

FACTORS INFLUENCING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Geetha M.L.

Associate professor,

Government First Grade College, Mangalore.

Geethaml331@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Teachers are considered as instrument of change in modern the society. A nation advances in proportion to education attained by people. Development of a country depends 20% on natural resources, 16% on infrastructure, and 64% on human resource and social factors. If we consider the demographic structure if India, it has majority of population with below age of 25 years, the role of higher education is attained vital importance from the point of view of development of our country. As per UGC report Higher education institutions in India has increased from 30 universities and 695 colleges in 1950-51 to nearly 740 universities and 37204 colleges as of 2014-15. In the academic year 2014-15, the total number of teachers in universities and Colleges was 12.61 lakhs as compared to 10.49 lakh teachers in 2013-14. Out of 12.61 teachers 84.66% teachers were working in colleges and 15.34% in universities. When we compare student- teacher ratio, it has declined about 2.5 times over this period. This calls for the need for highly qualified, efficient and forward-looking teachers in higher education field. Providing good quality of work life to teachers helps in attracting best of minds to education field which is need of the hour. In this context a study of quality of work life among teaching professionals in higher education gains importance. Quality of work life is a qualitative term. It represents concern for human dimensions of work. Therefore, there is a need to study quality of work life provided to teaching professionals in higher education. Present study is descriptive in nature. It tries to analyse the existing employee benefit schemes in the form of quality of work life provided teaching professionals in higher education field in India and to assess factors influencing quality of work life.

Key words: Quality of work life, Higher education, University Grants Commission.

INTRODUCTION

Education sector is the major indicator of human development. Unless the domestic sectors of education develop, overall human development is highly difficult. In order to bring excellence in providing services and to face cut throat competition from foreign universities, there is a need to recruit and retain qualified, able, and experienced teachers in Indian Universities and educational institutions that has a competitive edge over foreign Universities. In the light of above discussion there is a need for providing better Quality of work life to Indian Professionals working in Indian Universities. Quality of work life is a humanistic approach directed towards brining welfare to its employees. Quality of working life efforts focus not only on how people can do work better, but on how work may cause people to be better (Nadler & Lawler, 1983). The balanced focus of quality of working life on both how people can do work better and how work may cause people to be better may be critical to the success or failure of recent and future organisations, as it might help the organisations retain their key and most talented employees.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Anuradha S, Pandey P.N. (1975) made a study of relationship between organisational commitment and quality of working life of managers working in Bharath Heavy Electricals Limited, a public sector undertaking. They confirmed the positive contributions of quality of working life on efficiency and human wellbeing from the point of view of Indian economic development. M. L. Monga and Ashok Maggu (1981) studied the quality of working life of employees working in public sector in northern India. They found that

there is strong direct relationship between quality of working life and performance of employees working in Indian public sectors. Ogden Brown Jr. (1984) examined the chances of improving the quality of working life through effective organisational design and management. He concluded that good quality of work life programs were one of the best methods to increase organisational performance and quality of work life for the individual working in an organisation. Rao Rukmini V A (1986) undertook a comparative study of quality of working life of men and women employees doing similar type of work and also she analysed the effect of work on women employees. The study finding showed that the quality of working life score was significantly more for men employees because men employees had higher score for opportunities to learn new skills, challenge in work, and presence of discretionary elements in work. Muralidhara Mayyarpady (1997) made research on quality of work life of police personnel working in Karnataka state. In his study he selected satisfaction with earnings, level of work load, chances of feeling a sense of accomplishment at the end of the day, proportion of police duties enjoyed, level of personal and job security, level of satisfaction with superiors. The research findings showed that more than 40% of women police were dissatisfied at police station level. Majority of women police expressed dissatisfaction over lack of opportunities, unequal treatment between men and women, lack of comfortable uniforms and equipments, lack of objective performance evaluation criteria, promotion standards and absence of proper provision for married police women to live with their families. DR. J Vignesh Shankar (2010) studied the relationship between quality of working life and career satisfaction of employees in information technology organisations, education institution and manufacturing units of Chennai. He concluded that career balance has a significant impact on quality of working life. Rames P (2011) undertook a research on quality of work life of faculty in B-Schools. His finding shows that there is no significant difference between male and female in respect of opinion about quality of working life, institutional affiliation, and corporate experience. And there is significant difference between age capabilities, skills and quality of working life. Varatharaj V, Vasantha S, Varadharajan R (2012) made a comparative study of quality of work life, positive work attitude, job satisfaction and organisational effectiveness of employees working in service sector. The research results shows that quality of working life make a valuable contribution to the improvement of job satisfaction and responsible for change in work related attitudes like working condition, co-worker, management, job etc.,

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

In India education sector proved to be major employment provider. Therefore there is a need to study quality of working life provided by these organisations as a retention strategy

The objectives of the study are as follows

- To know the personal, organisational and career related aspects of respondents.
- To study various factors contributing to quality of work life of lecturers in higher education.
- Provide suggestions to improve quality of working life.

RESEARCH METHEDODOLOGY

The present study is descriptive in nature. It tries to analyse the quality of work life in the form of financial and non financial welfare facilities provided by Government and Private Aided, Private Unaided degree colleges under Department of collegiate education, Karnataka. The study uses primary data in the form of structured questionnaire for collecting relevant data and secondary data was collected from journals, periodicals, electronic data base, published and unpublished research studies. Response from 100 lecturers working in Government and private colleges were collected with the help of questionnaire. The respondents were asked to rate their answers in 5 point Likert scale. Collected data was statistically analysed with the help of statistical package for social science. Factor analysis has been conducted using principal component analysis with 5% significance level. And other statistical tests like KMO and Bartlett's test and Rotated Components Matrix were used.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS

Demographic and Other variables	Number
AGE	
Less than30	42
30-40	36
40-50	12
50 and above	10
MARITAL STATUS	
Married	66
Unmarried	34
MONTHLY INCOME	
Below 40000	45
40000-60000	28
60000-80000	16
80000 -100000and above	03
100000 and above	08
EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	
POST GRADUATION	52
POST GRADUATION WITH NET/SLET	23
MPHIL	14
PhD	11
WORK EXPERIENCE	
0-9 years	47
10-19 years	25
20-29 years	20
30 and above	08

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Demographic profile of respondents is presented in Table-1. The respondents are lecturers working in degree colleges in Karnataka. The respondents age profile show that majority of respondents belong to age bracket of 30 to 40 years (42%). 45% of the respondents earned less than rupees 400000 per month. Majority of respondents have post graduate qualification which includes postgraduate with NET/SLET (75%), 66% are married and 47% of respondents have 0 to 9 years of experience.

TABLE-2
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.745
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square	984.142
Sphericity Bartlett's test of sphericity	300
Df.	
Sig.	.000


Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin and Bartlett's test (KMO) revealed that the data used is accurate and valid. As the KMO measure of sampling adequacy is .745. This value is greater than .5 which is the minimum acceptance level.

TABLE-3
TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.725	32.451	32.451	8.725	32.451	32.451
2	3.246	9.794	42.245	2.171	9.794	42.245
3	1.765	6.732	48.977	1.685	6.732	48.977
4	1.442	5.926	54.903	1.442	5.926	54.903
5	1.289	5.157	60.060	1.289	5.157	60.060
6	1.215	4.859	64.919	1.215	4.859	64.919
7	1.127	4.506	69.425	1.127	4.506	69.425
8	1.019	4.236	73.661	1.019	4.236	73.661
9	.869	3.477	70.927			
10	.792	3.168	74.096			
11	.786	3.145	77.241			
12	.724	2.897	80.137			
13	.667	2.667	82.805			
14	.613	2.451	85.255			
15	.542	2.167	87.422			
16	.488	1.950	89.372			
17	.425	1.699	91.071			
18	.392	1.567	92.638			
19	.374	1.497	94.135			
20	.347	1.390	95.525			
21	.312	1.249	96.774			
22	.275	1.098	97.872			
23	.217	.868	98.740			
24	.178	.713	99.453			
25	.137	.547	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Twenty five variables were identified to describe quality of work life. These variables were subjected to principal component analysis. The analysis found eight components out of which 32.451% of variance explained by component 1, 9.794% of variance is explained by component 2, 6.128% of variance explained by component 3, 5.926% of variance is explained by component 4, 5.157% of variance is explained by component 5, 4.859% of variance is explained by component 6, 4.506% of variance is explained by component 7 and 4.236% of variance is explained by component 8. Above eight elements are able to explain quality of working life with total level of 73.661% variance.



The scree plot shows clearly that the first component has a higher Eigen value when compared to other components. Therefore component one explains most number of variables defining quality of working life. As principal component analysis shows redundancy i.e., some variables are correlated with one another, because they are measuring the same construct. In this case construct for the study being quality of work life.

TABLE-4
COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Infrastructure	.745							
Institute	.723							
Involvement								
Development	.701							
Satisfied With	.693							
Salary								
Safety	.672							
Motivation	.654							
High Quality	.636							
Teaching								
Compensation	.614							
Factor								
Skill Set	.602							
Acceptance of	.595							
Suggestions								
Job Security	.583							
Welfare	.568							
Opportunities	.551							
for								
Advancements								
Helpful	.546							
management								
Relationship	.541							
Feedback	.533							

Performance Appraisal Increment in Salary Recognition Proud to Work Good Working Environment Training Good Rapport Security Promotion		.594						
			.553					
				.592				
					.554			
						.635		
								.579

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated component matrix showed 8 factors influencing quality of working life. Out of these eight components component 1 i.e., infrastructure, development, salary, safety, motivation, quality of teaching, compensation factor, skill, job security, welfare, and opportunity for development explain almost 32% of quality of working life hence these variables are found to be prominent variables.

FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

Preset study shows that following factors influence quality of working life prominently. They are work related factors like infrastructure facilities, salary, safety, job security, motivation performance appraisal, feedback, working environment, training, good rapport, and opportunity for promotion. Employers need to give more importance to the factors mentioned above in order to bring in better quality of work life.

Based on the data analysis and findings following recommendations are made.

1. Higher Educational Institutions need to provide better working conditions which will help in maximum utilization of employee's abilities in bringing quality into education.
2. Teaching professionals need to be given necessary training to attain professional excellence and competence.
3. Educational institutions should take necessary steps to bring in quality of work life into their institutions. As many research studies show that quality of work life has significant influence on quality of work of the employees.
4. Employees should be educated regarding quality of working life initiative taken by employer. And this initiative should be taken care till it completed.
5. There should be proper feedback facility in order to take corrective action.

CONCLUSION

Present study was carried out with the objective of studying social, organisational and career related aspects of respondents and also for analysing factors influencing quality of working life of teaching professionals in higher education. The study shows that employee centred policies by the employer will result in better quality of working life. The study also found that providing improved work related factors, performance appraisal, feedback, working environment, training, good rapport, security, and promotion will result in improvement in quality of working life of teachers in higher educational Institutions.

REFERENCE

- Elise Ramstad (2009), "Promoting performance and the quality of working life simultaneously", International journal of productivity and performance management, vii. 58, Issue 5, PP. 423-436.
- Hyder Mohammadi, Mohsen Amiri Shahrabi(2013), Management science Letters, vol. 3, issue 10, pp. 2675-2600.

- Alfred F Wagennar, Michiel A J kompier, Ierne L D Houtman, Seth N J Vanden Bossche, Toon W Taris (2012), "Impact of employment contract changes on workers quality of working life, job security, health and work related attitudes, Journal of occupational health, Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 441-451.
- Tarek Hassan Ibrahim Abdeen (2001) "The quality of work life: An Empirical study", Thesis submitted to the University of Plymouth, PP.
- Ayuningtyas Dumilah, Misnaniarti (2016) "determinants of Quality of work life as an important issue to improve health workers performance in Indonesia", Indian Journal of Public Health research & Development, Vol. 7, Issue 2, April 2016, PP.155-159.
- Shankar Vignesh J (2010) "linkage between quality of work life and career satisfaction", Journal of management and entrepreneurship, April-June 2010, pp. 44-57.
- Karrir Naval (1995) "Factors related to quality of work life of managers in Indian industry", Finance India, Vol. XIII no. 4, December 1999, pp. 1239-1241.
- Krishan Jayasree (2012), "Quality of work life in AIDS service organisations", IJER, Vol. 9, No. 2, July-December 2012, pp. 455-461.
- Thakkar G Mehul (2012), "Assessment of quality of nursing work life", AIMS International journal of Management, Vol. 6, No. 3, September 2012, pp. 231-245.
- Rathi Neerpal (2010), "Relationship of quality of work life with employees' psychological well being", October09-march10, pp 53-60.
- Amir Zeeshan Dr.(2010), "The interactive effect of communication and stress on perception of quality of work life", Integral Review, Vol. 3, No. 2, December 2010, pp. 1-4
- Ogden brown Jr. (1984), "Improving quality of work life through effective organisational design and management", proceedings of the human factors and Ergonomics Society annual meeting, October 1984, Vol. 28, issue 8, pp. 710.
- Rukmini Rao V A (1986), "study of work life, self concept, aspirations and family life of working women", Thesis, university of Delhi.
- Sanker M, Mohan raj R (2013) "Quality of work life sustains robust work culture: A field experience sampling study on SAGO industry." International journal of advance research, vil. 1, issue 6, pp. 269-273.
- Varatharaj v, vasantha S, Varadharajan R (2012), "Quality of work life is a source of positive work attitude, job satisfaction and organisational effectiveness: An empirical study", PMR Jan-June 2012, pp.2-8.
- Shankar Vignesh J (2010) "linkage between quality of work life and career satisfaction", Journal of management and entrepreneurship, April-June 2010, pp. 44-57.
- Rames P, Balaji B (2011), "Quality of work life in Academia", South Asian Journal of Socio-Political Studies, Vol 12, no. 1 ,July-Dec2011, pp. 77-78.