



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers

Pugalendhi, Subburethina Bharathi; M, Umaselvi and
Nakkeeran, Senthil kumar

Hallamark Business School, Trichy, Tamilnadu, India, Majan
University College, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman , Anna
University Chennai

01. June 2010

Online at <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27868/>
MPRA Paper No. 27868, posted 04. January 2011 / 11:18

Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers

P.Subburethina Bharathi, B.E., M.B.A., M.Phil.,¹
Dr. M. Umasevi, M.B.A., M.com., M. Phil., Ph.D.,²
Dr. N. Senthil Kumar, B.E., M.B.A., Ph.D.,³

Abstract

Several Research Studies in the world have measured the Quality of Work of Employee's in Industries, Universities, Schools, Government and Non Government Organizations. This research study highlights the quality of work life of college teachers under various dimensions. New Challenges can be faced with employee's commitment and involvement in achieving organizational goals. This study helps the college teachers to know the level of perception towards QWL and to enhance the same by the educational administrators.. Quality of Work Life is the essential concept of favorable situations in a working environment. The Quality of Work Life facilitates employee's training opportunities, job satisfaction and working conditions. A better Quality of Work Life improves the growth of the employee's along with the organization growth. The universe of the study includes 12 colleges located within the Tiruchirappalli city limit and 1279 college teachers were working during May 2008 – February 2009. A sample of 239 respondents was collected from the universe. The collected data after being coded were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social sciences Research (SPSS) and various statistical tests were applied based on hypotheses and matching variables. There is a significant association between quality of work life total and quality of life in teaching environment total. It shows QWL of college teachers is in low level.

Key Words: Quality of Work Life, College Teachers, Perception.

¹Associate Professor, Hallmark Business School, Trichy -620 102 (psrbharathi@sify.com)

²Assistant Professor, Majan University College, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman (uma@majancollege.edu.om)

³Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Anna Univesity, Chennai – 600 025 (sen_nsk76@annauniv.edu)

INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) has been defined as “The quality of relationship between the employees and the total working environment”. QWL is concerned with the overall climate of work and the impact on work and people as well as on organization effectiveness. Quality is no more a specialized word but has become a necessary and must for the best survival. In this era, quality of human inputs is the greatest asset to any organization. Maintaining the quality of such human inputs rises from maintaining the quality of work life perfectly. Rise in the quality of work life would help employees’ well being there by the well being of the whole organization. This research is an attempt to study the quality of work life of college teachers. Legislation enacted in early 20th century to protect employees from job-injury and to eliminate hazardous working conditions, followed by the unionization movement in the 1930 and 1940s were the initial steps. Emphasis was given to job security, due to process at the work place and economic gains for the workers. The 1950s and the 1960s saw the development of different theories by psychologists proposing a “positive relationship between morale and productivity”, and the possibility that improved human relations would lead to the enhancement of both. Attempts at reform to acquire equal employment opportunity and job enrichment schemes also were introduced. Finally, in the 1970s the ideal of QWL was conceived which, according to Walton, is broader than these earlier developments and is something that must include ‘ the values that were at the heart of these earlier reform movements’ and ‘human needs and aspirations’. The theories of motivation and leadership provided a sound base for the concept of QWL. If the lower-order needs are satisfied, people seek satisfaction for the higher-order needs.

Origin of Quality of Work Life

Legislation enacted in early 20th century to protect employees from job-injury and to eliminate hazardous working conditions, followed by the unionization movement in the 1930 and 1940s were the initial steps. Emphasis was given to job security, due to process at the work place and economic gains for the workers. The 1950s and the 1960s saw the development of different theories by psychologists proposing a “positive relationship between morale and productivity”, and the possibility that improved human relations would lead to the enhancement of both. Attempts at reform to acquire equal employment opportunity and job enrichment schemes also were introduced. Finally, in the 1970s the ideal of QWL was conceived which, according to Walton, is broader than these earlier developments and is something that must include ‘ the values that were at the heart of these earlier reform movements’ and ‘human needs and aspirations’. The theories of motivation and leadership provided a sound base for the concept of QWL. If the lower-order needs are satisfied, people seek satisfaction for the higher-order needs. QWL activity gained

importance between 1969 and 1974, when a broad group of researchers, scholars, union leaders and government personnel development interest in how to improve the quality of an individual through on-the-job experience. The United States department of health, education and welfare sponsored a study on this issue, which led to the publication of work in America. Simultaneously, the pressure of inflation promoted the US Government to address some of these issues. Accordingly, a Federal Productivity Commission was established. This commission sponsored several labor management QWL experiments which were jointly conducted by the University of Michigan quality of work programme and the newly-evolved National Quality of Work Centre.

The term “Quality of Work Life” has appeared in Research Journals and press in USA only in 1970’s. **The term quality of work life was introduced by Louis Davis.** The first International QWL conference was held in Toronto in 1972. The international council for quality of work life was established in 1972. From 1980 onwards QWL was increasingly placed on employee-centered productivity programs. In the mid 1990s till today faced with challenges of economize and corporate restructuring, QWL is reemerging where employees are seeking out more meaning where rising educational levels and occupational aspirations in today’s slow economic growth and reduced opportunities for advancement, naturally, there are rising concerns for QWL and for career and personal life planning. In India, QWL offers a value frame and the social technology of organizational change leading to task effectiveness of micro-entities through utilization and unfolding of human potential. Some evidence of the rising tide interest in the quality of work life issue is the fact that the second International Conference on quality of work life held in Toronto in 1981 attracted 1,500 participations. The 200 unionist and 750 management people combined out-numbered the, academicians, consultants and government officials in attendance. Quality is no more a specialized word but has become a necessary and a must work for the best survival. In this era, Quality of human inputs is the greatest asset to any organization. Maintaining the quality of such human inputs rises farm maintaining the quality of work life perfectly. A perfect quality of work life would help the organization. Rise in the quality of work life would help employees’ well being thereby the well being of the whole organization. This is an attempt to capitalize the human assets of the organization.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Before resuming with objectives the researcher has gone through past studies on the topic and present as Review of Literature. A number of researchers and theorists have been paying attention in the meaning of the QWL concept and have tried to identify the kinds of factors that determine such an experience at work (Rosen, Ian C. (2000), Pruett, Ellen S. (2001), Bolduc, Richard Robert (2002), Fitzsimmons, Verna Marie (2002), Linda K. Johnsrud (2002), Meena Osmany, Dr. Waheeda Khan (2003), Littlefield, Kelly Lorraine (2004), Zeenobiyah Hannif (2004), Chao, Chih Yang(2005), Nasal Saraji G, Dargahi H (2005), Raduan Che

Rose, LooSee Beh (2006), N. Karl Haden, Ph.D.; William Hendricson, M.S et.al (2007), Rishu Roy (2008), Nirmala Kaushik, Manju Singh Tonk (2008), Marcia and Joanna E.M. (2009), Phusavat, Kongkiti (2009).

(Table: 1) QWL factors from previous research studies (2000-2009)		
Study	Factors Identified	
	Work Environment	Employee
Rose, Ian C. (2000)	Work Locus of Control	Employee Involvement
Pruett, Ellen S. (2001)	Work Load	Perception
Bolduc, Richard Robert(2002)	Relationship	Motivation
Fitzsimmons, Verna Marie (2002)	Productivity	Performance
Linda K. Johnsrud (2002)	Employee Retention	Perception
Meena Osmany, Waheeda Khan(2004)	Organizational Development	Effectiveness
Kelly L. Burning (2004)	Employee Commitment	Perception
Chao, Chih Yang (2005)	Promotion	Performance
Nasal Saraji G, Dargahi .H et.a (2005)	Health and Safety	Employee Satisfaction
Rauduan che Rose et.al (2006)	Career achievement	Career Satisfaction
N. Karal Hade, Willam Hendricson et.al (2007)	Job satisfaction	Perception
Rishu Roy (2008)	Job Performance	Motivation and Rewards
Nirma Kaushik, Manju Singh Tonk (2008)	Social Integration	Personality
Guna seelan Rethinam, Maimunah Ismail (2008)	Dynamic changes	Work Life
Dev Raj Adhikar, Dhruva Kumar Gautam (2008)	Labour Legislations	Job and Expectations
Julia Connell, Zeenobiyah Hannif, (2009)	Working conditions	Employee focus
Marica Smoke and Joanna E.M. Sale (2009)	Productivity	Employee characteristics
Kongkiti Phusvant (2009)	Social support at work	Personality
Subburethina Bharathi, Umaselvi (2009)	Teaching Environment	Perception

The above table presents a summary of a number of previous studies indicating the various factors deemed to be of significance for employees in the universe

Methodology

This study attempts to describe the various characteristics related to QWL and QWL in teaching environment, and to find out the association between the selected socio-economic variables and the various dimensions of QWL. Hence Descriptive cum Diagnostic research design has been adopted as defined by Kothari C.R. (2007) Descriptive research studies are concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual, or a group, whereas diagnostic research studies determine the association between the variables. . In this study the researcher has chosen the teaching professionals of self finance colleges under the affiliation of Bharathidasan University in Trichirappalli city, Tamilnadu, India to find out the quality of work life. The universe of the study includes 12 colleges located within the city limit and 1279 college teachers were working during May 2008 – February 2009. The researcher used disproportionate stratified random sampling method to select a sample of 239 respondents from the universe. The researcher used a standard questionnaire as a primary tool for data collection. The researcher used a standard

questionnaire as a primary tool for data collection. The questionnaire focuses on 16 dimensions divided into two sections as follows: Adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, Opportunities for development, Opportunities for growth and security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work and total life space, Social relevance and working life, QWL feeling, Curricular aspects, Teaching-Learning and evaluation, Research consultancy and extension, Infrastructure and learning resources, Student support and progression, Organization and management and Healthy practices which consists of 116 questions. The first part of the questionnaire deals with the socio-economic characteristics and the second part deals with various dimensions of quality of work life and quality of work life in teaching environment. In the second part the researcher used two types of questionnaires to measure the level of perception of the respondents. Namely,

1. Quality of Work Life Questionnaire
2. Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire

The reliability of Quality of Work Life Questionnaire is found to be .879 and the reliability of Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire is found to be .960 by using split half reliability test. The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS and various statistical tests were applied based on hypotheses and matching variables. (Chi-square Test, Student's 't'-test, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation)

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The collected data were analyzed using the SPSS 16.0 package. The analysis reveals that, majority (39.7%) of the respondents are 26-30 years old, 30.1% of them are 21-25 years old, 17.6% of them are 31-35 years old, 7.5% of them are 36-40 years old and remaining 5% of them are 41-45 years old. In this study majority (69.9%) of the respondents are female and remaining 30.1% are male. Majorities (76.6%) of the respondents are designated as lecturer, 18.4% of them are Senior Lecturers, 3.8% of them are Assistant professors and remaining 1.3% of them are professors. Majorities (61.5%) of the respondents are working in Science Department and remaining 38.5% of them are working in Arts Department. Majority (65.3%) of the respondents are having 1-5 years length of service, 28.5% of them are between 6-10 years length of service and remaining 6.3% of them are between 11-15 years length of service. Majorities (49.0%) of the respondents are from urban place, 30.1% of them are from rural place and remaining 20.9% of them are from semi-urban place. More than half (58.6%) of the respondents are nuclear family type and the remaining 41.4% of them are joint family type. More than half (78.7%) of the respondents are not members of professional forum, and remaining 21.3% of them are having professional membership. Majority (51.0%) of the respondents earning between `3001-6000 monthly incomes, 23.8% of them earning between `6001-9000, 17.6% of them earning between `1000-3000 and

remaining 7.5% earning between ` .9001-12,000 monthly incomes. It is inferred that 30.1% of the respondents are working in autonomous college, 26.4% of them are working in self financing college, 25.1% of them are working in Government College and remaining 18.4% of them are working in government aided college.

‘t’ TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS SEX WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT
Difference between the Respondents Sex and their perceived Quality of work Life Total

Table: 2

Quality of Work Life	Sex	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Work Life Total	Male	144.2500	17.52483	237	.130
	Female	143.9461	14.35784		P>0.05

There is no significant difference between the sex of the respondents with regard to the various dimensions of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

Between the Respondents Sex and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total

Table No:3

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Sex	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Male	146.2083	27.32895	237	2.500
	Female	155.7844	26.79487		P<0.05

There is a significant difference between the sex of the respondents with regard to the various dimensions of quality of work life in teaching environment total.

‘t’ TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS FAMILY TYPE WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT
Difference between the Respondents Type of Family and their perceived Quality of work life Total

Table No:4

Quality of Work Life	Type of Family	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Work Life Total	Joint	145.1212	16.66432	237	.895
	Nuclear	143.2714	14.34861		P>0.05

There is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

Difference between the Respondents Type of Family and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total

Table No: 5

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Type of Family	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Joint	144.424 2	28.43578	237	4.083
	Nuclear	158.892 9	24.79287		P<0.05

There is a significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of quality of work life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

't' TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS DEPARTMENT WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Table No: 6

Difference between the Respondents Department and their perceived Quality of work life

Quality of Work Life	Department	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Work Life Total	Arts	140.706 5	13.15131	237	2.823
	Science	146.122 4	16.26657		P<0.05

There is a significant difference between Department of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work Life Total

Difference between the Respondents Department and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total

Table No:7

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Department	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Arts	151.3043	28.19506	237	.706
	Science	153.8980	26.70250		P>0.05

It is inferred from the above table that, there is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with regard to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

't' TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Difference between the Respondents Professional Membership and their perceived Quality of work life Total

Table No: 8

Quality of Work Life	Professional Membership	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Work Life Total	Yes	136.3529	13.13594	237	4.544
	No	146.1223	15.26490		P<0.05

There is a significant difference between Professional Membership of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work life total.

Difference Between The Respondents Professional Membership And Their Perceived Quality Of Work Life In Teaching Environment

Environment

Table No: 9

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Professional Membership	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Yes	148.3529	27.49969	237	1.335
	No	154.1330	27.13323		P>0.05

There is no significant difference between professional memberships of the respondents with regard to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ONE WAY A OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED AGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL

Table No: 10

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
QWL Total						
Between Groups	146.7083	G1=14.62338	1636.738	4	409.185	1.760
Within Groups	143.1158	G2=19.01504	54393.923	234	232.453	P>0.05
	139.7857	G3=7.33031				
	148.0000	G4=13.13728				
	144.2500	G5=2.80016				

G1=21-25, G2=26-30, G3=31-35, G4=36-40, G5=41 – 45

There is no significant difference among various age groups of the respondents with regard to QWL Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED AGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No:11

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total						
Between Groups	166.8750	G1=24.07964	23987.738	4	5996.935	9.182
Within Groups	148.7684	G2=29.72693	152835.85	234	653.145	P<0.05
	139.2143	G3=23.72766				
	148.6667	G4=13.50381				
	156.0000	G5=14.82627				

G1=21-25, G2=26-30, G3=31-35, G4=36-40, G5=41 - 45

It is found from the above table that there is a significant difference between age groups of the respondents with regard to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED DESIGNATION AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Table No: 12

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
QWL Total						
Between Groups	143.5738	G1=15.67751	1421.475	3	473.825	2.039
Within Groups	143.3864	G2=15.10770	54609.186	235	232.380	P>0.05
	150.6667	G3=2.78388				
	162.0000	G4=.00000				

G1= Lecturer, G2= Senior Lecturer, G3= Assistant Professor, G4= Professor

There is no significant difference between various designations of the respondents with regard to QWL Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED DESIGNATION AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Table No:13

Variable s	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	SS	Mean Square	F
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total						
Between Groups	151.4590	G1=29.34874	3	3117.602	1039.201	1.406
Within Groups	155.1818	G2=19.12781	235	173705.988	739.174	P>0.05
	163.6667	G3=12.28821				
	175.0000	G4=.00000				

G1= Lecturer, G2= Senior Lecturer, G3= Assistant Professor, G4= Professor

There is no significant difference between various designations of the respondents with regard Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED INCOME AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Table No:14

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	SS	Mean Square	F
QWL Total						
Between Groups	140.7857	G1=19.41653	3	5800.123	1933.374	9.045
Within Groups	144.4426	G2=14.87804	235	50230.538	213.747	P<0.05
	149.8947	G3=10.93436				
	130.3333	G4=8.72454				

G1= 1000-3000, G2=3001-6000, G3= 60001-9000, G4= 9001-12000

There is a significant difference between varied income of the respondents with regard to QWL Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED INCOME AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No: 15

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	SS	Mean Square	F
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total						
Between Groups	153.5714	G1=26.84022	3	3310.570	1103.523	1.495
Within Groups	150.1230	G2=30.81311	235	173513.020	738.353	P>0.05
	159.1579	G3=20.84962				
	150.3333	G4=16.71561				

G1= 1000-3000, G2=3001-6000, G3= 60001-9000, G4= 9001-12000

There is no significant difference between varied income of the respondents with regard to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED TYPE OF COLLEGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL

Table No:16

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	SS	Mean Square	F
Quality of Work Life Total						
Between Groups	141.8571	G1=17.88210	3	3321.301	1107.100	4.936
Within Groups	141.3333	G2=12.70688	235	52709.360	224.295	P<0.05
	144.0500	G3=14.87396				
	151.5682	G4=13.94907				

G1= Self Financing, G2= Autonomous, G3= Government, G4= Government Aided
 There is a significant difference between varied income of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work Life Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED NATURE OF COLLEGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No: 17

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	df	SS	Mean Square	F
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total						
Between Groups	159.4286	G1=27.78356	3	807.475	6449.183	9.624
Within Groups	146.1250	G2=25.59046	235	15269.463	670.111	P<0.05
	143.9500	G3=23.65101				
	166.8409	G4=26.46537				

G1= Self Financing, G2= Autonomous, G3= Government, G4= Government Aided
 There is a significant difference between varied income of the respondents with regard to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS NATIVE PLACE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL

Table No: 18

Native Place	Quality of Work Life		2 x
	Low	High	
Quality of Work Life Total			
Rural	42	30	.953
Urban	60	57	Df=2
Semi Urban	26	24	P>0.05

There is no significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS NATIVE PLACE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No: 19

Native Place	Quality of Life in Teaching Environment		2 x
	Low	High	
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment (Total)			
Rural	51	21	30.318
Urban	45	72	Df=2
Semi Urban	12	38	P<0.05

There is a significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS LENGTH OF SERVICE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL

Table No:20

Length of service	Quality of Work Life		2 x
	Low	High	
Quality of Work Life Total			
1-5	84	72	8.037
6-10	41	27	Df=2

There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS LENGTH OF SERVICE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No:21

Length of Service	Quality of Life in Teaching Environment		2 x
	Low	High	
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment (Total)			
1-5	60	96	8.241
6-10	39	29	Df=2
11-15	9	6	P<0.05

There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

KARL PEARSON'S COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL

Table No: 22

Variables	Correlation Value	Significance
Quality of Work Life Total	-.033	P>0.05 Not significant

There is no significant relationship between the age of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work Life and Quality of Work Life Total.

KARL PEARSON'S COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL

Table No:23

Variables	Correlation Value	Significance
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	-.195	P<0.01

There is a significant relationship between the age of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work Life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

RELIABILITY OF THE TOOL

Split Half Reliability Test For Quality of Work Life Scale(1)

Table No:35

Variable	SCALE (FIRST HALF)
SCALE (SECOND HALF)	..879**

** Significant at 0.01 Level

The reliability of Quality of Work Life Questionnaire is found to be .879 by using split half reliability test.

Split Half Reliability Test for Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Scale(2)

Table No:36

Variable	SCALE (FIRST HALF)
SCALE (SECOND HALF)	.960**

** Significant at 0.01 Level

The reliability of Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire is found to be .960 by using split half reliability test.

Inter correlation between the Major Variables of the study

Table No:37

Variable	Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Significance
Quality of Work Life Total	.547	P<0.01

--	--	--

There is a significant association between quality of work life total and quality of life in teaching environment total.

FINDINGS

Findings related to the respondents by their overall perceived levels of Quality of Work Life and Overall Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment:

- With regard to the overall quality of work life 59.0% of the respondents have high level of quality of work life and 41.0% of the respondents have low level of quality of work life.
- With regard to the overall quality of work life in teaching environment 54.8% of the respondents have high level of quality of work life in teaching environment and 45.2% of the respondents have low level of quality of work life in teaching environment.

Findings derived from the statistical tests: (Quality of Work Life)

- There is no significant difference between sex of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- There is a significant difference between the department of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- There is a significant difference between the professional membership of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- There is no significant difference between the type of family of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- There is no significant difference between the age of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is no significant difference between the designation of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is no significant difference between the various income levels of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)

- There is no significant difference between the type of college of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is no significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (Chi-square test)
- There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life. (Chi-square test)

Findings derived from the statistical tests: (Quality of work life in teaching environment)

- There is a significant difference between Sex of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. ('t'-test)
- There is no significant difference between the department of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. ('t'-test)
- There is a significant difference between the professional membership and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. ('t'-test)
- There is no significant difference between the type of family of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. ('t'-test)
- There is a significant difference between the age of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is no significant difference between the designation of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is no significant difference between the various income levels of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is a significant difference between the type of college of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (One way - ANOVA)
- There is a significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (Chi-square - test)
- There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of overall quality of work life in teaching environment. (Chi-square - test)

CONCLUSION

QWL is the shared responsibility not only of the management and employees, but also by the society. To improve Quality of work life is first to identify and then try to satisfy employee's important needs through their experience in their working environment. Depending upon the situational requirements, management may select the relevant needs of the employee's to improve them with a short term plan. There is a significant association between quality of work life total and quality of life in teaching environment total. It shows QWL of college teachers is in low level. According to a report, improved flexible working environment was found to be successful in Europe, Japan, United States and Canada. According to traditional teachings, the workplace is a temple and work is worship. A planned change in the working environment is the need of the hour to improve QWL in India. Improved Flexible working environment can be an answer to the multifarious roles of the Indian employees. This research is to enhance the QWL of the college teachers by integrating the task role and social role, such that the synergies are effectively obtained.

Reference:

Ali, Ashraf and Prabhu R. Quality of Work Life – Organizational Management 19 (3) October – December 2003, Page (22 – 26)

Arun Monappa , Industrial Relations, Ninth print (1995), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company Ltd., Quality Control – Tool for Worker Development, Page (351 to 355)

Arun Monappa, Mirza S. Saiyadain, Personnel Management, Second edition (2000), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing company, New Delhi, Page (373 – 387)

Aswathappa. K, Human Resource and Personnel Management, Second edition(2002), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company, New Delhi, Page (390,391,523)

Biswajeet Pattanayak, Human Resource Management (2002), Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd., New Delhi, Page (248 -259)

Biswajeet Pattanayak, Human Resource Management (2003), Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, Page (249 – 258)

Biswanath Ghosh, Human Resource Development and Management (2000), Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Page (26 -27)

Black .L, and Forro D. Humor in the academic library : You must be joking! Or, how many academic librarians does it take to change a light bulb? College and Research Libraries 60 (2) March 1999, Page (65-72)

C.B. Memoria, S.V. Gankar, Personnel Management Text and Cases, Twenty Second Edition (2002), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (599 – 604)

C.S. Venkata Rathnam, B.K. Srivastava, Personnel Management and Human Resources, Eleventh reprint (1999), Page (236 – 239)

Choudhury, Anuva and Giri, D.V. Quality of Work life : A study in NALCO – Excellence in Supervision 11 (2) March – April 1995, Page (37-44)

Cohem, Susan G and others, Hierarchical construct of self-management leadership and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived work group effectiveness, Personnel Psychology 50 (2) 1997.

David A. De Cengo & Stephan P. Robbins, Personnel/Human Resource Management (1999), Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, Page (8 – 9)

De Nitish R, Towards and appreciation of quality of work life and quality of work, Economic and Political Weekly 19 (20) 1984, Page M-46.

Edwin B. Flippo, Personnel Management, International edition(1984), Mc Graw – Hill International Editions, Management Series, Page (416,421)

Gani .A and Ahamad, Riyaz, Correlates of Quality of Work Life - An analytical study, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations 31 (1) July 1995-96, Page (17)

H.L. Kaila, S. Ravisankar, Sathish Pai, Managing Occupational Health in Service Industries (2001), Himalaya Publishing House.

Infinite Books, New Delhi, Page (295)

Ivanovic, MBA, Dictionary of Personnel Management, Reprint (2000), Universal Book Stall, New Delhi, Edited by P.H.Collin.

J.H. Hartley and G.M. Stephenson, Successful Employee Relations, First edition (2000)

Kaushal, Shyam Lal, Quality of work life : Gate way to job satisfaction, International Journal of Management and Tourish 6(2) October – December 1997, Page (52 – 56)

Kumar K, Pradeep and Ganesh, Quality of Work Life in small scale industries, SEDME 23 (4) December 1996.

Kumar, H. and Shanubhogue A, Quality of worklife : An empirical approach, Manpower Journal 32 (3) October – December 1996, Page (17 – 24)

Kumar, Satish, Gender issues and quality of work life : A case study of the formal labour market in Delhi, Labour and Development 1 (1) 1995 Page (31)

Mirza S. Saiyadain, Human Resource Management (2003), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, Page (359 – 389)

Muraleedharan, K.P. and Krishnavani, S. Quality of Work Life in the SSI sector, SEDME 21 (3) Septemeber 1994, Page (53 – 57)

Murali, Krishna P. and others, Quality of Work Life among women employees of Andra Bank, Indian Journal of Public Enterprise 12 (21) December 1996.

P. Subba Rao, Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations, Text Cases and Games (2001), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (657 - 663)

P. Subba Rao, Personnel and Human Resource Management Text and Cases (2002), Himalya Publishing House, Page (403 – 409)

P. Subbarao, VSP Rao, Personnel/Human Resource Management, Text, Cases and Games (2000), Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Page (482 – 506)

Pandiyaa, D. and others, Industrial democracy and Quality of Work Life : An empirical stury of its dimension in North Eastern Coal Fields, Coal India Ltd., Marherita, Indian Journal of Public Enterprise 10 (18) June, Page(61 – 88)

Sengupta, Palas R. and Sadique, Zafor, The effect of Quality of Work Life on group cohesiveness : An empirical analysis, Labour and Development 7 (2) 2001, Page (126)

Sharma, Anuradha , Pandey P.N, Organizational Commitment and Quality of Work Life, Perception of Indian Managers, ABHIGYAN Summer 1995, Page (39 – 44)

Shibata, Kenneth E and others, Mission of Quality, Community and Junior College Journal 55 (2) October 1984, Page (29)

Srinivas R. Kandula, Human Resource Management in Practice (2003), Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, Page (129 – 130)