From Working Conditions to Well-Being: Ranking the Drivers of IT Employee Satisfaction

This study aimed to investigate the dimensions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) among IT employees and to identify which factors are prioritized by employees when assessing their work life. The research was conducted with 1,030 IT employees, using a Friedman test to determine whether there were significant differences in the mean ranks of various dimensions of QWL.

Key Findings:

The Friedman test results indicated that there was no significant difference between the mean ranks of different QWL dimensions, suggesting that employees, in general, perceive these factors as equally important. However, there were variations in the relative importance placed on different dimensions, which were ranked as follows:

1. WorkingConditions(WCS):

Employees rated working conditions as the most important factor in their overall QWL, with a high mean rank of 5.22. This emphasizes the significance of a comfortable and supportive work environment, including physical workspace, tools, and the overall organizational infrastructure.

2. JobandCareerSatisfaction(JCS):

Closely following working conditions, employees ranked job and career satisfaction with a mean rank of 4.77. This factor indicates that employees place high value on job satisfaction, opportunities for career growth, and alignment with their professional goals.

3. HomeWorkInterface(HWI):

Employees gave considerable importance to the home-work interface, with a mean rank of 4.22. This suggests that achieving a balance between professional responsibilities and personal life is a key concern for IT professionals, particularly in today's increasingly flexible work environments.

4. ControlatWork(CAW):

The control at work dimension, which measures the degree of autonomy employees feel they have in their roles, was ranked with a mean score of 4.04. This reflects that employees value the ability to make decisions and exercise control over their work tasks and processes.

5. GeneralWell-Being(GWB):

Employees placed slightly less emphasis on their general well-being, giving it a mean rank of 3.72. While important, this dimension—encompassing factors like physical health, mental health, and overall well-being—was ranked lower than more work-specific factors like working conditions and job satisfaction.

6. StressatWork(SAW):

The stress at work factor was ranked 3.11, indicating that while stress management is a concern, it was not considered as pressing as other factors in determining overall QWL.

7. EmployeeEngagement(EEE):

Finally, employee engagement within the organization received the lowest mean rank of 3.07. While engagement remains a critical factor for organizational success, employees seemed to rate it slightly lower compared to the other more immediate and tangible worklife factors.

Interpretation:

The findings suggest that IT employees, as a group, prioritize working conditions and job satisfaction more highly than factors like stress management or employee engagement. The importance of home-work interface highlights the growing trend of flexible work arrangements and the need for employees to maintain a work-life balance. Control at work also plays a significant role in job satisfaction, as employees desire autonomy in their roles.

The lower ranking of stress at work and employee engagement could suggest that while these are important, they may not be the immediate concerns for employees in the context of their daily working environment. Employees may view stress as something that can be managed with good working conditions or job satisfaction, while engagement might be viewed as an outcome of these other factors.

Conclusion:

This study provides valuable insights into the relative importance of various QWL dimensions among IT employees. Organizations aiming to improve employee well-being and retention should focus on enhancing working conditions, fostering job and career satisfaction, and promoting a healthy home-work interface. By addressing these key areas, employers can create a more supportive and engaging work environment, ultimately improving overall employee satisfaction and performance.

Dimensions of QWL	Mean Rank	Chi-Square value	P value
General Well Being	3.72		
Home Work Interface	4.22		
Job and Career Satisfaction	4.61		
Control at Work	4.04	847.533	<0.001**
Working Conditions	5.22		
Stress at Work	3.11		
Employee Engagement	3.07		

Note: ** Denotes significant at 1% level