



Measurement of quality of work life- a comparative study

Dr. Geetha M L

Professor

Department of Commerce

Govt. First Grade College, Kavoore, Mangalore, India.

ABSTRACT

Managing Human resource in an organisation is gaining importance day by day. Quality of work life of the employees is one of the important factors in deciding whether Organisation is providing Employee friendly working condition. Quality of work life is gaining importance during present post COVID period. In this paper an effort is made to understand and measure different factors influencing Quality of work life of the teaching professionals working in Government, Private Aided, Private unaided & Autonomous Degree Colleges.

Key words: Quality of work life, Government, Private Aided, Private Unaided, Autonomous.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work- life is a qualitative concept influenced by different factors. This study tries to measure the quality of work- life of teaching professionals in First Grade Colleges in Dakshina Kannada district. The present study makes use of Work-Related Quality of Life scale containing 24 questions developed by Simon Easton and Darren Van Laar (2012) to measure the different factors influencing the quality of work- life. Two reasons for selecting this questionnaire are that this scale was developed recently, and therefore is suited to present working conditions. Secondly, this scale has been tested on 3792 teaching professionals and found to be of high level of construct reliability. A first order confirmatory factor analysis was found a good fit for a six- factor model. Thus, six factors were considered to measure the quality of work- life, viz., GWB (general well- being), HWI (home-work interface), JCS (job and career satisfaction), CAW (control at work), WCS (working conditions), and SAW (stress at work). GWB includes both physical health and psychological well- being. HWI addresses work- life balance and work- family conflicts of the employees. JCS represents sense of achievement, high self- esteem, and fulfillment of potential. CAW focuses on level at which an employee thinks he can exert his influence on decisions, which he thinks affect them at the job. WCS tries to understand the resources and working conditions, which makes employees happy and secure at the workplace. SAW discusses employee's perception about excessive pressure at work.

II. Objectives of the Study

The central purpose of the research is to study the quality of work- life among teaching professionals in Degree Colleges of Dakshina Kannada district located in the southern coastal belt of Karnataka, India. The specific objectives of the study are:

- 1) To measure the quality of work- life of teaching professionals;
- 2) To assess the quality of work- life of teaching professionals;
- 3) To offer recommendations and suggestions for improving the quality of work- life among teaching professionals.

III. Research Methodology

This study is mainly based on the primary data collected from the respondents with the help of a structured questionnaire for the purpose of the present research and also from secondary data.

The required data for the research was collected through an empirical survey by personally administering the questionnaire. The stratified sampling technique was used for the present study. The respondents consisted of 520 teaching professionals in Government, Private Aided, Private Unaided, and Autonomous First Grade Colleges working in different positions like Principals, Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Guest Faculty in the Dakshina Kannada District of State of Karnataka, India.

Secondary sources of data such as books, periodicals, and journals as well as internet sources like ProQuest, EBSCO, JSTOR, Sage Publications, and Emerald Publications were referred to along with published data from the University Grants Commission, Mangalore University, Department of Collegiate Education, and college souvenirs of Degree Colleges of Mangalore for the purpose of study.

Respondents are asked to rate each factor based on the five- point Likert rating scale from strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, and strongly disagree=1. Individual factor scores are calculated by taking the average of the item score contributing to the respective factor. The respondents are requested to answer all questions.

The interpretation quality of work- life is drawn based on the mean value as shown below. If

Mean value is < 3 =Low

Mean value is $3 > 4$ = Average

Mean value is > 4 = High

To study the existence of significant differences among employees of different types of educational institutions mean, standard deviation, median, and Factor analysis test was applied to measure and find the effect of the six factors of quality of work- life. The

Kruskal- Wallis test was used to compare the score.

IV. MEASUREMENT OF DIFFERENT FACTORS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF THE RESPONDENTS

The study tries to measure six factors of quality of work- life viz., GWB (general well- being), HWI (home-work interface), JCS (job and career satisfaction), CAW (control at work), WCS (working conditions), and SAW (stress at work). There are 24 questions in this scale. The results of the research analysis is as follows.

MEASUREMENT OF GENERAL WELL- BEING OF THE RESPONDENTS

In order to measure the general well- being of the respondents, six questions were asked regarding their sense of feeling well, feeling of happiness and unhappiness, and satisfaction in life.

Table-1: Measurement of general wellbeing of the respondents

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Media n	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
I feel well at the moment	Government	1 0.8%	5 3.1%	24 16.2%	100 66.9%	20 13.1%	3.8	0.69	4.00	2.680	3	0.44
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	7 4.6%	26 16.2%	102 63.1%	23 14.6%	3.85	0.78	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	5 3.8%	31 23.8%	78 60.0%	14 10.8%	3.75	0.76	4.00			
	Autonomous	2 2.3%	4 4.6%	21 26.2%	36 45.4%	17 21.5%	3.79	0.91	4.00			
	Total	7 1.5%	21 4.0%	102 20.6%	316 58.8%	74 15.0%	3.82	0.79	4.00			
Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed	Government	12 7.7%	39 26.2%	23 15.4%	62 41.5%	14 9.2%	2.82	1.15	4.00	10.701	3	0.13
	Private Aided	1 0.8%	26 16.2%	38 23.8%	68 42.3%	27 16.9%	2.57	0.98	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	6 4.6%	32 24.6%	37 28.5%	42 32.3%	13 10.0%	2.44	1.06	3.00			
	Autonomous	06 7.7%	17 21.5%	14 17.7%	34 42.3%	09 10.8%	1.45	1.15	4.00			
	Total	25 5.2%	114 22.1%	112 21.3%	206 39.6%	63 11.7%	2.68	1.10	4.00			
I am satisfied with my life	Government	7 4.6%	13 8.5%	15 11.5%	90 60.0%	23 15.4%	3.73	0.98	4.00	1.980	3	0.576
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	9 5.4%	26 16.5%	95 59.2%	28 17.7%	3.86	0.82	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	18 13.8%	19 14.6%	70 53.8%	21 16.2%	3.69	0.96	4.00			
	Autonomous	2 2.3%	10 12.3%	11 13.8%	45 56.2%	12 15.4%	3.70	0.95	4.00			
	Total	13 2.5%	52 10.0%	73 14.0%	298 57.3%	84 16.2%	3.75	0.93	4.00			
In most ways my life is close to ideal	Government	1 0.8%	19 12.3%	50 33.1%	77 51.5%	3 2.3%	3.42	0.77	4.00	0.708	3	0.871
	Private Aided	3 2.3%	16 10.0%	53 33.1%	75 46.9%	13 7.7%	3.48	0.86	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	4 3.1%	15 11.5%	43 33.1%	57 43.8%	11 8.5%	3.43	0.91	4.00			
	Autonomous	0 0.0%	11 13.8%	32 40.0%	28 35.4%	09 10.8%	3.43	0.86	3.00			
	Total	8 1.5%	62 11.9%	181 34.8%	231 44.4%	38 7.3%	3.44	0.85	4.00			
Generally, things work out well for me	Government	5 3.1%	16 10.8%	41 26.9%	81 53.8%	7 5.4%	3.48	0.87	4.00	10.488	3	0.15
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	9 5.4%	37 23.1%	91 56.9%	21 13.1%	3.75	0.81	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	13 10.0%	36 27.7%	64 49.2%	15 11.5%	3.59	0.88	4.00			
	Autonomous	3 3.1%	4 4.6%	35 44.6%	30 37.7%	8 10.0%	3.47	0.86	3.00			
	Total	12 2.3%	40 7.7%	159 30.6%	257 49.4%	52 10.0%	3.57	0.86	4.00			
Recently, I have been	Government	11 7.7%	35 23.1%	38 25.4%	59 39.2%	7 4.6%	3.10	1.06	3.00	16.891	3	0.001

feeling reasonably happy all things considered	Private Aided	5 3.1%	16 10.0%	44 27.7%	78 48.5%	17 10.8%	3.54	0.92	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	21 16.2%	47 26.2%	53 40.8%	7 5.4%	3.32	0.86	3.00			
	Autonomous	2 3.1%	17 20.8%	31 39.2%	26 32.3%	4 4.6%	3.15	0.91	3.00			
	Total	20 3.8%	91 17.5%	167 32.1%	209 40.2%	33 6.3%	3.28	0.95	3.00			

Source: Primary data

According to Table 1, 3.82±0.79 respondents agree that they feel well at the moment. Further, respondents of all the institutions agree that they feel well at the moment and there is average satisfaction regarding the first statement as mean is more than 3, but less than four. There is no significant difference between the respondents of different institutions towards feeling well at the moment as $p=0.444>0.05$. In case of the second statement of feeling unhappy and depressed, there is no significant difference among respondents of different institutions as $p=0.13<0.05$. There is no significant difference between respondents as $p=0.576>0.05$ in respect of third statement. The fourth statement, in most ways my life is close to ideal, showed no significant difference among the respondents as $p=0.871>0.05$. On average, all respondents perceived that they tried to lead an ideal life as the mean is more than 3. There is no significant difference among respondents regarding the fifth statement, generally things work well for me, as $p=0.15<0.05$. All respondents agree that things work in their favor with 3.57±0.86. There is high significant difference among the respondents of various colleges regarding the last statement, recently I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered, as $p=0.001<0.01$. Respondents of Private aided college showed higher mean value of 3.54, while respondents of Government College showed least mean value of 3.10. All respondents perceived that they feel reasonably happy with the value as 3.28±0.95. Further, the respondents of all institutions are happy in their present job as mean value is more than 3.

Table 2: Measurement of overall general well-being of the respondents

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
General well-being	Government	150	3.47	0.54	3.50	11.610	3	0.009
	Private Aided	160	3.68	0.55	3.75			HS
	Private Unaided	130	3.49	0.61	3.58			
	Autonomous	80	3.47	0.57	3.33			
	Total	520	3.53	0.57	3.50			

Source: primary data

The GWB among respondents of Government colleges is 3.47±0.54, Private Aided Colleges is 3.68±0.55, Private Unaided Colleges 3.49±0.61, and Autonomous Colleges 3.47±0.57. The Kruskal Wallis Test shows significant difference in the level of GWB among respondents of different colleges as $p=0.009<0.01$. General well-being is average among all respondents, but among all colleges, the GWB of Private Aided Colleges was better compared with others. Overall general well-being was average among the respondents.

MEASUREMENT OF HOME- WORK INTERFACE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Home- work interface deals with the respondents’ perceptions of their work- life balance like availability of adequate facilities, flexible working hours, and ability to fulfil family needs.

Table 3: Measurement of home- work interface of the respondents

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work around my family	Government	2 1.5%	28 18.5%	32 21.5%	74 49.2%	14 9.2%	3.46	0.95	4.00	4.947	3	0.176
	Private Aided	6 3.8%	18 11.5%	39 24.6%	75 46.9%	21 13.1%	3.54	0.99	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	9 6.9%	13 10.0%	32 24.6%	62 47.7%	14 10.8%	3.45	1.04	4.00			
	Autonomous	6 6.9%	20 25.4%	14 17.7%	30 37.7%	10 12.3%	3.23	1.16	3.50			
	Total	25 4.8%	85 16.3%	115 22.1%	236 45.4%	59 11.3%	3.42	1.04	4.00			
My current	Government	1 0.8%	8	13 8.5%	107	21	3.92	0.71	4.00	5.172	3	0.160

working hours/pattern suit my personal circumstances			5.4 %		71.5 %	13.8 %						
	Private Aided	3 2.3%	16 10.0 %	21 13.1 %	90 56.2 %	30 18.5 %	3.78	0.94	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	5 3.8%	14 10.8 %	20 15.4 %	69 53.1 %	22 16.9 %	3.68	1.00	4.00			
	Autonomous	8 10.0 %	7 8.5 %	15 19.2 %	32 40.0 %	18 22.3 %	3.56	1.21	4.00			
	Total	22 4.2%	45 8.7 %	73 14.0 %	287 55.2 %	93 17.9 %	3.74	0.99	4.00			
My superior actively promotes flexible working hours/pattern	Government	6 3.8%	36 23.8 %	31 20.8 %	67 44.6 %	10 6.9%	3.27	1.03	4.00	0.822	3	0.844
	Private Aided	7 4.6%	36 22.3 %	41 25.4 %	60 37.7 %	16 10.0 %	3.26	1.06	3.00			NS
	Private Unaided	7 5.4%	21 16.2 %	49 37.7 %	41 31.5 %	12 9.2%	3.23	1.01	3.00			
	Autonomous	8 10.0 %	4 4.6 %	38 47.7 %	26 33.1 %	4 4.6%	3.18	0.97	3.00			
	Total	31 6.0%	87 16.7 %	171 32.9 %	191 36.7 %	40 7.7%	3.23	1.01	3.00			

Source: Primary data

Table 3 explains the measurement of home- work interface of respondents of different institutions. Three statements were used to measure their home- work interface. The first statement was my employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in and around my family. On average, 3.42 ± 1.04 opined that their employer provided adequate facilities and flexibility to fit their work to suit their family needs. And there is no significant difference among respondents of different institutions with $p = 0.176 > 0.05$. The second statement was related to working hours suiting the personal circumstances of the respondents to which 3.74 ± 0.99 perceived that the current working hours suited their personal circumstances. All respondents showed average satisfaction with the working hours as the mean value of all the institutions was above 3. Since $p = 0.160 > 0.05$ there is no significant difference among the respondents with regard to working hours. The third statement pertained to superiors supporting flexible working hours. All respondents agreed that their superior supported flexible working hours as the mean value of all the institutions was more than 3 showing average satisfaction about the working hours. And there is no significant difference among respondents of different institutions with respect to flexible working hours as $p = 0.844 > 0.05$.

Table 4: Measurement of overall home- work interface

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Home-work interface	Government	150	3.55	0.65	3.67	3.111	3	0.375
	Private Aided	160	3.53	0.78	3.67			NS
	Private Unaided	130	3.46	0.81	3.67			
	Autonomous	80	3.32	0.91	3.33			
	Total	520	3.46	0.80	3.67			

Source: Primary data

According to the Table-2, on an average 3.46 ± 0.80 feel that there is positive home- work interface institutions. About 3.55 ± 0.65 respondents from Government Colleges, 3.53 ± 0.78 respondents from private Aided College, 3.46 ± 0.81 from Private Unaided Colleges, and 3.32 ± 0.91 from Autonomous Colleges agree that there is home- work interface. There is average satisfaction about the home- work interface among all the respondents as the mean value of the overall HWI is more than three. And there is no significant difference among the respondents of different institutions in relation to home- work interface with $p = 0.375 > 0.05$.

MEASUREMENT OF JOB AND CAREER SATISFACTION

Job or career satisfaction is measured by analyzing the perception of the respondents towards idea of job, encouragement by superior to develop skill, opportunity for development, etc.

Table 5: Measurement of job and career satisfaction

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
I have a clear set of goals to enable me to do my job	Government	2 1.5%	2 1.5%	10 6.2%	85 56.9%	51 33.8%	4.20	0.75	4.00	2.269	3	0.518
	Private Aided	1 0.8%	4 2.3%	21 13.1%	81 50.8%	53 33.1%	4.13	0.78	4.00			NS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	3 2.3%	20 15.4%	66 50.8%	39 30.0%	4.05	0.83	4.00			
	Autonomou s	4 5.4%	2 2.3%	4 5.4%	45 55.4%	25 31.5%	4.05	0.97	4.00			
	Total	12 2.3%	11 2.1%	52 10.0%	278 53.5%	167 32.1%	4.11	0.84	4.00			
I have opportunity to use my abilities at work	Government	1 0.8%	9 6.2%	20 13.1%	98 65.4%	22 14.6%	3.87	0.76	4.00	8.048	3	0.045
	Private Aided	5 3.1%	5 3.1%	13 8.5%	91 56.9%	46 28.5%	4.05	0.88	4.00			Sig
	Private Unaided	3 2.3%	8 6.2%	15 11.5%	81 62.3%	23 17.7%	3.87	0.86	4.00			
	Autonomou s	2 2.3%	3 3.1%	19 23.8%	39 49.2%	17 21.5%	3.85	0.88	4.00			
	Total	11 2.1%	24 4.6%	74 14.2%	304 58.5%	107 20.6%	3.91	0.85	4.00			
When I do a good job, it is acknowledged by my superior	Government	7 4.6%	32 21.5%	36 23.8%	62 41.5%	13 8.5%	3.28	1.04	3.50	9.206	3	0.027
	Private Aided	4 2.3%	14 8.5%	41 25.4%	79 49.2%	22 14.6%	3.65	0.91	4.00			sig
	Private Unaided	6 4.6%	18 13.8%	34 26.2%	51 39.2%	21 16.2%	3.48	1.07	4.00			
	Autonomou s	4 4.6%	6 6.9%	23 29.2%	36 45.4%	11 13.8%	3.57	0.97	4.00			
	Total	21 4.0%	66 12.7%	136 26.2%	228 43.8%	69 13.3%	3.50	1.01	4.00			
I am encouraged to develop new skills	Government	0 0.0%	20 13.1%	23 15.4%	90 60.0%	17 11.5%	3.70	0.84	4.00	9.132	3	0.028
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	9 5.4%	20 12.3%	105 65.4%	25 15.4%	3.88	0.79	4.00			Sig
	Private Unaided	1 0.8%	8 6.2%	22 16.9%	73 56.2%	26 20.0%	3.88	0.82	4.00			
	Autonomou s	2 2.3%	6 6.9%	25 31.5%	34 42.3%	13 16.9%	3.65	0.92	4.00			
	Total	6 1.2%	41 7.9%	99 19.0%	291 56.0%	83 16.0%	3.78	0.85	4.00			
I am satisfied with the career opportunities available	Government	7 4.6%	24 16.2%	29 19.2%	70 46.9%	20 13.1%	3.48	1.06	4.00	10.303	3	0.016
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	17 10.8%	33 20.8%	82 51.5%	25 15.4%	3.68	0.92	4.00			Sig
	Private Unaided	10 7.7%	18 13.8%	33 25.4%	60 46.2%	9 6.9%	3.31	1.05	4.00			
	Autonomou s	0 0.0%	9 11.5%	30 36.9%	37 46.9%	4 4.6%	3.45	0.76	4.00			
	Total	18 3.5%	68 13.1%	133 25.6%	249 47.9%	52 10.0%	3.48	0.96	4.00			
I am satisfied with the training I received in order to perform my present job	Government	6 3.8%	33 22.3%	24 16.2%	81 53.1%	7 4.6%	3.32	1.00	4.00	11.003	3	0.012
	Private Aided	5 3.1%	17 10.8%	36 22.3%	86 53.8%	16 10.0%	3.57	0.92	4.00			sig
	Private Unaided	5 3.8%	16 12.3%	37 28.5%	62 47.7%	10 7.7%	3.43	0.94	4.00			
	Autonomou s	4 4.6%	12 14.6%	33 40.8%	26 33.1%	5 6.9%	3.23	0.94	3.00			
	Total	20 3.8%	78 15.0%	140 26.9%	244 46.9%	38 7.3%	3.39	0.96	4.00			

Table 5 depicts the measurement of JCS (Job and Career Satisfaction) of the respondents. For this, six statements were addressed to the respondents. The first statement about the goals to execute their teaching job received more than 4 mean value and all

respondents confirmed that they have clear idea about their goals before starting their teaching work with 4.11 ± 0.84 . There is no significant difference among the respondents as $p=0.518 > 0.05$. About 3.91 ± 0.85 accepted that they have opportunity to use their abilities at the workplace and there is significant difference among respondents of different educational institutions as $p=0.045 < 0.05$. On average, all respondents perceived to the second statement with mean value exceeding 3. About 3.70 ± 0.84 are happy that their superior acknowledges their good work. There is a significant difference between respondents of different institutions with $p=0.27 < 0.05$. About 3.48 ± 0.96 said that they were satisfied with the career opportunities available to them. There is a significant difference among respondents of different colleges as $p=0.016 < 0.05$. All agree that they get career opportunities in their institutions as mean value is more than 3. About 3.39 ± 0.96 are satisfied with the training received to perform their job efficiently. There is high significant difference among respondents working in different colleges as $p=0.12 > 0.05$.

Table 6: Measurement of overall job career satisfaction of the respondents

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Job career satisfaction	Government	150	3.64	0.52	3.67	11.984	3	0.007
	Private Aided	160	3.83	0.61	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	130	3.67	0.62	3.83			
	Autonomous	80	3.63	0.58	3.50			
	Total	520	3.69	0.59	3.83			

Source: Primary data

Measurement of JCS is average among the respondents with 3.69 ± 0.59 . JCS among Government College respondents is 3.64 ± 0.52 , Private Aided Colleges is 3.83 ± 0.61 , Private Unaided Colleges is 3.67 ± 0.62 , and Autonomous Colleges is 3.16 ± 1.13 . There is high significant difference in the level of JCS between the different respondents as $p=0.007 < 0.01$. JCS is more in Private Aided Colleges and less in Autonomous Colleges. There is average job career satisfaction among the respondents as mean value is more than three and less than four.

MEASUREMENT OF CONTROL AT WORK

Control at work analyse perception of respondents on opportunity to voice employee's area of work, ability to influence major decisions relating the job and in general.

Table 7: Measurement of control at work of the respondents

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
I am able to voice my opinions and influence changes in my area of work	Government	5 3.1%	24 16.2%	34 23.1%	80 53.1%	7 4.6%	3.40	0.92	4.00	24.094	3	0.000
	Private Aided	6 3.8%	9 5.4%	33 20.8%	96 60.0%	16 10.0%	3.67	0.88	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	2 1.5%	13 10.0%	30 23.1%	70 53.8%	15 11.5%	3.64	0.87	4.00			
	Autonomous	8 10.0%	11 13.8%	31 39.2%	19 23.8%	11 13.1%	3.16	1.13	3.00			
	Total	24 4.6%	59 11.3%	138 26.5%	248 47.7%	51 9.8%	3.47	0.98	4.00			
I am involved in the decisions that affect me in my area of work	Government	7 4.6%	23 15.4%	28 18.5%	80 53.1%	12 8.5%	3.45	1.00	4.00	9.025	3	0.029
	Private Aided	6 3.8%	22 13.8%	28 17.7%	91 56.9%	13 7.7%	3.51	0.96	4.00			sig
	Private Unaided	4 3.1%	14 10.8%	38 29.2%	61 46.9%	13 10.0%	3.50	0.93	4.00			
	Autonomous	6 6.9%	14 17.7%	22 28.5%	34 42.3%	4 4.6%	3.20	1.01	3.00			
	Total	24 4.6%	75 14.4%	122 23.5%	259 49.8%	40 7.7%	3.42	0.98	4.00			
I am involve	Government	10 6.9%	29	49	54	8 5.4%	3.14	1.02	3.00	11.597	3	0.009

d in the decisions that affect members of the public in my area of work			19.2 %	32.3 %	36.2 %							
	Private Aided	12 7.7%	33 20.8 %	48 30.0 %	54 33.8 %	12 7.7%	3.13	1.07	3.00			HS
	Private Unaided	6 4.6%	27 20.8 %	48 36.9 %	43 33.1 %	6 4.6%	3.12	0.95	3.00			
	Autonomous	4 4.6%	28 34.6 %	31 39.2 %	13 16.2 %	4 5.4%	2.83	0.94	3.00			
	Total	31 6.0%	124 23.8 %	180 34.6 %	155 29.8 %	30 5.8%	3.06	1.00	3.00			

Source: primary data

Table 7 shows the perceptions of respondents on Control at work (CAW). About 3.47 ± 0.98 feel that they can voice their opinions and influence change in their area of work. There is significant difference among respondents of different colleges as $p=0.000 < 0.01$. Respondents of Private Aided Colleges had highest mean value and Autonomous College respondents had least mean value. About 3.42 ± 0.98 opined that they are involved in decisions that affect their area of work. There is highly significant difference between respondents with $p=0.029 < 0.05$. Private Aided Colleges scored highest mean and Autonomous Colleges score lowest mean. With regard to the third statement, 3.06 ± 1.00 agreed that they are involved in decisions that affect members of the public. As per the Kruskal Wallis test, there is high significant difference among the respondents as $p=0.009 < 0.01$. The respondents of Government College scored the highest value and respondents from Autonomous Colleges were least satisfied with the third statement. The respondents of all colleges experience average satisfaction except for respondents from Autonomous Colleges, who perceived low satisfaction as the mean value is less than three.

Table 8: Measurement overall control at work of the respondent

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Control at work	Government	150	3.33	0.72	3.33	27.738	3	0.000
	Private Aided	160	3.44	0.69	3.50			HS
	Private Unaided	130	3.42	0.66	3.33			
	Autonomous	80	3.06	0.70	3.00			
	Total	520	3.31	0.71	3.33			

As per Table 8, CAW is average among all the respondents with 3.31 ± 0.71 . CAW among Government College respondents is 3.33 ± 0.72 , Private Aided Colleges is 3.44 ± 0.69 , Private Unaided Colleges is 3.42 ± 0.66 , and Autonomous Colleges is 3.06 ± 0.70 . Further, there is average CAW among respondents of all institutions as the mean value is more than three for all the institutions. And also, there is high significant difference in the level of CAW of different respondents as $p=0.000 < 0.01$. CAW is more in Private Aided Colleges and less in Autonomous Colleges.

MEASUREMENT OF WORKING CONDITIONS

Working conditions include perceptions of the employees regarding safe work environment, provision of necessary materials for effective performance of the job, and quality of working conditions provided by the employer.

Table 9: Measurement of working conditions of the respondents

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively	Government	6 3.8%	37 24.6 %	45 30.0 %	58 38.5 %	4 3.1%	3.12	0.95	3.00	15.633	3	0.001
	Private Aided	6 3.8%	21 13.1 %	40 23.1 %	84 52.3 %	12 7.7%	3.47	0.95	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	3 2.3%	22 16.9 %	40 30.8 %	54 41.5 %	11 8.5%	3.37	0.94	3.50			
	Autonomous	7 8.5%	23 29.2 %	16 20.0 %	28 35.4 %	6 6.9%	3.03	1.13	3.00			
	Total	24 4.6%	109 21.0 %	135 26.0 %	218 41.9 %	34 6.5%	3.25	1.01	3.00			

I work in a safe environment	Government	7 4.6%	15 10.0%	35 23.1%	67 44.6%	26 17.7%	3.61	1.04	4.00	19.412	3	0.000
	Private Aided	1 0.8%	7 4.6%	17 10.8%	92 57.7%	42 26.2%	4.04	0.79	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	4 3.1%	8 6.2%	21 16.2%	74 56.9%	23 17.7%	3.80	0.91	4.00			
	Autonomous	2 2.3%	8 9.2%	12 14.6%	26 32.3%	32 41.5%	4.02	1.07	4.00			
	Total	14 2.7%	39 7.5%	84 16.2%	249 47.9%	134 25.8%	3.87	0.97	4.00			
The working conditions are satisfactory	Government	10 6.9%	17 11.5%	35 23.1%	78 52.3%	9 6.2%	3.39	1.01	4.00	17.593	3	0.001
	Private Aided	2 1.5%	11 6.9%	27 16.9%	95 59.2%	25 15.4%	3.80	0.84	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	3 2.3%	15 11.5%	33 25.4%	71 54.6%	8 6.2%	3.51	0.86	4.00			
	Autonomous	0 0.0%	6 6.9%	16 20.0%	50 63.1%	8 10.0%	3.76	0.72	4.00			
	Total	14 2.7%	48 9.2%	111 21.3%	298 57.3%	49 9.4%	3.62	0.88	4.00			

Source: Primary data

Table 9 shows the results of the working conditions of employees (WCS). The researcher used three statements to measure WCS. About 3.25 ± 1.01 agree that their employer provides them with all facilities to enable them to do their job effectively. And there is a high significant difference among respondents of different colleges as per the Kruskal Wallis test with $p=0.001 < 0.01$. Respondents of Private Aided Colleges scored high mean value and respondents from Autonomous Colleges scored least mean value. The respondents of all institutions confirmed that they work in a safe environment with mean and standard deviation as 3.87 ± 0.97 . There is a high significant difference among the different respondents as $p=0.000 < 0.01$. It is interesting to note that there is a high concern for safety of employees in Private Aided College and Autonomous College as the respondents scored mean value more than four, and Government College and Private Unaided College respondents scored average mean value of more than three for safe environment category. About 3.62 ± 0.88 claimed that working conditions in their College is satisfactory. There is high significant difference among the respondents with $p= 0.001 < 0.01$. Working conditions are at the higher end in Autonomous Colleges and lower in Government Colleges.

Table 10: Measurement of overall working conditions of the respondents

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Working conditions	Government	150	3.37	0.78	3.67	17.658	3	0.001
	Private Aided	160	3.77	0.68	4.00			HS
	Private Unaided	130	3.56	0.73	3.67			
	Autonomous	80	3.60	0.71	3.67			
	Total	520	3.58	0.74	3.67			

Source: Primary data

Overall WCS is 3.58 ± 0.74 and WCS is average among respondents as mean value is more than 3. Overall WCS is 3.37 ± 0.78 in Government Colleges, 3.77 ± 0.68 in Private Aided Colleges, 3.56 ± 0.73 in Private Unaided Colleges, and 3.60 ± 0.71 in Autonomous Colleges. There is high significant difference across the colleges with $p= 0.001 < 0.01$. WCS is high in Private aided colleges, followed by Autonomous Colleges and Private Unaided Colleges, and low in Government Colleges.

MEASUREMENT OF STRESS AT WORK

In order to measure stress at work, excessive level of stress felt by the respondents at work was analyzed.

Table 11: Measurement of stress at work of the respondents

	Institution	SD	D	N	A	SA	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test	df	p
I often feel under	Government	13 8.5%	47 31.5%	39 26.2%	47 31.5%	4 2.3%	3.12	1.10	3.00	10.480	3	0.15

pressure at work	Private Aided	14 8.5%	58 36.2%	37 23.1%	44 27.7%	7 4.6%	3.17	1.07	3.00			NS
	Private Unaided	13 10.0%	47 36.2%	32 24.6%	34 26.2%	4 3.1%	3.24	1.00	3.50			
	Autonomous	8 10.0%	17 21.5%	31 39.2%	16 19.2%	8 10.0%	3.05	1.20	3.00			
	Total	48 9.2%	163 31.3%	147 28.3%	136 26.2%	26 5.0%	3.12	1.11	3.00			
I often feel excessive levels of stress at work	Government	10 6.2%	48 32.3%	32 21.5%	48 32.3%	12 7.7%	2.97	0.86	3.00	10.438	3	0.15
	Private Aided	10 6.2%	42 26.2%	50 31.5%	43 26.9%	15 9.2%	2.93	0.89	3.00			NS
	Private Unaided	7 5.4%	37 28.5%	45 34.6%	33 25.4%	8 6.2%	3.02	0.83	3.00			
	Autonomous	6 6.9%	15 18.5%	20 24.6%	23 29.2%	16 20.8%	2.65	0.97	3.00			
	Total	32 6.2%	137 26.3%	146 28.1%	148 28.5%	57 11.0%	2.88	0.89	3.00			

Source: Primary data

Table 11 shows the measurement of stress at work (SAW). Two statements were posed to the respondents to measure their stress at work. About 3.12±1.11 perceived that they feel under pressure. There is no significant difference among the respondents regarding work pressure. Second statement was whether the respondents feel excessive levels of stress at work. About 3.12±1.11 feel excess stress at work. There is no significant difference among the respondents regarding this statement as p value is 0.15>0.05.

Table 12: Measurement of overall stress at work of the respondents

	Institution	N	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Stress at work	Government	150	2.95	0.86	3.00	10.438	3	0.015
	Private Aided	160	2.95	0.89	3.00			sig
	Private Unaided	130	2.87	0.83	3.00			
	Autonomous	80	2.85	0.97	3.00			
	Total	520	2.90	0.89	3.00			

Source: Primary data

As per Table12, the average consolidated value of SAW is 2.99±0.89. Stress at work is 2.95±0.87 in Government Colleges, 2.95±0.89 in Private Aided Colleges, 2.87±0.83 in Private Unaided Colleges, and 2.85±0.97 in Autonomous Colleges. There is low stress at work as the average mean value is less than 3. There is significant difference among respondents across the colleges with respect to SAW with P= 0.015>0.05. Stress at work is more in Government and Private Aided Colleges with the same mean value, and is less in Autonomous.

MEASUREMENT OF OVERALL QUALITY OF WORK- LIFE

Measurement of overall quality of work- life was considered after general well- being, home- work interface, job career satisfaction, control at work, working conditions, and stress at work and show the following results

Table 13: Measurement of overall quality of work- life

Institution	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Highly satisfied	Mean	SD	Median	Kruskal Wallis test value	df	p
Government	2 1.5%	20 13.1%	30 20.0%	84 56.2%	14 9.2%	3.58	0.887	4.00	10.870	3	0.12
Private Aided	4 2.3%	9 5.4%	23 14.6%	97 60.8%	27 16.9%	3.85	0.849	4.00			sig
Private Unaided	1 0.8%	13 10.0%	33 25.4%	71 54.6%	12 9.2%	3.62	0.820	4.00			

Autonomous	0 0.0%	6 6.9%	30 36.9 %	34 43.1%	10 13.1%	3.62	0.800	4.00			
Total	7 1.3%	48 9.2%	116 22.3 %	286 55%	63 12.2%	3.67	0.844	4.00			

Source: Primary data

Table 13 shows the overall quality of work- life of respondents. About 3.58 ± 0.887 respondents of Government institutions perceive that there is quality of work- life in their institution. About 3.85 ± 0.849 respondents of Private Aided Colleges perceive that they are satisfied with the quality of work- life. About 3.62 ± 0.820 respondents of Private Unaided Colleges agreed to there being quality of work- life in their institution. About 3.62 ± 0.800 respondents of Autonomous Colleges agreed to the existence of quality of work- life in their colleges. There is average quality of work- life among respondents of all the institutions as the mean is more than 3 and less than four. According to the Kruskal Wallis test, there is significant difference among respondents across the colleges with $p = 0.012 > 0.05$. The quality of work- life is high in Private aided Colleges and less in Government Colleges.

V. CONCLUSION

The measurement of factors affecting quality of work- life helps organizations to identify areas of good practices and factors needing special attention. Lower range of scores with mean value less than three indicates employees are less satisfied with the work- life in one or more areas. When the score falls into the mid- range of more than three and less than four mean value, it may indicate that the working life does not provide high level of satisfaction, but also that the employees are not totally dissatisfied with their work. Higher mean score of more than four indicates that quality of work- life is good and the employees are satisfied. This type of scoring can help find issues needing special attention and solving the problem at the earliest. It helps employers to understand the employees' view point with the objective of fulfilling the aims and objectives of the organization. Accordingly, an action plan can be prepared. It also helps employees to understand their level of satisfaction and they can take necessary actions to increase it as such.

REFERENCES

- Andre, L. P. F, & Rennata, G. B. S. (2009 August). A model for evaluation of the quality of working life at public Universities. *Sistemas&Gestao*, 4(2), 136-154.
- Anitha, B., & Subba, R. P. (1998). *Quality of work life in Commercial Banks*. New Delhi. Discovery publishing house, 56-144.
- Back, W., & Margareta. (2011). *Quality of life and work in Europe: theory, practice and policy*. Quality of life and work in Europe: theory, practice and policy, xiv, 262.
- Bateman. T. S., & Organ. D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between effect and employee Citizenship. *Academy of Management journal*, 26, 587-595.
- Elmuti, & Dean (2003), Impact of internet aided self managed teams on quality of work life and performance. *Journal of Business Strategies*, 20(2), 119-136.
- Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Pizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). Opportunities to work at home in the context of work life balance. *Human resource management, Journal*, 12(1), 54-76.
- Ferriss, A. (2002). Religion and the Quality of Life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, (3), 199-215.
- Richard, W. E. (1973 Fall). Quality of working life: What it is?. *Slowan Management Review*, 15(1), 11-21.
- Stewart, I. D., Steve, S., Clyde, W. S., & Jacqueline, L. S. (1999 August). Health behaviour, Quality of work life and organisational effectiveness in Lumber Industry. *Health education & behaviour*, 26(4), 579-591.