

TITLE	FACTORS AFFECTING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND PERFORMANCE EFFICIENCY: A CASE STUDY OF FOOD FACTORY IN NAKORN RATCHASIMA PROVINCE
KEYWORD	QUALITY OF WORK LIFE, PERFORMANCE EFFICIENCY, JOB CHARACTERISTIC, TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP, PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT
STUDENT	PIYAMAPORN KOOKITTITRI
ADVISOR	ASSOC. PROF. PRAPHAN CHIKIDURAJAI
LEVEL OF STUDY	MASTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
FACULTY	GRADUATE COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT SRIPATUM UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC YEAR	2015

ABSTRACT

The independent research was designed to study personal factors, job characteristics, transformational leadership and perceived organizational support which affecting to quality of work life and factors of quality of work life affecting performance efficiency of employee in a food factory in Nakornratchasima Province. The sample were 91 persons by Taro Yamane's method. Data was collected through questionnaires that confidence (Reliability Coefficient) is equal to 0.93. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was utilized for data processing. Percentage, mean, standard deviation, the t-test, One-way ANOVA, multiple regression analysis and simple regression analysis were applied as the statistical analysis tools.

The findings were as follows:

1. The difference in of employees' gender, age and income has different in quality of work life with statistically significant at 0.05 level. The difference in of employees' position level and years of service has not different in quality of work life
2. There was a positive relationship with significant at .05 level among quality of work life, transformational leadership (X1) and perceived organizational support (X2). These predictors accounted for 67.8 percent of the variance. The equation derived from the analysis was as follows:

$$Y = -.109 + .103 (X1) + .814 (X2)$$

3. There was a positive relationship with significant at .05 level between performance efficiency and quality of work life (X1) These predictors accounted for 9.0 percent of the variance. The equation derived from the analysis was as follows:

$$Y = 3.025 + .272$$