DOI:10.26524/jms.2015.22



# A Study on Quality of Work Life with Special Reference to Private Engineering College Teachers in the District of Rayagada

**Debasis Pani**
*Assistant Professor, Centre for Management Studies,*
*Gandhi Institute of Advanced Computer & Research, Rayagada -765002 (Odisha), India*

**ABSTRACT:** Gone are the days, when teaching profession was considered as more comfortable. The teaching profession especially in engineering has become a challenging, highly committed and even more responsible in the contemporary milieu. The teacher shoulders the responsibility of preparing and nurturing the young minds to maximize the profession of Engineering. In this connection the quality of work life of teachers plays a significant role in disseminating their role and duties. Due to mushroom growth of engineering colleges in India and no proper regulatory control the teachers working in private engineering colleges has less scope for quality of work life, which is very dismal.

The present research was conducted to study relationship between all identified variables of quality of work life and to study the relationship between quality of work life of teachers working in various private engineering colleges with demographics factors (age, gender) more specifically in Rayagada district of Odisha. The data was gathered through a five point Likert scale questionnaire from 55 respondents. Mean, Standard deviation, one way ANOVA, T-test and Regression analysis were carried out to serve the purpose of study.

Keywords: Quality of Work Life; Job Security

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The responsibility of the teacher is very important and great. If the plans of the nation are to be fulfilled, it is the teacher who can make the most substantial contribution towards the achievement of the desired goals. The teacher has a powerful and abiding influence in the formation of the character of every future citizen. Teacher acts as a pivot for the transmission of intellectual and technical skills and cultural tradition from one generation to the other. So teachers have to work in more dignity and with ample operational freedom. In other words the teachers have to enjoy a good quality of work life. It has been proved that a good quality of work life results into the wellness of the faculty and also improved student behaviour.

Quality of Work Life is an umbrella term which includes many concepts. QWL means the sum total of values, both materials and non-materials, attained by the worker throughout his life.

Quality of work life can be said to be all the original inputs which aim at improving the employees' satisfaction and enhancing organizational effectiveness. If employees are not satisfied then it may lead to absenteeism and excessive turnover (Chen et al., 2006). Attrition, employee's commitment, productivity etc. depend upon the dimensions of Quality of work life. An organization provides a better QWL then it develops the healthy working environment as well as satisfied employee. High QWL can give a result in better organizational performance, effectiveness, innovativeness, etc. (Yadev.R, Khanna.A, 2014). QWL is important for employees' as well as it is necessary for organisation to achieve the growth and profitability in the market. QWL firms achieved more profitability than other non QWL firms, (David lewis et al, 2001)

## 2. LITREATURE REVIEW

Quality of Work Life incorporates a hierarchy of perspectives that not only include work-based factors such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay and relationship with work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflects life situation and general feelings of well being.

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is a comprehensive concept that includes an individual's job related wellbeing as well as the extent to which work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences (Lokanadha Reddy. M and Mohan Reddy.P, 2010).

QWL refers to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement and commitment and individuals experience with respect to their lives at work (Srivastava & Kanpur, 2014).

Linda K. Johnsrud (2006) studied on Quality of faculty work life: the University of Hawaii to describe the changes in QWL from 1998 to now. The objective of the study was to find out the current level of satisfaction. Variables were used Relations with the department chair, campus service, community service, faculty relation, salary and demographic factor. The result showed that salary was the main variable for satisfaction from year 1998 to 2006. Faculty relations and community services is the most positive elements in faculty work life and other finding was campuses' faculty are generally more satisfied than others.

Quality of work life is often considered in two directions, one is of removal of negative aspects of work and working conditions and other is the modification of work and working conditions to enhance the capability of employees and to promote behavior which is important for individual and society (Mohammad Baitul Islam, 2012)

The study conducted by (Sivakumar.S,Ganesan.N.M, 2014) shows QWL led to an identification of two general factors namely work/work environment and employee welfare and well

being. Within the first factor are included such features as democracy, task content/physical features of the job, quantity and quality of leisure time created by the job, and promotion. The second broad QWL factor mainly emphasizes employee welfare and well-being. That emphasized the physical working environment including safe and healthy working conditions while stressed security, equity, and individuation of the employee as features of a quality working experience, emphasized job security, good pay, and benefits respectively. Healthy social relations and social integration were two other employee welfare features thought to comprise QWL.

(Casio,1998) examined the domination of quality of work life from eight aspect .these eight aspect are the amount of :communication, employee involvement, desire and motivation to work , job security, career progress, solving problems, salary, pride of a job.

(Schermernrhorn & John, 1989) believes that to improve the quality of work life in the following factors must exist in the organization, fair and adequate pay , health and safety of working conditions ,creating opportunities to learn, growth in the professionalism path, professional integrity in the organization , support of individual rights and proud of the job.

(Prof. Richard E. Watson, 1975) identifies eight dimensions that make up Quality of Work Life framework as Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe ad Healthy Working Conditions, Immediate Opportunities to use to develop human capacities, future opportunities for continued growth and security, Social Integration in the work organisation, Constitutionalism and rights for privacy in the work organisation, work and the total life space refer to the balanced role of work, Social relevance of work.

(Donalson, 2000) in their research, as" Relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment" concluded that there is significant relationship between the quality of working life to organizational commitment, absenteeism from work and the delay and two components of the partner's satisfaction and job security have the strongest impact on organizational commitment.

If organizations are concerned with developing their human resources in order to gain a competitive advantage into the marketplace, it seems necessary for them to give proper attention to their most precious asset, namely, their human resources by providing high-quality working-life experiences in consonance their various needs eliciting favorable job related responses in return (Chandranshu Sinha, 2012).

## 3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1 To study relationship between all the variables and quality of work life.

2. To study the relationship between quality of work life of teachers working in private engineering colleges with demographics factors (age, gender).

## 4. RESERCH METHODOLOGY

**4.1** Scope of the Study - The respondents were teachers, involved in this research study were selected from various reputed privately managed engineering colleges GIST, MITS, GIET, RITAM and GIACR established at Rayagada district of Odisha.

**4.2** Population and Sample Size – The population of this study includes teachers who are employed in various privately managed engineering colleges in the Rayagada district of Odisha. It involves a sample size of 55 employees.

**4.3** Data Collection - The current study understands the concept of quality of work life among the teacher of private engineering colleges. Primary data was collected with a self administered questionnaire. Convenience sampling approach was adopted in order to collect the primary data and it took a period of one month for the entire collection of data.

**4.4** Survey Instrument - A structured questionnaire was developed with five point Likert scale, with 1 the strongly disagree and 5 the strongly agree on QWL variables such as Nature of Job, Stress Level, Work Independence, Job Security, Career Prospects, Safety and Health Work Conditions, Opportunity for growth and security and Total life space. A three point Likert scale developed to measure the overall QWL variable, with 1for disagreed, 2 for undecided and 3 for agreed. It was developed with discussion of experts and review of literature.

**4.5** Statistical Tools - Data analysis was done using statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20.0 for the data gathered through structured questionnaire. Mean, standard deviation, T-test and one way ANOVA were used as statistical tools.

## 5. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

**5.1 Sample Profile** - Demographic features of faculties of privately managed engineering colleges in the district of Rayagada, are exhibited with the help of table 1 below:

**Table 1 – Sample Profile**

| Demographic Variable | Categories | Counts | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 28 | 50.9 % |
| | Female | 27 | 49.1 % |
| Age | Less than 25 years | 13 | 23.6 % |
| | 25 to 35 years | 20 | 36.4 % |
| | 35 to 45 years | 16 | 29.1 % |
| | Above 45 years | 6 | 10.9 % |
| Marital Status | Married | 29 | 52.7 % |
| | Unmarried | 26 | 47.3 % |
| Designation | Teaching Assistant | 13 | 23.6 % |
| | Assistant Professor | 19 | 34.5 % |
| | Associate Professor | 15 | 27.3 % |
| | Professor | 8 | 14.5 % |
| Educational Qualification | B-Tech | 13 | 23.6 % |
| | M-Tech | 32 | 58.2 % |
| | PhD | 10 | 18.2 % |
| Academic Experience | Less than 5 years | 13 | 23.6 % |
| | 5 to 10 years | 18 | 32.7 % |
| | 10 to 15 years | 11 | 20.0 % |
| | Above 15 years | 13 | 23.6 % |

In the present study a sample size of 55 faculties of different private engineering colleges in the district of Rayagada has been taken as respondents, which include 28 male and 27 female employees and they have been categorised on the basis of various demographic factors like age, marital status, designation, educational qualification and finally academic experience.

**5.2 Reliability Statistics:-** The reliability of scale indicates that the study is free from random error. Internal consistency is measured in this research using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, (a). The statistic provides an indication of the average correlation among all of the items that make up the scale. Values range from 0 to 1 with higher values indication greater reliability.

**Table -2 Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|---|---|
| 0.717 | 9 |

Table above indicates the result of analysis of the Cronbach's alpha scale for QWL is 0.717, where its value is more than 0.7, which shows a greater reliability in any kind of social research. This indicates that the survey instrument (questionnaire) can be liable tool to measure the construct consistently.

**5.3 Descriptive Statistics:-** Level of QWL among the faculties of different private engineering colleges in relation to identified factors is shown in Table 3 which shows the mean values, standard deviation and variance for the variables.

**Table-3 Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nature of Job | 55 | 3.18 | 1.020 | 1.040 |
| Career Prospect | 55 | 3.29 | .975 | .951 |
| Safety and Healthy Work Condition | 55 | 3.05 | 1.044 | 1.090 |
| Job Security | 55 | 3.40 | 1.065 | 1.133 |
| Opportunity for Growth and Security | 55 | 3.31 | 1.120 | 1.255 |
| Life Space | 55 | 3.24 | 1.186 | 1.406 |
| Work Independence | 55 | 2.95 | 1.113 | 1.238 |
| Stress Level | 55 | 3.27 | 1.209 | 1.461 |
| Overall QWL | 55 | 2.27 | .651 | .424 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 55 | | | |

The mean score on overall QWL was found to be 2.27 on a three point Likert scale. This is above the neutral score of 1.5, which implies that respondents' overall QWL is favorable/positive. Based on a five point Likert type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), the survey conducted for knowing the response of faculties on various attributes relating to QWL. The mean scores with the Nature of Job 3.18, Career Prospects 3.29, Safety and Healthy Work Conditions 3.05, Job Security 3.40, Opportunity for growth and security 3.31, Life space 3.24, Work Independence 2.95 and Stress Level 3.27. all the mean scores of independent variables are above the neutral score 3, which implies for favourable or positive outcome. According to these results, faculties are more satisfied with Job security Conditions.

**5.4 Relationship between overall QWL of faculties with demographics factors (age, gender):**

5.4.1 1st Hypothesis: Relationship between overall QWL of faculty members with demographics factors (age).

$H_0$: The overall QWL do not vary in accordance with age

$H_1$: The overall QWL vary in accordance with age.

**Table-4 One Way ANOVA**

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 1.526 | 3 | .509 | 1.213 | .314 |
| Within Groups | 21.383 | 51 | .419 | | |
| Total | 22.909 | 54 | | | |

To analysis hypothesis that is there difference in overall QWL according to age, we use ANOVA one way. The results is F(3,51)=1.213, p=0.314, where p>0.05 so result is not significant at 5%. We have to accept the null hypothesis. That overall QWL do not vary in accordance with age.

5.4.2 2nd Hypothesis: Relationship between overall QWL of faculty members with demographics factors (Gender).

$H_0$: The overall QWL do not vary in accordance with gender.

$H_1$: The overall QWL vary in accordance with gender.

To analyze that is there significant difference between male and female QWL we use mean, standard deviation, T-test.

**Table-5 t-Test**

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | t – Test | Sig.(2 tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall QWL | Female | 27 | 2.37 | .629 | .121 | 1.094 | .279 |
| | Male | 28 | 2.18 | .670 | .127 | | |

The result shows t(53)=1.094, p=0.279 where p>0.05 so result is not significant at 5%. We have to accept the null hypothesis. That overall QWL do not vary according to gender. The table results indicate that. Male's faculty reported lower levels of QWL (mean 2.18, SD 0.670) comparing to female faculty (mean 2.37, SD 0.629).

**5.5 To test whether the identified factors are good predictor of QWL.**

To analysis the relationship between overall QWL and the identified factors affecting QWL, we use linear regression model.

**Table-6 Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .808[a] | .653 | .593 | .415 |

The table-6 is Model Summary. This table provides the R, $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and the standard error of the estimate, which can be used to determine how well a regression model fits the data.

- R represents multiple correlation coefficient, whose value is 0.808 which indicates a good level of prediction
- $R^2$ represents coefficient of determination, whose value is 0.653, which means our independent variables explains 65.3% of the variability of our dependent variable.
- Adjusted $R^2$ value is 0.593, which shows the model 59.3% accurately report our data

**Table – 7 ANOVA[a]**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 14.970 | 8 | 1.871 | 10.843 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 7.939 | 46 | .173 | | |
| | Total | 22.909 | 54 | | | |

3rd Hypothesis

$H_0$: There is no significant relationship between overall QWL and the identified factors affecting QWL.

$H_1$: There is significant relationship between overall QWL and the identified factors affecting QWL.

The F-ratio in the ANOVA table shows that the identified factors (Independent Variables) statistically significantly predict the overall QWL (Dependent Variable), $F(7,47) = 10.843$, $p < 0.0005$ so the result is significant. $H_0$ is rejected. Hence the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable

**Table – 8 Coefficients**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | -.583 | .340 | | -1.715 | .093 |
| | Nature of Job | .114 | .068 | .179 | 1.686 | .099 |
| | Career Prospect | .037 | .079 | .055 | .465 | .644 |
| | Safety and Healthy Work Condition | .070 | .073 | .113 | .963 | .340 |
| | Job Security | .151 | .086 | .247 | 1.762 | .085 |
| | Opportunity for Growth and Security | .234 | .069 | .403 | 3.402 | .001 |
| | Life Space | .121 | .067 | .220 | 1.792 | .080 |
| | Work Independence | .089 | .072 | .153 | 1.236 | .223 |
| | Stress Level | .065 | .072 | .121 | .907 | .369 |

a. Dependent Variable: Overall QWL

In the above coefficient table the unstandardized coefficients indicate how much the overall QWL (dependent variable) varies with the identified factors affecting QWL (independent variable) when all other independent variables are held constant.

- All the identified factors affecting the QWL have a positive relation with the overall QWL.

- Opportunity for Growth and Security factor have highest impact on the overall QWL as its Beta value is 0.234
- Stress level factor have lowest impact on the overall QWL as its Beta value is 0.065
- Except Opportunity for Growth and Security factor all the identifiend independent factors affecting overall QWL are not statistically significant.

A multiple regression was run to predict overall QWL from Nature of Job, Stress Level, Work Independence, Job Security, Career Prospects, Safety and Health Work Conditions, Opportunity for growth and security and Total life space. These variables statistically significantly predicted Overall QWL, $F(7,47) = 10.843$, $p < 0.0005$, $R^2 = 0.653$. All eight variables added statistically significantly to the prediction, $p < 0.05$

## CONCLUSION

Good QWL ensures optimum operational freedom and overall development of faculties. Because academic dwells when academicians work with free mind and without any institutional impediment. That is the reason, specifically in private engineering colleges ample care has been taken to develop good ambience, and good academic environment so that teachers can contribute their best effort. In this present research a sincere attempt taken to understand how various independent factors like Nature of Job, Stress Level, Work Independence, Job Security, Career Prospects, Safety and Health Work Conditions, Opportunity for growth and security and Total life space positively influences the dependent factor i.e., overall QWL experiences of faculties working in various private engineering colleges. The study reveals that Opportunity for Growth and Security factor have larger impact on overall QWL experience, where as Nature of job, Job security and life space has moderate impact and the rest factors has less impact on overall QWL experience. Finding of the study further indicates that overall QWL experiences do not vary significantly due to age and gender. At last the present study concludes that, private engineering colleges should understand these factors which enrich the QWL of the faculty members. Because faculties are considered as the most important assets of any educational institutions and they are the force behind every success.

## REFERENCES

[1] Chen, S.H., Yang, C.C., Shiau, J.Y. and Wang, H.H., "The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education", The TQM Magazine, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 484-500,2006.

[2] Yadev.R, Khanna.A, "IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science", Volume 19, Issue 9, Ver. V, PP 71-80, 2014

[3] David lewis et al (2001) ,extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of worklife, leadership in health sciences, MCB university press, 14(2).

[4] Lokanadha Reddy. M and Mohan Reddy.P (2010), "Quality of work life of employees:Emerging Dimensions", Asian Journal of Management Research, pp. 827-839.

[5] Srivastava, Kanpur (2014), "A Study On Quality Of Work Life: Key Elements & It'sImplications", IOSR Journal of Business and Management, Vol. 16, Iss. 3, pp. 54-59.

[6] Linda K. Johnsrud (2006) studied on Quality of faculty work life: the University of Hawaii.

[7] Mohammad Baitul Islam (2012), "Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: An Analysis on Employees of Private Limited Companies in Bangladesh", Global Journal of Management and Business Research, Vol. 12, Iss. 18.

[8] Sivakumar.S,Ganesan.N.M. (2014), "Quality of work life of college teachers – A study with reference to Madurai district.", Indian Journal of Applied Research, Volume-4, issues-8, pp. 369-371.

[9] Casio, W.F (1998), Managing human resources: productivity, quality of work life, profits, Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.,

[10] Schermernrhorn, J.R., John, R (1989), .Managment for Productivity, John Wily and Sons: Inc.

[11] Walton, R.E., (1975). Criteria for Quality of Working Life. In Davis, L.E., Cherns, A.B. andAssociates (Eds.) The Quality of Working Life, The Free Press, New York, NY, 1: 91-104

[12] Donalson, slewat, (2000), "health behavior : quality of work life and organizational effectiveness in the lunbe industry "published by : sage publication, pp.122-130.

[13] Chandranshu Sinha (2012), "Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: Empirical Evidence From Indian Organizations", Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, Vol.1, No.11, pp. 31-40

*****