

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: A STUDY OF JAMMU UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Taranjit Rao*, R.S. Arora**, A. K. Vashisht***

*Assistant Professor, Commerce, SGGS College, Chandigarh, India.

**Department of Commerce, Punjab University, Patiala, Punjab, India.

***Professor and Chairman, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India.

Abstract Quality of work life (QWL) is a multifaceted concept implying concern for members of organization. Present research paper is an attempt to study QWL of teachers working at University of Jammu, Jammu. The study is based on primary data collected with the help of a questionnaire from 78 teachers working at the above mentioned university. The analysis has been done by classifying the teachers into various age, designation, teaching subject, and gender categories. The various tools used to reach the inferences include mean, weighted score, standard deviation, and chi-square.

Keywords: QWL, Jammu University Teachers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life (QWL) refers to how an individual perceives his or her work life. It encompasses various aspects of work life, i.e., work itself, working conditions, working skill, rewards—financial and otherwise. Thus it is a multifaceted concept implying concern for the members of the organization irrespective of the level they belong to. It is a continuous process of changing and improving the work climate so that the interface of people, technology and organization makes for a more satisfying work experience for employees and gives desired outcomes for the organization.

Although a good QWL helps all organizations to increase their performance/productivity irrespective of the sector they belong to, yet for the organizations in the service sector, it is more important because performance of the service organization is highly person-centric. A higher education institution is one such organization and the purpose of such institution is to provide relevant, accessible and quality education in cost effective manner. Performance of institutions in higher education is greatly dependent on the performance of teachers. A teacher is an instrument of transforming human resources into human capital. Teachers should experience high levels of quality of work life in order to realize their full potential and become an asset to the institution. Many researchers have explored QWL perceived by academia and its effects on their motivational level, leadership behaviour, and labour turnover.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Putt et al. (1980) discussed the quality of work life of professors in public administration from a job satisfaction perspective. Data were collected from the national universe of public administration from professors engaged in teaching and research. Nine independent variables were analyzed using bivariate and/or multivariate analysis in assessing their impact on professional role satisfaction. The results revealed that participation in policy formation had major impact on degree of job satisfaction of public administration professors. It was concluded that work load, individual position, organization policy, and autonomy had a great impact on quality of work life.

Lee Gim Wah (1996) investigated the relationship between motivational factors and satisfaction among secondary school teachers from eight out of the thirty two secondary schools in George Town, on the Island District of the state of Penang. Data was collected from 328 respondents using a bilingual structured questionnaire. Data were tested using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings indicated a positive and significant relationship between satisfaction and motivational factors but satisfaction generally did not differ between males and females. Gender only affected satisfaction with external motivators. There was no significant difference in satisfaction with internal motivation among the races, but the difference in satisfaction with external motivators was found to be significant among the various ethnic groups. No significant difference in satisfaction was observed among

teachers with different marital status and qualifications. The variance in satisfaction was significant & explained by both external and internal motivators but not by length of service and age. External motivators, however, appeared to be the best predictor of satisfaction.

Chao et al. (2005) investigated the relationship between perceived leadership behaviour of a principal and quality of work life (QWL) of teachers. All teachers in industrial vocational high school in Taiwan were surveyed to collect the data through structured questionnaires on the Leadership Behavior of a Principal and Quality of Work Life of Teachers. The data were analyzed by t-test, one-way ANOVA, Pearson product-moment correlation, and stepwise regression. The results highlighted that female respondents were significantly satisfied than male respondents in informal/material and informal/mental quality of work. Respondents with different teaching experiences were significantly different in relationship-oriented leadership behaviour. Task-oriented leadership behavior was significantly correlated with all components of quality of work life. Relationship-oriented leadership behaviour was significantly correlated with every component except informal/material quality of work life. The strongest correlation was found between task-oriented leadership behaviour and informal/mental quality of work.

Rama Devi (2006) studied job satisfaction of the teaching staff in the universities. Data were collected from 200 teaching staff - 100 members from University of Hyderabad, a Central University, and 100 members from Sri Krishnadevaraya University, a State University. The results showed that teaching staff in the University of Hyderabad were highly satisfied with their jobs when compared to the teaching staff in Sri Krishnadevaraya University. The teaching staff in both the universities were satisfied with the nature of their job dimension and least satisfied with the facilities provided to them. The results also revealed that average job satisfaction score and average score of needs met were significantly related in both the universities.

Ologunde et al. (2007) examined the phenomenon of labour turnover among university teachers in southwestern Nigeria. Data were collected from 442 teachers drawn from two federal and two state universities in the southwestern zone of Nigeria with the help of a structured questionnaire. The data collected from the survey were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics such as percentages, t-tests and two-way analyses of variance (ANOVA). The results showed that poor motivation affected labour turnover of the university teachers in southwestern Nigeria. The findings showed that the motivation strategies available for university teachers in Nigeria were inadequate for their continued stay in the university system. Economic incentives were found to be grossly inadequate for the retention of lecturers in the university system. It was therefore recommended that both economic and non-economic forms

of motivation be employed to keep the university teachers on their job. Similarly, there was a pressing need to make the environment of the universities more conducive for teaching and learning.

Kavalu (2009) measured QWL /Job satisfaction among the employees in personnel and administrative departments of Moi University. Data were collected with the help of a questionnaire from senior, middle, and junior staff of administrative departments in Moi University. It was found that senior management had no problem with benefits and allowances such as housing allowance, travelling allowance etc., but lower level employees got small amounts of these allowances. Though the working conditions were good, they were not optimal. Responses showed that employees in the lower level management had little opportunity to fully utilize their skills and knowledge. Findings revealed the presence of stress because of work overload, organization structure and role conflict between jobs and families. It was suggested that university should exploit the working conditions to gain competitive advantage.

Bharathi et al. (2010) described the various characteristics related to QWL and QWL in teaching environment and explored the association between the socio-economic variables and the various dimensions of QWL. The data were collected from teaching professionals of 12 self financing colleges under the affiliation of Bharathidasan University in Trichirappalli city, Tamilnadu, India, to find out the quality of work life. 239 teachers filled two questionnaires namely: Quality of Work Life Questionnaire and Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire. Researchers analyzed the data by Chi-square Test, t-test, ANOVA, Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation. Findings revealed that there was a significant association between quality of work life and quality of life in teaching environment. It showed that QWL of college teachers was at low level. There was no significant difference between sex, age, designation, income of the respondents, and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. There was significant difference between sex, professional membership, age of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. There was no significant difference between the various income levels, designation of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment.

The above review of literature on quality of work life focused on different dimensions such as amenities at work, participation in decision making, planning and policies, working conditions, supervision and management, communication, career advancement, job safety and security, compensation, recognition and praise, interpersonal relations, job stress, job enrichment, promotion and salary. Demographic variables such as age, experience, occupation, income, designation, marital status, and educational

qualification have been consistently followed by the researchers. In the light of above discussions, this research paper is an attempt to study the QWL of teachers teaching at Jammu University, Jammu.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To study the perception of faculty members regarding various dimensions of QWL.
- To find out the relationship between certain demographic variables and the levels of overall QWL.

3.1. Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested:

Ho1: There are no significant differences among faculty members of different age groups regarding their perception towards level of quality of work life.

Ho2: There are no significant differences among faculty members with different designations regarding their perception towards level of quality of work life.

Ho3: There are no significant differences among faculty members teaching different subjects regarding their perception towards level of quality of work life.

Ho4: There is no significant difference between male and female faculty members regarding their perception towards level of quality of work life.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The universe of the study comprises of permanent teachers from University of Jammu, Jammu. A sample of 78 permanent faculty members teaching in various departments of the University of Jammu has been selected using random sampling. They have been administered a self developed questionnaire. The initial section of the instrument seeks the information on personal variables: age, sex, marital status, highest degree attained, designation, teaching subject, and teaching experience in university. Second section has been devoted to fifteen broad dimensions

of quality of work life with sub factors namely salary (eight sub factors), other economic benefits (seven sub factors), fringe benefits (six sub factors), sitting arrangements (seven sub factors), teaching and research related arrangements (thirteen sub factors), general facilities (eleven sub factors), job related policies (seven sub factors), management practices (seven sub factors), administrative efficiency (seven sub factors), work related aspects (nine sub factors), work environment (eleven sub factors), interpersonal relations (seven sub factors), participation in decision making (three sub factors), contribution of university to society (five sub factors) and personal growth (six sub factors). Respondents have been asked to indicate their responses on a five point scale namely: Highly Satisfied, Satisfied, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied and Highly Dissatisfied (which were given weighted score of 5,4,3,2, and 1 respectively) in the present study. Third section deals with personal importance scale, i.e., weightage given by the respondents to every dimension out of 10 in terms of how important each dimension is for them in determining their quality of work life in the university. For analyzing the data, the respondents have been divided into various age, designation, teaching subject, gender, and experience categories. Following table provides the comprehensive profile of the surveyed respondents and are categorized according to their age, designation, teaching subject, and gender.

The perception of the university teachers have been analyzed in relation to age, designation, teaching subject, and gender. Age wise, the respondents have been categorized as A1 (age up to 35 years), A2 (age 36-45 years) and A3 (age above 46 years). The table reveals that maximum respondents fall in category A2 (48.7%) followed by category A3 (35.9%) and category A1 (15.4%). Designation wise, the respondents have been categorized as D1 (professor), D2 (associate professor), and D3 (assistant professor). The table reveals that maximum respondents fall in category D3 (39.7%), followed by category D2 (34.7%), and category D1 (25.6%). Teaching subject wise the respondents have been categorized as T₁ (sciences), T₂ (professional), and T₃ (social sciences). The table reveals that maximum respondents fall in category T₃ (50.0%), followed by category T₂ (25.6%), and category T₁ (24.4%). Further gender wise respondents have been

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents

Age (years)		Designation		Teaching Subjects		Gender	
Upto 35 (A1)	12(15.4)	Professor(D1)	20 (25.6)	Sciences(T1)	19 (24.4)	Male(G1)	42 (53.8)
36-45 (A2)	38(48.7)	Associate Professor(D2)	27 (34.7)	Professional (T2)	20 (25.6)	Female(G2)	36 (46.2)
Above 46 (A3)	28(35.9)	Assistant Professor(D3)	31 (39.7)	Social sciences(T3)	39 (50.0)		

Note: Figures in parenthesis denote percentage

categorized as G1 (male) and G2 (female). The table reveals that 53.8 percentage of respondents are male followed by females (46.2%).

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To find out the differences in the perception of teachers in relation to their age, designation, teaching subject and gender, mean scores have been calculated. With a view to find out the overall level of QWL of teachers of University of Jammu, the weighted scores and standard deviation have been computed.

No. of Respondents	Minimum Weighted Score	Maximum Weighted Score	Mean	Std. Deviation
78	552.00	3924.00	2512.76	673.48

Assuming a normal distribution of QWL scores, the procedure of taking half distances from the mean score for dividing the sample has been used. Thus a respondent whose QWL score falls between mean plus minus half standard deviation has been placed in the medium QWL group, a respondent with score mean minus half standard deviation or below has been put in the low QWL group and a respondent

whose score is mean plus half standard deviation or above has been classified in the high QWL group. In the present study, the weighted mean value of QWL scores has been found to be 2512.76 with a standard deviation of 673.48. Thus, mean plus half standard deviation equals 2849 and mean minus half standard deviation equals 2176. Therefore teachers whose scores were 2849 and above have been included in the high QWL and those whose scores are 2176 or less have been placed in the low QWL. The remaining teachers (with scores 2176 to 2849) have been grouped in the medium QWL.

The frequencies under each group are as follows:

Category	Number of teachers	Percentage of teachers
High QWL	27	34.6
Medium QWL	27	34.6
Low QWL	24	30.8
Sample Size	78	100

Majority (69 %) of teachers at university of Jammu have a medium to high QWL. Only 31 percent teachers have low QWL. In order to explore the relationship between personal variables and the overall level of quality of work life of teachers, the Chi Square test has been used.

Table 2: Overall Level of QWL Perceptions: Age-wise Distribution

Overall Level of QWL	A1		A2		A3		TOTAL	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
High	2	16.7	14	36.8	11	39.3	27	34.6
Medium	4	33.3	9	23.6	14	50.0	27	34.6
Low	6	50.0	15	39.4	3	10.7	24	30.8
Total	12	100.0	38	100.0	28	100.0	78	100.0

Chi-Square value = 10.618, Degrees of freedom = 4, Significant at 5 per cent significance level

The analysis shows that the calculated value of Chi-square is significant since it is more than the table value. It is evident from table 2 that there is a significant difference among

the teachers belonging to different age categories in their perception towards QWL. Hence null hypothesis Ho1 is rejected.

Table 3: Overall Level of QWL Perceptions: Designation-wise Distribution

Overall Level of QWL	D1		D2		D3		TOTAL	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
High	10	50.0	9	33.3	8	25.8	27	34.6
Medium	7	35.0	8	29.6	12	38.7	27	34.6
Low	3	15.0	10	37.1	11	35.4	24	30.8
Total	20	100.0	27	100.0	28	100.0	78	100.0

Chi-Square value = 4.605, Degrees of freedom = 4, Not Significant at 5 per cent significance level

The analysis shows that calculated value of Chi-square is not significant since it is less than the table value indicating that there is no significant difference in the level of QWL

amongst the respondents classified on the basis of teaching subject. Hence null hypothesis Ho3 is accepted.

Table 4: Overall Level of QWL Perceptions: Teaching Subject-wise Distribution

Overall Level of QWL	T1		T2		T3		TOTAL	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
High	5	26.4	10	50.0	12	30.8	27	34.6
Medium	7	36.8	5	25.0	15	38.4	27	34.6
Low	7	36.8	5	25.0	12	30.8	24	30.8
Total	19	100.0	20	100.0	39	100.0	78	100.0

Chi-Square value = 3.084, Degrees of freedom = 4, Not Significant at 5 per cent significance level

The analysis reveals that calculated value of Chi-square is not significant since it is less than table value indicating that there is no significant difference in the level of QWL among

the respondents classified on the basis of designation. Hence null hypothesis Ho2 is accepted.

Table 5: Overall Level of QWL Perceptions: Gender-wise Distribution

Overall Level of QWL	G1		G2		TOTAL	
	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%	Number of respondents	%
High	10	23.8	17	47.2	27	34.6
Medium	15	35.7	12	33.3	27	34.6
Low	17	40.4	7	19.4	24	30.8
Total	42	100.0	36	100.0	78	100.0

Chi-Square value = 5.888, Degrees of freedom = 2, Not Significant at 5 per cent significance level

The analysis depicts that the calculated value of Chi-square is not significant since it is less than the table value. It is clear from table 5 that there is no significant difference between the male and female teachers' perception towards QWL. Hence null hypothesis Ho4 is accepted.

FINDINGS

On the basis of fifteen dimensions of quality of work life (salary, other economic benefits, fringe benefits, sitting arrangements, teaching and research related arrangements, general facilities, job related policies, management practices, administrative efficiency, work related aspects, work environment, interpersonal relations, participation in decision making, contribution of university to society, and personal growth) taken for the present study, majority (about 69 %) of the respondents at university of Jammu have a medium to high QWL. Aged teachers (more than 45 years) have reported higher QWL as compared to their younger counterparts. There are no significant differences

in the level of QWL of university teachers on the basis of their designation, i.e., professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. University teachers have shown no significant difference in the level of QWL on the basis of teaching subjects namely sciences, professional, and social sciences. There is no significant difference in the level of QWL of university teachers on the basis of gender as well. Thus the entire null hypotheses except Ho1 stand accepted.

REFERENCES

- Bharathi, P. S., Umaselvi, M., & Kumar, N. S. (2010) Quality of Work Life: Perception of College Teachers. Retrieved from <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27868/>.
- Chao, C. Y., Huang, Y. L., & Lin, C. W. (2005). The Relationship between Leadership Behaviour of a Principal and Quality of Work Life of Teachers in an Industrial Vocational High School in Taiwan. A Paper Presented at International Conference on Education 'Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy and Practice

- Singapore. Retrieved from <http://conference.nie.edu.sg/paper/Converted%20Pdf/ab00352.pdf>.
- Devi, V. R. (2006). Job Satisfaction among University Teachers. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, October-December, 3(4), pp. 87-94.
- Dessler, G. (2004). *Human Resource Management*. Pearson Education.
- Kavalu, A. N. (2009). An Evaluation of Quality of Work Life in a University: A Case Study of the Administrative Department. Retrieved from ArticlesGratuits.com - Free Articles.
- Ologunde, A. O., Asaolu, A. O. & Elumilade, D. O. (2007). Labour Turnover among University Teachers in Southwestern Nigeria - Issues, Solutions and Lessons. Retrieved from www.pdfsearch.com/Labour-Turnover-Among-University-Teachers-In-Southwestern-Nigeria-issues.
- Putt, A. D., & Springer, J. F. (1980). Quality of Work Life among Public Administration Professors. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 2(2), pp. 225-246.
- Wah, L. G. (1996). *Relationship between Motivational Factors and Satisfaction among Teachers*. Master's Thesis, University of Utara, Malaysia.