

PERCEPTION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS WITH REGARD TO FACTORS DETERMINING QWL

Dr. Kawaljit Kaur¹, Dr. Dhiraj Sharma²

¹Assistant Professor, Deptt. of Commerce and Management, Khalsa College, Amritsar, India

²Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, India

Abstract: Purpose –For employee satisfaction, employees must be self motivated. Thus objective of this study is to analyze what factors affect quality of work life of faculty members working among public sector universities in Punjab.

Design/ Methodology - Data were collected from total three universities of Punjab state of India. Faculty members teaching in different universities were the sampling unit for present study. Factor analysis was used to analyze data.

Findings - Factors which motivates to both sector's employees to work efficiently are salary & rewards, better leave plans, reasonable working hours and opportunities for promotion. There are few factors, which create aversion among employees both sectors are; too much workload, conduct of top management, long travelling hours and internal politics.

Originality- Although vast literature exists about quality of work life in different sectors but, yet, hardly very few studies have been conducted in India to investigate QWL in higher education sector particularly in Punjab. Present study adds to the literature by scour into this aspect in Indian higher education sector.

Keywords: Motivation, University, Job Satisfaction, Quality of work life

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life refers to the level of pleasure or displeasure with one's own career. The employees who enjoy their career are said to have a high quality of work life, while who are not satisfied with their job have a low quality of work life. For the success of every organization it is utmost important to retain competent employees. As mentioned in hygiene two factor theory, the presence of hygiene factors do not create satisfaction but absence of these definitely create dissatisfaction. Due to changes in work environment i.e. technological, high competition, rise of employee unions etc.; employers are not only offering pay as compensation, but are considering other benefits both intrinsic & extrinsic to create a quality working environment that will attract and retain the best brains in the industry. The quality of work life can be explained as the quality of association among the employees and the work surroundings such that the employees have an important pressure in structuring the organizational surroundings in techniques utilized to rise not only their personal inspiration and job satisfaction but also the profits and productivity of the organization. The quality of work life covers numerous areas like getting rid of the health hazards for the employees, sufficient fair compensations, security of job, benefits for employees, profit sharing, work schedules and the work place contribution. A worker must have an optimistic awareness of QWL in the

organization. She / he should possibly struggle to further develop the working conditions, raise the quality and production of products (Runcie, 1980).

II. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The most contented teachers are the ones who feel their jobs are secure and they are treated as experts by the Community. This is one of the key factors as this ensures that they are capable of delivering the student requirement and they are capable of utilizing their overall skills (Walton et al., 2003). Teachers whose jobs are secure are more likely to have prospects for professional development, interact cohesively with peers and greater parental involvement in their schools and to their students (Gupta & Sharma, 2011). Rewards and Benefits serves as a motivating factor for teachers to perform well in the colleges. This also creates a healthy competition between teachers in using their overall skills in their performance and strives to increase the overall standard of the college (Kaur, 2012). Compensation plays a pivotal role in effectiveness of the university. Lesser compensation would not attract skilled and experienced people with great performance and would not help in achieving the quality in imparting education, while higher compensation might be an overhead with costs running more than the desired (Malarvizhi, 2012; Islam, 2012). University should strive to provide opportunity for every team member to showcase their talent, proficiency, skills, capacity and abilities (Zakari, Khamis & Hamadi, 2010). Utilizing teacher's capacities in areas other than their present position will help them to understand that management appreciates and identifies that what the staff could provide to the university. This can also provide work variety and helps to break up the everyday grind of work and also helps to get free from the stress of the routine work (Gupta & Sharma, 2011). Teachers will be dissatisfied if rational climate doesn't exist for them to differentiate work from family (Carr et al. 2003). The universities demand shouldn't be interfering with teacher's family responsibilities and personal duties apart from their carrier (Aziz et al., 2010; Al-Enezi et al. eds., 2009). Teachers experience poor mental health and lower job satisfaction as compared to other groups (Miller et al. 2005). There is an association between the quality of work life with the commitment to university among some 205 students who possess the student job and it is found that there is a considerable association among the willingness to work and the commitment to university (Turner 2005) whereas there is a significant and positive association between the organizational commitment and the quality of work life. Disappointment with quality of work life may affect faculties irrespective of their positions. When the universities starts to identify that the faculties have their lives apart from work, trust and loyalty among faculties is created (Saraji and Dargahi, 2006). Workload pressure, role ambiguity and performance pressure were the predictors of job stress. But managerial role and relationship with others had no significant direct effect on job stress (Alam 2009). As far as association in the perception of employees towards quality of work life and job satisfaction across the gender and nature of job is concerned there is difference in the perception of males and females with regard to different dimensions like working conditions, work life balance, opportunities of growth and social relevance of job (Shalla et al.2014).

III. RESEARCH GAP AND AIM OF STUDY

The review of the existing literature reveals that a numbers of studies have been

carried out on various aspects of quality but a very few comprehensive studies in this area could be found which provides detailed information regarding quality of work life in universities of Punjab region. In the light of the above discussion comprehensive and detailed study regarding universities is of dire need. This study aims to analyze perception of university teachers with regard to factors determining QWL.

IV. METHODOLOGY

Data were collected from three government universities of Punjab state of India. Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of random sampling. Faculty members were the basic sampling unit for the study. As faculty members who were working in the universities for more than two years had been considered for the study. Teachers were asked to fill the questionnaires. Of the 300 questionnaires distributed to the teachers, 250 (83.33%) complete questionnaires were received back. This resulted in a total sample of 250 faculty members teaching in universities. Keeping into consideration the objectives of the study, a structured questionnaire was prepared. The questionnaire was framed on the basis of previous literature, discussions with experts of the related field. The suggestions of experts led to many meaningful modifications. The preliminary draft was pre tested. Questionnaires were received back with Suggestions; questionnaires were revised and sent for final survey. All the questions were close ended. Factor analysis was used to analyze the data.

V. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The statements (Table 1) general in nature reflecting perception of faculty members were short listed on the basis of review of previous studies (Walton, 1972; Gordon, 1984 and Gilgeous, 1998) and discussions with experts and institutions. Faculty members were asked to express their level of agreement/ disagreement with respect to various statements based on five-point Likert scale. Factor analysis is applied to summarize the data into less and meaningful factors relevant to the sample.

Data were examined for its suitability for factor analysis. Reliability is measured by using Crohnbach's Alpha. Crohnbach's Alpha ranges from 0 to 1. The Crohnbach's Alpha of likert scaled items in the questionnaire was 0.732 which is deemed to be good. This was done by computing the correlation matrix which was depicted enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Correlation matrix was computed which depicted that there were enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Communality and factor loadings were high enough to prove the suitability of data as well as the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was 0.715 which indicated that the sample was good enough for sampling. Barlett's Test of Sphericity showed statistically significant number of correlations among the variables. Hence all the above mentioned parameters revealed that data was fit for factor analysis. Out of 34 statements listed for assessing quality of work life after applying factor analysis total variance that 12 factors extracted together for 62.357% of total variance so it is possible to economize on the number of variables from 34 to 12.

The 1st factor explains the largest portion of the total variance. The 2nd factor for the

most of the residual variance, subject to being uncorrelated with the first factor. The second factor explains the second highest variance and so on. The Eigen values for the factors are in decreasing order of magnitude as we move from variable 1 to variable 12. Factor 1 accounts for a variance 4.885 which (4.885/34) or 14.367% of the total variance. Likewise the second factor accounts for (2.566/3.4) or 7.548% of total variance and so on. All factor loadings greater than 0.5 have been considered for factor analysis.

Table 1: Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Public Sector University

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem	F ₃	Good Relationship with co-workers	0.639	4.88	7.96	7.96
		F ₁₂	Faculty members have friendly relations with each other	0.669			
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues are ready	0.708			
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after performing my work	0.584			
2	Effect Recognition and Career Progression	F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.577	2.56	7.30	15.27
		F ₈	Support from the top management is helpful in accomplishing a task	0.628			
		F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.643			
		F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.515			
		F ₂₄	All the faculty member generally support all the members of the	0.695			

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
			universities				
3	Employee loyalty and Growth	F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.584	1.87	6.03	21.30
		F ₁₅	On the basis of my own standards, I am satisfied with personal development	0.510			
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.787			
		F ₂₉	All the members are generally committed to their work	0.587			
4	Quality on Work Place	F ₂₀	I feel that my university provides maximum facilities for doing my work properly	0.688	1.70	4.92	26.22
		F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.515			
5	Conducive Environment	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at the university	0.725	1.52	4.89	31.12
		F ₂₂	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.579			
6	Lower Self Esteem	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this University	0.816	1.47	4.82	35.94
		F ₂₇	Most of my activities are routine and	0.574			

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
			boring				
7	Employee Development	F ₂₁	I am developing new skills and abilities at work	0.704	1.41	4.67	40.62
		F ₃₄	My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences	0.558			
8	Work load other than teaching	F ₃₂	I feel too much burdened for research work.	0.582	1.30	4.48	45.10
		F ₃₃	My university organizes FD for the up gradation of facility	0.815			
9	Rationality	F ₁₁	Favouritism does not play any part in the institution of work	0.754	1.18	4.46	49.57
		F ₂₅	Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work	0.511			
10	Organizational satisfaction	F ₂	Job security exists at my university.	0.741	1.15	4.30	53.88
		F ₁₄	I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work	0.566			
11	Organizational communication and economic benefit	F ₁	There is a reasonable periodical increase in salary	0.795	1.08	4.26	58.15
		F ₂₃	There is an active low of ideas	0.501			

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
12	Critical factors	F ₁₉	Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization.	0.586	1.01	4.20	42.35
		F ₂₆	Employer overdrive the employees	0.701			

KMO 0.715

Factor 1: Job satisfaction and self esteem

This suggests that factor 1 is the combinations of four variables. Faculty of Public Sector University perceives that there exists job satisfaction and self esteem. This factor explains (7.965%) variance with 4 statements. Highest coefficient is for the statement F₃, "Good relationship with co-workers" (0.639), followed by F₁₂ "Faculty members have friendly relations with each other" (0.669) whereas next variable F₁₃ states that "Fellow colleagues are ready to help in distress" (0.708) and one more statement which is extracted in factor 1 is F₁₆ "feeling of satisfaction after performing my work". Our results go hand in hand with the results of study conducted by Schulz and Pauline (2009), Johansson and Heikinaro(2004) who too found that teachers derived most of their job satisfaction from interpersonal relations.

Factor 2: Effort Recognition and Career Progression

This factor explains a combination of 5 statements with 7.309% of variance. The statement F₇ scored the highest score. It is sufficient motivational strategies" (0.577), followed by F₈ "support from top management is helpful in accomplishing a task" (0.628). The statement F₉ states that "university recognizes and acknowledge my work" with factor loadings 0.643 is also a combination of F₁₀ "Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression" (0.515) and statement F₂₄ All the faculty members generally support all the members of the universities with factor loadings 0.695. Effort recognition and career progression also fall in line with the findings of Jenkinsons and Chapman (1990), Sweeney (1981).

Factor 3: Employee loyalty and growth

This factor explains 6.032% of variance with 4 statements. These statements indicate that employees committed towards their duties and sufficient promotional opportunities are provided to deserving employees. The highest Varimax coefficient is secured by the statement F₅, "Effective Promotional Opportunities in the University" (0.584), followed by F₁₅, "On the basis of my own standards; I am satisfied with Personal Development" (0.510). Other two statements are related to commitment and good communication system, are loaded on the same factor. These are F₂₈, "Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other" with factor loadings 0.787 and F₂₉, "All the members generally committed to their work" (0.587).The results contradict with studies conducted by Sonmezer and Eryaman (2008).

Factor 4: Quality on Work Place

Public university provides maximum facilities to conduct research work as well as to perform other activities. Factor 4th explaining 4.920% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F₂, "My University provides maximum facilities for doing to my work properly" (0.688) followed by F₁₇ "Feeling good about the quality of work performed" (0.515). Bhanugopal et al. (2008) also found that there is correlation between quality of work life and work environment.

Factor 5: Conducive Environment

The 5th factor explains 4.897% of variance of 2 statements. The highest coefficient is 0.725 in case of the statement F₆, "Good safety measures adopted at my university" followed by F₂₂, "I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties" (0.579) employees feels comfortable in this environment and work efficiently. It is also found in the study of Mirvis and Lawler (1984) that quality of work life is associated to working environment, working hours and safe working conditions.

Factor 6: Lower Self Esteem

Factor 6 enlists negative statements which lead to low the morale of employees. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 6 explains 4.820% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.816 in case of statement F₁₈, "There are many political problems in this university" and F₂₇, "Most of my activities are routine and boring" with factor loadings of 0.484.

Factor 7: Employee Development

Factor 7 enlists statements related to employee development. 7th factor explains 4.679% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F₂₁, "I am developing new skills and abilities at work" 0.704 followed by F₃₄, "My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences" with factor loading of 0.558.

Factor 8: Workload other than teaching

This factor is a combination of 2 statements with 4.487% of variance. The statement F₃₂ highlights that "I feel too much burdened for research work" (0.582) followed by other statement F₃₃ "My university organizes FDP for the up gradation of faculty" (0.815). These statements create extra burden other than teaching on university faculty.

Factor 9: Rationality

Factor 9 enlists favorable statements which lead to job satisfaction among public sector university faculty. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 9 explains 4.64% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.754, in case of statement F₁₁, "Favoritism does not play any part in the Institution" and F₂₅, "Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work" (0.511).

Factor 10: Organizational Satisfaction

The 10th factor explains 4.309% of variance with 2 statements the statement F₂ scores highest score, "Job security exists at my university" (0.741), followed by F₁₄ "I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work" (0.566).

Factor 11: Organization Communication and Economic Benefits

This factor explains 4.269% of the variance with 2 statements. This factor features that there is two way communications to make healthy environment and

economic benefits are reasonably provided to the faculty. The highest varimax coefficient is secured by the statement F₁, "There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary" (0.795), followed by F₂₃, "There is an active flow of ideas" with factor loadings 0.501.

Factor 12: Critical Factors

The factor 12th explains 4.205% of variance with 2 negative statements. The statement F₁₉, "Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization" (0.586) followed by F₂₆, "Employer overdrive the employees" with factor loadings of 0.70%.

VI. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND CONCLUSION

The study is based upon self reports of university teachers teaching in public sector universities of Punjab whilst other data collection procedure such as focus discussions might provide some more insights of the same study. More so, as this study is based upon teachers teaching in government universities in Punjab only, results might vary for India level or in any other state. Thus future research can use different methods of data collection to delve deeper insights.

As the study put forth that faculty members feel motivated if supportive work environment is provided. They want respect in their work and quality time. University teachers were found to be more satisfied with co-workers behavior and job security. Teachers perceived that proper recognition is provided to their efforts but few of them felt that there is politics among the teachers. As far as work load is concerned teachers perceived that there is not much work load other than teaching and proper research infrastructure is provided to them.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alam, S. Shah (2009), "A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 8(1), pp. 105-128.
- [2] Bhanugopal, Ramudu and Fish, Alan (2008), "The Impact of Business Crime on Expatriate Quality of Work-Life in Papua New Guinea", *Australian Human Resources Institute*.Vol.46 (1), 68-84.
- [3] Carr, Jennifer Z, Schmidt, Aaron M, Ford J K, Deshon and Richard P (2003), "Climate Perceptions Matter: A Meta-Analytic Path Analysis Relating Molar Climate, Cognitive and Affective States and Individual Level Work Outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- [4] Gilgeous, V., (1998), "Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life", *Integrated Manufacturing System*", Vol. 9(3), 173-181.
- [5] Gupta and Sharma (2011), "Factor Credentials Boosting Quality of Work Life of BSNL Employees in Jammu Region", *Sri Krishna International Research & Educational Consortium*, Vol. 1(2).
- [6] Islam B M (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(18) Version 1.0, Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA).

- [7] Jenkinsons, R. and Chapman, W. (1990), "Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers" *International Review of Education*, Vol. 36(3), 299-313.
- [8] Johansson, N. and Heikinaro, P. (2004), "Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers in Finland", Paper Presented at Athens, Pre Olympic Conference.
- [9] Kaur A (2012), "Quality of work life, National foundation of Indian Engineers", Retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.nafenindia.com/nafdigjun12.pdf>
- [10] Kaur, C. (1992), *Education in Punjab (A Historical Study)*, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi.
- [11] Malarvizhi (2012), "A Study on Quality Of Work Life In Jeppiaar Cements Private Limited, Mela Mathur, Perambalur-District", retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.isrj.net/publishArticles/736.pdf>
- [12] Miller, G.V. and Travers, C.J. (2005), "Ethnicity and the Experience of work: Job stress and Satisfaction of Minority Ethnic Teachers in the U.K.", *International Review of Psychiatry*, Vol. 17(5), 317-327.
- [13] Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984), "Accounting for the Quality of Work Life", *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol.5, 197-212.
- [14] Runcie, J. F. (1980), *Dynamic Systems and the Quality of Work Life*, *Personnel*, Vol. 57(6) pp.13-24.
- [15] Saraji N. G. and Dargahi (2006), "Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL), Department of Health Care Management," School of Allied Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran, 1053-1056.
- [16] Sonmezer, M.G. and Eryaman, M.Y. (2008), "Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction levels of Public and Private School Teachers", *Journal of Theory and Practice in education*, Vol. 4(2), 189-212.
- [17] Sweeney, P. (1981), "Human Needs and Job satisfaction", *Professional Journal*, Vol. 32(1), 42-55.
- [18] Turner, B.A. & P. Chelleadurai (2005), "Organization and Occupational Commitment, Intention to Leave and Perceived Performance of Intercollegiate Coaches", *Journal of sport management*, 682-686.
- [19] Walton (1982), "International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life", *Productivity*, Vol.22 (4), 79-83.
- [20] Zakari NM, Al Khamis NI, Hamadi HY (2010), "Conflict and Professionalism: Perceptions among Nurses in Saudi Arabia" *International Nurses Review*, Vol.57 (3) 297-304.