employee Performance (0.861) exceed the acceptable threshold of 0.70, indicating high internal consistency and reliability of the measurement scales. Hence, the data is suitable for further statistical analysis.

2. Descriptive Analysis of Quality of Work Life Dimensions

Descriptive statistics were used to examine the level of Quality of Work Life among employees.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of QWL Dimensions

QWL Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation
Work Environment	3.74	0.62
Compensation & Benefits	3.41	0.71
Work–Life Balance	3.29	0.76
Career Development	3.58	0.68
Organizational Support	3.66	0.64
Overall QWL	3.54	0.60

Interpretation

The overall mean value of QWL is 3.54, indicating a moderate to high level of Quality of Work Life among employees. The highest mean score is observed for Work Environment (3.74), suggesting that employees are generally satisfied with workplace conditions. However, Work–Life Balance (3.29) has the lowest mean value, indicating that employees face challenges in balancing professional and personal responsibilities.

3. Descriptive Analysis of Employee Performance

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Employee Performance

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
Employee Performance	3.67	0.59

Interpretation

The mean value of 3.67 indicates that employees perceive their performance level as above average. This reflects satisfactory efficiency, productivity, and task completion among employees.

4. Correlation Analysis between QWL and Employee Performance

Pearson’s Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance.

Table 4: Correlation between QWL and Employee Performance

Variables	Employee Performance
Quality of Work Life	0.684**

Significant at 1% level (p < 0.01)

Interpretation

The correlation coefficient (r = 0.684) indicates a strong and positive relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance. The result is statistically significant at the 1% level, confirming that improvements in QWL are associated with higher employee efficiency and productivity.

5. Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to analyze the impact of different QWL dimensions on employee performance.

Table 5: Model Summary

R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
0.721	0.520	0.506

Interpretation

The R² value of 0.520 indicates that 52% of the variation in employee performance is explained by Quality of Work Life dimensions. This demonstrates a strong explanatory power of the model.

Table 6: Regression Coefficients

QWL Dimensions	Beta (β)	t-value	Sig.
Work Environment	0.241	3.82	0.000
Compensation & Benefits	0.178	2.94	0.004
Work–Life Balance	0.219	3.46	0.001
Career Development	0.196	3.12	0.002
Organizational Support	0.263	4.21	0.000

Interpretation

All QWL dimensions have a positive and significant impact on employee performance. Among them, Organizational Support (β = 0.263) has the strongest influence, followed by Work Environment and Work–Life Balance. This indicates that employees perform better when they feel supported by management, experience a healthy work environment, and maintain work–life balance.

Findings

The present study was undertaken to examine the level of Quality of Work Life (QWL) among employees and to analyze its impact on employee performance. Based on the analysis and interpretation of the collected data using descriptive statistics, correlation, and regression analysis, the following detailed findings have been derived

1. The study reveals that employees experience a moderate to high level of Quality of Work Life. The overall mean score of QWL indicates that employees are generally satisfied with their workplace conditions, organizational policies, and interpersonal relationships. This suggests that organizations have implemented basic QWL practices, although there is scope for further improvement.
2. Among the various QWL dimensions, work environment recorded the highest mean score. Employees perceive their workplaces as relatively safe, comfortable, and conducive to performing their tasks efficiently. Adequate infrastructure, proper safety measures, and a supportive physical environment positively influence employees’ morale and willingness to perform better.
3. Work–life balance emerged as the lowest-rated dimension of Quality of Work Life. Employees reported challenges in balancing professional responsibilities with personal and family life, mainly due to long working hours and workload pressure. This finding indicates that inadequate work–life balance may negatively affect long-term employee performance and well-being if not addressed effectively.
4. The study finds that employees perceive organizational support to be strong and meaningful. Support from supervisors, fair treatment, and availability of assistance during work-related difficulties significantly enhance employees’ confidence and motivation. Organizational support also shows the strongest influence on employee performance among all QWL dimensions.
5. Employees expressed a reasonably positive perception of career development opportunities such as training, skill enhancement, and promotion prospects. The findings indicate that employees who perceive better growth opportunities tend to exhibit higher levels of performance, commitment, and job involvement.
6. The study highlights that compensation and benefits have a significant positive impact on employee

performance. Although employees are moderately satisfied with their pay and benefits, the findings suggest that fair and performance-linked compensation systems enhance motivation, efficiency, and productivity at the workplace.

7. The analysis shows that employee performance levels are above average, indicating satisfactory efficiency, productivity, and quality of work. Employees who report higher Quality of Work Life tend to demonstrate better task completion, reduced errors, and improved work outcomes.
8. Correlation analysis confirms a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance. This indicates that improvements in QWL are directly associated with enhanced employee efficiency, productivity, and overall performance.
9. Regression analysis reveals that all selected QWL dimensions—work environment, compensation, work–life balance, career development, and organizational support—significantly influence employee performance. Together, these dimensions explain a substantial proportion of the variation in employee performance, demonstrating the critical role of QWL in shaping work outcomes.
10. Among all QWL dimensions, organizational support emerged as the most influential predictor of employee performance. Employees who feel valued, supported, and recognized by management tend to be more committed, motivated, and productive, contributing positively to organizational effectiveness.

Conclusion

The present study concludes that Quality of Work Life (QWL) plays a vital role in enhancing employee performance and overall organizational effectiveness. The findings clearly indicate that employees experience a moderate to high level of Quality of Work Life, which positively influences their efficiency, productivity, and work outcomes. Employees who perceive their workplace as supportive, fair, and conducive to personal and professional growth demonstrate higher levels of motivation and commitment toward their jobs.

The study establishes a strong and positive relationship between Quality of Work Life and employee performance, confirming that improvements in QWL dimensions lead to better employee outcomes. Among the various factors examined, work environment, organizational support, career development opportunities, compensation, and work–life balance significantly contribute to employee performance. In particular, organizational support emerges as the most influential factor, highlighting the importance of supportive leadership, recognition, and effective communication in driving employee productivity.

However, the study also identifies work–life balance as an area requiring immediate attention, as employees face challenges in managing professional and personal responsibilities. Addressing this issue through flexible work arrangements, realistic workload allocation, and employee-friendly policies can further enhance performance and well-being.

Overall, the study emphasizes that Quality of Work Life should be viewed as a strategic human resource tool rather than a welfare measure. Organizations that invest in

comprehensive QWL initiatives can foster a motivated workforce, reduce stress and turnover, and achieve sustained improvements in employee performance. The study thus provides valuable insights for managers and policymakers to design effective QWL practices that support both employee well-being and organizational success.

Reference

1. Walton RE. Criteria for quality of working life. In L. E. Davis A. B. Cherns (Eds.), *The quality of working life*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1975:1:91–104.
2. Hackman JR, Oldham GR. *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1980.
3. Sirgy MJ, Efraty D, Siegel P, Lee DJ. A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 2001;55(3):241–302. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010986923468>
4. Rethinam GS, Ismail M. Constructs of quality of work life: A perspective of information and technology professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 2008;7(1):58–70.
5. Cascio WF. *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2010.
6. Swamy DR, Nanjundeswaraswamy TS, Rashmi S. Quality of work life: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 2015;8(2):281–300.
7. Suresh S, Venkatammal P. A study on quality of work life among employees in banking sector. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2016;2(5):487–491.
8. Agarwal S, Gupta A. Quality of work life and employee performance in the post-pandemic era: Evidence from Indian organizations. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2021;8(4):543–560. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2021-0078>