

International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies

Research Article / Survey Paper / Case Study

Available online at: www.ijarcsms.com

Quality of Work Life in the Universities

Dr. Bindu Jain¹

Associate Professor

Department of Business Administration

Faculty of Commerce

University of Rajasthan

Jaipur – India

Dr. Yashika Swami²

Research Scholar

Department of Business Administration

Faculty of Commerce

University of Rajasthan

Jaipur – India

Abstract: *Quality of Work Life seeks to create a human work environment where the employees work co-operatively and make positive contribution in achieving organizational objectives. QWL is a common concern, not only to improve life at work, but also life outside work. The study aims to understand QWL, level and extent of 'Quality of work life' of university's teachers in Rajasthan.*

Keywords: *Quality of Work Life*

I. INTRODUCTION

Universities provide quality education that creates responsible citizenship. Universities are not only a sanctuary of knowledge, culture, social and technological innovation but they are also important centers of cultivation of a nation's resources. Teacher's role is pivotal in providing education and enriching the national culture. In order to attain these goals the teacher should not only be a committed and devoted but also competent and creative and for that matter they should be provided a better quality of work life (QWL).

Definitions of Quality of Work Life

Quality of work life concept recognizes that work is the chief determinant of an individual's freedom, growth and self respect. Quality of work life refers to the quality of the content of the relationship between man and his work situation. Inevitably, the nature of the design of his task plays a crucial role. The QWL suggests a total approach to man and his task. It attempts a fusion of interests-satisfying certain essential technical criteria of the job and fulfilling certain basic socio-psychological needs of the individual at the same time (N.S.S. Varadan & Bernard Martyris, 1977).

Quality of work life is a process by which an organization attempts to unlock the creative potential of its people by involving them in decision affecting their work lives (Guest, 1979).

The main objectives of the study are as following:-

1. To find out the level and extent of 'Quality of work life' of university's teachers.
2. To explore what factors comprises the 'Quality of work life' experience of university's teachers.
3. To suggest suitable measures to improve 'Quality of work life' of university teachers.

The study reviews the recent empirical literature devoted to this topic and researcher is able to identify 3 dimensions to measure QWL in selected state universities of Rajasthan. These factors include Job Security, pay and allowances, promotional avenues.

Hypothesis of the study is:

H1 (null): There is no significant gap between the actual and expected Quality of Work Life of State universities.

II. METHODOLOGY

UNIVERSE OF THE STUDY

The study has covered the following state universities:-

1. University of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Mohan Lal Sukhadia University, Udaipur
3. Jai Narain Vyas University, Jodhpur

SAMPLE DESIGN

The sample design of this study will be non-probability convenience sampling method

METHOD OF STUDY

The present research follows both exploratory and descriptive research design.

DATA COLLECTION

Primary data- In order to collect the primary data in this study, questionnaire and interview method is used.

Secondary data- Research studies conducted in this area and related areas in different universities, books, magazines and journals, websites dealing with this subject and various reports published by institutions working in this field is the source of secondary data collection.

III. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

To test the difference in expectation and perception in given parameters for two Independent samples 't' test is applied. This is a statistical technique that is used to compare two population means.

1st Factor Job security

State universities provide job security to their permanent teachers except some condition. A permanent whole time employee of the University shall compulsorily retire on having attained the age of 60 years on the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 60 years. The incident such some misconduct or criminal offence involving moral turpitude, indisciplinary behavior etc., a permanent employee's service may be terminated after conducting such enquiry as may be necessary in individual cases. T test is applied on the data collected from three universities.

Formulation of Hypothesis

H1: There is no significant difference between expectation and perception of Faculty members regarding Job security.

Data analysis and interpretation

Faculties are required to present their responses in a structured questionnaire, which was developed using five point Likert Scale and tested for appropriateness through a pilot study.

Testing of hypothesis

Table 1: Result-Independent Sample 't' test

Group Statistics					
	EP_type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Job_Security	Expectation	388	4.7474	.58678	.02979
	Perception	388	4.1082	1.16966	.05938

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Job_Security	Equal variances assumed	190.099	.000	9.621	774	.000	.63918	.06643	.50876	.76959
	Equal variances not assumed			9.621	570.190	.000	.63918	.06643	.50869	.76966

The statistical significance of the data has been tested using Student's Independent sample "t" test at 95 percent confidence level. The data qualify certain assumptions, that the dependent variable (scores) should be measured on a continuous scale and the independent variable should consist of two categorical independent groups (expectation and perception) and there is a need of **homogeneity of variances**. It was found that the gap between faculty expectation and their perception on Job security is statistically significant and positive for overall ($\mu_{\text{Difference}}=0.63918$ as $\mu_{\text{expectation}}= 4.747 > \mu_{\text{Perception}}= 4.1082$) as well as for all individual dimensions. The result connote that the present job security does not meet the expectation level of faculty members ($t_{\text{overall}}= 9.621, p = 0.000 < .05$).

2nd factor Pay & Allowances

State universities provide pay and Allowances to their teachers as per the 6th pay commission recommendations implemented by UGC. It is up to the state universities whether it facilitates all the allowances to its faculties say for Children's Education Allowance (CEA), academic allowances, reemployment of teachers etc are not available to teachers of State Universities.

Formulation of Hypothesis

H1: There is no significant difference between expectation and perception of Faculty members with Pay and Allowances

Data Analysis and interpretation

Table 2: Result- Independent sample 't' test

Group Statistics					
	EP_type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Overall	Expectation	388	3.2706	.96376	.04893
	Perception	388	2.6862	.98812	.05016
Pay_adqt	Expectation	388	2.7732	1.61232	.08185
	Perception	388	2.1907	1.46791	.07452
Pay_band	Expectation	388	3.5129	1.25232	.06358
	Perception	388	2.9742	1.18751	.06029
Pay_6com	Expectation	388	3.8196	1.10831	.05627
	Perception	388	2.9407	1.44819	.07352
Pay_allow	Expectation	388	2.9768	1.47046	.07465
	Perception	388	2.6392	1.39720	.07093

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Overall	Equal variances assumed	.756	.385	8.340	774.000	.000	.584	.070	.447	.722
	Equal variances not assumed			8.340	773.518	.000	.584	.070	.447	.722
Pay_adqt	Equal variances assumed	28.951	.000	5.262	774.000	.000	.582	.111	.365	.800
	Equal variances not assumed			5.262	767.283	.000	.582	.111	.365	.800
Pay_band	Equal variances assumed	.441	.507	6.148	774.000	.000	.539	.088	.367	.711
	Equal variances not assumed			6.148	771.825	.000	.539	.088	.367	.711
Pay_6com	Equal variances assumed	130.979	.000	9.493	774.000	.000	.879	.093	.697	1.061
	Equal variances not assumed			9.493	724.539	.000	.879	.093	.697	1.061
Pay_allow	Equal variances assumed	4.748	.030	3.279	774.000	.001	.338	.103	.135	.540
	Equal variances not assumed			3.279	771.987	.001	.338	.103	.135	.540

The statistical significance of the data has been tested using Student's Independent sample "t" test at 95 percent confidence level. The data qualify certain assumptions, that the dependent variable (scores) should be measured on a continuous scale and the independent variable should consist of two categorical independent groups (expectation and perception) and there is a need of **homogeneity of variances**. The table above provides results for two tests- Levene's test for Equality of Variances and t-test for Equality of Means. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has been used with assumptions that the variances for the two group's viz. expectation and perception are equal. If this null hypothesis is rejected at 5 percent significance level, then test statistics for 'no equal variance' is considered for interpretation of the t-test for Equality of Means.

It was found that the gap between faculty expectation and their perception on university Pay and allowance policies is statistically significant and positive for overall ($\mu_{\text{Difference}}=0.584$ as $\mu_{\text{expectation}}= 3.270 > \mu_{\text{perception}}= 2.686$) as well as for all individual dimensions. The result connote that there is a significant dissatisfaction among faculty members regarding university pay and allowance policies ($t_{\text{overall}}= 8.340$, $p = 0.000 < .05$). The present pay and allowances does not meet the expectation level of faculty members. They seem displeas about the adequacy of payment and their pay band ($t_{\text{Pay_adqt}} = 5.262$, $p = 0.000 < .05$; t

Pay_band = 6.148, $p = 0.000 < .05$). Further, faculty is not contented with the benefits of medical & housing allowances, TA, DA & academic allowances ($t_{\text{pay_allow}} = 3.279$, $p = 0.000 < .05$). Teaching staff are also not satisfied with new annual increment scheme of 6th pay commission ($t_{\text{pay_6com}} = 9.493$, $p = 0.000 < .05$).

3rd factor Promotional Avenues

As per the guidelines of UGC the universities (University of Rajasthan, MLS university, JNV University) has established Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC). The Internal Quality Assurance Cell of the Universities works as an academic and administrative audit committee. All the universities have a performance based appraisal system (PBAS). The faculties of the universities have to submit their annual academic performance indicators (API). Promotion of faculty members is made as per the career advancement scheme.

Formulation of hypothesis

H1: There is no significant difference between expectation and perception of Faculty members regarding Promotional Avenues

Data Analysis and interpretation

Table 3: Result- Independent sample 't' test - Promotional Avenues

Group Statistics					
	EP_type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Overall	Expectation	388	3.0393	.62465	.03171
	Perception	388	2.4111	.70910	.03600
UCG_advt	Expectation	388	3.1160	1.46252	.07425
	Perception	388	2.4794	1.60009	.08123
Fair_process	Expectation	388	3.1727	1.30139	.06607
	Perception	388	2.7113	1.47824	.07505
API_aspt	Expectation	388	3.1005	1.19114	.06047
	Perception	388	2.6314	1.23921	.06291
Appr_athrty	Expectation	388	3.0232	1.04274	.05294
	Perception	388	2.3892	1.32968	.06750
Const_feedback	Expectation	388	3.0876	1.23997	.06295
	Perception	388	2.5284	1.24586	.06325
Work_prmt	Expectation	388	3.0077	1.19752	.06079
	Perception	388	1.7964	1.06010	.05382
Career_advt	Expectation	388	2.7655	1.50937	.07663
	perception	388	2.3402	1.25660	.06379

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Overall	Equal variances assumed	3.447	.064	13.094	774	.000	.62820	.04797	.53402	.72237
	Equal variances not assumed			13.094	761.879	.000	.62820	.04797	.53402	.72237
UCG_advt	Equal variances assumed	6.366	.012	5.785	774	.000	.63660	.11005	.42056	.85263
	Equal variances not assumed			5.785	767.828	.000	.63660	.11005	.42056	.85264

Fair_process	Equal variances assumed	15.464	.000	4.614	774	.000	.46134	.09998	.26507	.65761
	Equal variances not assumed			4.614	761.765	.000	.46134	.09998	.26506	.65762
API_aspt	Equal variances assumed	.000	.998	5.375	774	.000	.46907	.08726	.29777	.64037
	Equal variances not assumed			5.375	772.791	.000	.46907	.08726	.29777	.64037
Appr_athrty	Equal variances assumed	59.034	.000	7.391	774	.000	.63402	.08579	.46562	.80242
	Equal variances not assumed			7.391	732.374	.000	.63402	.08579	.46561	.80244
Const_feedback	Equal variances assumed	.389	.533	6.267	774	.000	.55928	.08924	.38410	.73445
	Equal variances not assumed			6.267	773.983	.000	.55928	.08924	.38410	.73445
Work_prmt	Equal variances assumed	7.989	.005	14.919	774	.000	1.21134	.08119	1.05195	1.37073
	Equal variances not assumed			14.919	762.779	.000	1.21134	.08119	1.05195	1.37073
Career_advt	Equal variances assumed	66.102	.000	4.265	774	.000	.42526	.09971	.22953	.62098
	Equal variances not assumed			4.265	749.381	.000	.42526	.09971	.22952	.62099

The statistical significance of the data has been tested using Student's Independent sample "t" test at 95 percent confidence level. The data qualify assumptions of dependent variable to be measured on a continuous scale and the independent variable should consist of two categorical independent groups (expectation and perception). It was found that the gap between faculty expectation and their perception on university promotion avenues is statistically significant and positive for overall ($\mu_{\text{Difference}} = .62820$ as $\mu_{\text{expectation}} = 3.0393 > \mu_{\text{perception}} = 2.4111$) as well as other individual dimensions. The result indicate that there is a significant dissatisfaction among faculty members regarding university promotion policies and methodology ($t_{\text{overall}} = 13.094$, $p = 0.000 < .05$). The present method of rewarding the work does not meet the expectation level of faculty members. They appear displeas about the formal evaluation process of the institution ($t_{\text{Fair_process}} = 4.614$, $p = 0.000 < .05$), application of UGC scheme for career advancement ($t_{\text{UGC_advt}} = 5.785$, $p = 0.000 < .05$), use of API scheme for promotional aspect ($t_{\text{API_aspt}} = 5.375$, $p = 0.000 < .05$).

IV. CONCLUSION

The result connote that there is a gap between faculty expectation and perception regarding job security. Faculty show low perception score for all dimensions of pay and allowances like adequacy of pay, present pay band, increments and other allowances. Faculty members are also displeas about the formal evaluation process of the institution, application of UGC scheme for career advancement, use of API scheme for promotional aspect.

OVERALL	RESULT
H1 (null): There is no significant gap between the actual and expected Quality of Work Life of State universities.	Rejected

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

- The universities should focus more on the interventions or events that enhance the quality of work life. In this present study, the educational institutions are responsible for creating an ambience and climate for working that has become a prominent influencer in determining the quality of work life.
- The pay and allowances should be revised to a better level thereby the motivation and commitment levels of the teachers may improve significantly.
- To help the working parents in pursuing their job and / or academic career, the university can provides Day Care facilities on payment basis at universities for kinder garden children of teachers / University's employees.
- The API score system should be modified in such a way that it gives due wait age to the working environment of teachers and the facilities available to them for research work and also promote collaborative research.
- Reimbursement of fee to faculty members for attending various workshops/ FDP's etc. This will encourage faculties to participate and become more competent, technology oriented.
- Teachers should be allowed to take consultancy work for industry as it gives them practical exposure of current scenario which can improve their teaching skills.
- Universities should make provision of five day work so that teachers can concentrate on research work in a better way.
- Ensure that every teacher is given equal opportunity to organize/participate in national/international conference, seminar, workshop etc.

References

1. Varadan,N.S.S. and Martyris, Bernard (1977). Towards Quality of Work Life, Industrial Relations, Wiley Blackwell Publishing, Vol XXIX (3), pp.109-111.
2. Guest, R.(1979). Quality of work life- Learning from Tarrytown, Harvard Business Review, July/aug, pp 76-87.

Websites

<http://www.uniraj.ac.in>
<http://www.mlsu.ac.in>
<http://www.jnvu.edu.in>
<http://www.ugc.ac.in>

AUTHOR(S) PROFILE



Dr. Bindu Jain, is working as Associate Professor in Maharani College, Department of Business Administration, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur since 1992. She obtained her M.com., M.Phil, Ph.D degree from University of Rajasthan, Jaipur. She is a research supervisor to students pursuing their doctoral degree. Her area of interest is General Management, HRM & Marketing. She has to her credit a large number of Research papers in national and International journals. She has authored books on computer science. She is Ex. Vice- Principle, Maharani college, Jaipur.



Dr. Yashika Swami, is a Research scholar (Department of Business Administration, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur), has received M.A English degree from Kurukshetra University, M.B.A degree in Human Resource and Marketing Management from Banasthali University, Ph.D degree from Rajasthan University and UGC NET qualified in HR in 2010. She was awarded Doctoral Fellowship offered by ICSSR (Indian Council of Social Science research) for her Ph.D research work. She has 2 years of teaching experience.