A STUDY OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: CRITICAL VIEW TO PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL COLLEGES IN HARYANA

Shaveta T Grover Ph.D (P), M.Phil
Asst. Professor
Budha College of Management
(Affiliated to Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra)
E-41, Hospital Area, Nilokheri (Karnal) Haryana, India.

Ms Geeta Sachdeva Ph.D (P)
Asst. Professor
Galaxy Global Group of Institutions
(Affiliated to Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra)
730, Sector, 5, Kurukshetra, India.

ABSTRACT

In the present study, an attempt has been made to investigate the relationship between jobs related variables and quality of work life, further it shows how private institutions working methodology affects the employees' professional life, further investigate try to check the discrepancies between expected and actual dimensions of QWL in their respective organizations. The present study is found to be critical as respondents' expectations related to the various dimensions of QWL are quite high in comparison to the actual they are getting. In order to resolve the problems many recommendations have been quoted in the study.

Keywords: QWL, Job related factors, Private professional colleges, Haryana.

Introduction:

Quality of work life is generic phase that covers a person's feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards and benefits, job security, working conditions, organizational and interpersonal relationships and its intrinsic meaning in a person's life. Beukema (1987) describes QWL as the degree to which employees are able to shape their jobs actively, in accordance with their options, interests and needs. It is the degree of power an organization gives to its employees to design their work. This definition emphasizes the individual's choice of interest in carrying out the task. However, this definition differs from the former which stresses on the organization that designs the job to meet employees' interest. It is difficult for the organization to fulfill the personal needs and values of each employee. However if the organization provides the appropriate authority to design work activities to the individual employees, then it is highly possible that the work activities can match their employees needs that contribute to the organizational performance. In the same vein Heskett, Sasser and Schlesinger (1997) define QWL as the feelings that employees have towards their jobs, colleagues and organizations that ignite a chain leading to the organizations' growth and profitability. A good feeling towards their job means the employees feel happy doing work which will lead to a productive work environment. This definition provides an insight that the satisfying work environment is considered to provide better QWL. Lau, Wong, Chan and Law (2001) operationalised QWL as the favorable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities. Indirectly the definition indicates that an individual who is not satisfied with reward may be satisfied with the job security and to some extent would enjoy the career opportunity provided by the organization for their personal as well as professional growth.

Literature Review:

Hackman and Oldhams (1980) highlight the constructs of QWL in relation to the interaction between work environment and personal needs. The work environment that is able to fulfill employees' personal needs is considered to provide a positive interaction effect, which will lead to an excellent QWL. They emphasized the personal needs are satisfied when rewards from the organisation, such as compensation, promotion, recognition and development meet their expectations.

Parallel to this definition, Lawler (1982) defines QWL in terms of job characteristics and work conditions. He highlights that the core dimension of the entire QWL in the organization is to improve employees well-being and productivity. However, he accepted the fact that QWL is complex, because it comprises physical and mental well being of employees.

Asakura and Fujigaki (1993) examined the direct and indirect effect of computerization on workers health and well-being.

Scully, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1995) learning opportunities and skill discretion have also proven to have a positive effect on job satisfaction and reduced job stress that will lead to better QWL. The opportunity to develop and the use of skills are associated with learning mechanisms. This applies especially when the job requires employees to deploy cognitive skills. With respect to learning, greater autonomy on job enhances the acquisition and utilization of knowledge whilst greater participation is held to promote cognitive growth via increased knowledge transfer among employees.Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1996) highlighted that job security is the most controversial issue in contemporary work environment. Job security, the central aspect of QWL represents strength of the organizations to provide permanent and stable employment regardless of the changes in work environment. Hence, providing a sense of security is important especially in the work environment where many facets of jobs can be outsourced.

Elisa and Ellen (2001) revealed that the majority of employees suggested that their long work hours have negatively affected their personal life and family responsibilities.

Martinsons and Cheung (2001) reported that IT professional's insufficient compensation and poor promotion prospects were key sources of dissatisfaction. For example, offering compensation and rewards significantly lower compared to the competitors for the same type of work can trigger employees' dissatisfaction that will create intention among them to leave the organisation. Therefore, it is important to know whether the employees are satisfied. It is also widely expressed that job satisfaction appears to stem from the interaction between the employee, the job itself and the organizational context within which the job is carried out.

Wall, Cordery and Clegg, (2002) career development opportunity will provide essential training that will help the individual employees to equip with the new skills to spearhead in their career. Most contemporary organizations do not limit themselves to just training an employee for a job, but they go beyond to furnish them with a support system that encourages workplace learning.

Fountoulakis and Kaprins (2003) that higher job demand leads to higher strain work environment hence, it affects their health and well being. An unstrained work environment ensures good health and psychological conditions which enable the employees to perform job and non-work related functions without inhibitions. Thus, it leads to an unstressful work environment providing comfortable work life.

An attempt is made in this paper to examine the working methodology of private institutions with regard to quality of work life of employees.

Objectives:

- To study the association between job related variables and quality of work life.
- To check the discrepancies between expected and actual dimensions in respective organizations.
- To examine how private institutions working methodology affects the professional life.

Research Methodology:

Universe and Sample:

The universe in present investigation is the private professional institutions situated in Haryana. The sample size is 100. Convenient sampling is adopted to get insight about the study.

Sources of Data:

The study consists of both primary and secondary data. The primary data is collected through well structured questionnaire. Secondary data is collected with the help of various journals, books and internet.

Statistical Tools:

The collected data is consolidated, tabulated and analyzed by using statistical tools like descriptive statistics, Chi- Square Test, Z-Test and t- Test.

Analysis of Association between Job Related Variables And Quality Of Work Life

Hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant difference between jobs related variables and QWL.
H1: There is significant difference between jobs related variables and QWL.

Table-1

Variables	Chi-Square Value	Chi-Square table value	Significant/ Non Significant
Fair Pay	27.82	12.8	Significant
Job Securities	52.82	10.5	Significant
Employee Benefits	58.56	12.8	Significant
Flexible work schedules	17.36	10.5	Significant
Opportunities for growth	107.76	12.8	Significant
Health & Safety	34.58	10.5	Significant
Empowerment	42.00	12.8	Significant

(Through Primary Data)

In the above table all variables were found to be significant ($p<.05$), hereby interpreting that these variables have significant association with quality of work life, concluding that these variables put major impact and give high contribution in raising quality of work life.

Analysis of Discrepancies between Actual Dimensions and Expected Dimensions

Hypothesis:

H0: There is no difference between actual dimensions and expected dimensions.
H1: There is difference between actual dimensions and expected dimensions.

Table-2

Discrepancy Between actual dimensions and expected dimensions	t value	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
	48.916	99	.000	28.63	27.46	29.79

(Through Primary Data)

Here to check the discrepancies between actual dimensions and expected dimensions hypothesis has been formed and interpreted with the help of t test as mentioned in above table. The above result states that there exists a significant difference between actual dimensions and expected dimensions because the calculated value is greater than the table value (1.96), which gives a clear indication of rejection of hypothesis, thus concluding that although institutions are providing them job related variables i.e. Fair Pay, Job security, Employee benefits, Flexible work schedules, Opportunities for growth, Health & safety and empowerment but are not able to meet the extent of expectations of employees.

Analysis of Whether Employees are Satisfied With The Working Methodology of Their Respective Private Institutions or Not

Here the main concern is to check the working methodology of the private institutions and their impact on Quality of work life of employees

Descriptive Statistics:

Table 3

Sr. No	Variables	M	SM	SD	SE	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	Are you satisfied with your organizations timings?	3.7800	3	1.0596	.10	-.637	-.175
2	Does your organization provide you all gazetted holidays as announced by government?	3.8000	3	1.1282	.11	-.500	-1.132
3	Do you get salary on time?	2.0900	3	.9545	.09	.457	-.756
4	Does your organization ask for extra work load for teaching & non teaching activities?	3.2000	3	1.2949	.12	-.211	-1.087
5	Does your organization provide you growth opportunities and increments on time?	3.2300	3	1.2297	.12	-.053	-.972
6	Does your organization give you enough authority to take decisions?	3.1300	3	1.1429	.11	.030	-.630
7	Does your organization give you the opportunities for attending seminars/workshops/conferences?	3.1000	3	1.2593	.12	-.378	-1.105
8	Is there any provision for further study leave in your organization?	3.6500	3	1.1044	.11	-.413	-1.165
9	Does your organization give you the same benefits as given by the government institutions like maternity leave, medical leave, PF, insurance etc?	2.6500	3	1.2258	.12	.199	-1.078

The average scores for above indicators were 3.78,3.80,2.09,3.20,3.23,3.13,3.10,3.65, and 2.65 respectively and the corresponding Standard means were of the order of 3.
From their mean scores it can be concluded that indicators 3 and 9 are below to their standard mean.
Further Z test has been applied in order to get the more clarity of the above statements with reduced standard error.

Analysis of the statements with the help of Z test:

Statement 1:

Are you satisfied with your organizations timings?
Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.
i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$$Z=\frac{|u-u_o|}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$$

$$Z=\frac{3.78-3}{.10}=7.8$$

The test indicates clearly a rejection of the null hypothesis ($p<.01$).

Which indicates there is a significant difference between observed mean and standard mean so it can be inferred that the faculties of private institutions as per sample selected are not comfortable with the timings of their respective institutions which may be due to the stringent policies of organizations.

Statement 2:

Does your organization provide you all gazetted holidays as announced by government?
Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.
i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$$

$$Z= \frac{3.80-3}{.11} = 7.2$$

Observed mean is greater than standard mean so our hypothesis is rejected.
It indicates there is a significant difference between observed mean and standard mean.
It can be depicted that organizations follows a flexi attitude towards providing hoilidays.

Statement 3:

Do you get salary on time
Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.
i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$$

$$Z= \frac{2.09-3}{.09} = 10.11$$

This test indicates clearly a highly significant difference between standard mean and estimated mean scores ($p<.01$) which shows the rejection of the hypothesis. Thus it can be interpreted that there are lots of variations in the timing to give salary to employees.

Statement 4:

Does your organization ask for extra work load for teaching & non teaching activities?
Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.
i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$$

$$Z= \frac{3.20-3}{.12} = 1.66$$

Z test suggested that there is no significant difference between the observed mean and standard mean. Hence our hypothesis is being accepted i.e. ($p>.01$).
Again the above statement provides a critical view which supports to the study, further reasons comes out that along with highly pressurize teaching activities faculties have to suffer with non teaching activities resulting that faculties are not able to devote more time to further enhancement for their academics.

Statement 5:

Does your organization provide you growth opportunities and increments on time rarely?
Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.

i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$

$Z= \frac{3.23-3}{.12} = 1.91$

Z test suggested that there is no significant difference between the observed mean and standard mean. Hence our hypothesis is being accepted i.e. (p>.01), which indicates that institutions provide growth opportunities and increments rarely, thus interpreting that institutions do not follow any fix norms and do not state any criteria for growth opportunities as well as increments.

Statement 6:

Does your organization give you enough authority to take decisions?

Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.

i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$

$Z= \frac{3.13-3}{.11} = 1.18$

Z test suggested that there is no significant difference between the observed mean and standard mean. Hence our hypothesis is being accepted i.e. (p>.01), which indicates that institutions provide authority to take decisions related to academics.

Statement 7:

Does your organization give you the opportunities for attending seminars/workshops/conferences?

Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.

i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$

$Z= \frac{3.10-3}{.12} = .83$

Z test suggested that there is no significant difference between the observed mean and standard mean. Hence our hypothesis is being accepted i.e. (p>.01), which indicates that organizations provide opportunities for attending seminars and conferences in terms of intimation which they have got invitations from the organizing parties.

Statement 8:

Is there any provision for further study leave in your organization?

Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.

i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$

$Z= \frac{3.65-3}{.11} = 5.90$

Z test suggested that there is significant difference between the observed mean and standard mean. Hence our hypothesis is being rejected i.e. (p>.01), which indicates that organizations do not provide any leaves for further study although this aspect plays a vital role for the development of faculties thus many of them have to quit their jobs for some time for completion of their studies and research work.

Statement 9:

Does your organization give you the same benefits as given by the government institutions like maternity leave, medical leave, PF, insurance etc?

Hypothesis: There is no difference between observed mean and standard mean.

i.e. $\mu=\mu_o$

$$Z= \frac{Iu-u_oI}{SE} \longrightarrow N(0,1)$$

$$Z= \frac{2.65-3}{.12} = 2.91$$

This test indicates clearly a highly significant difference between standard mean and estimated mean scores (p<.01) which shows the rejection of the hypothesis thus stating that the system prevailing in private institutions is totally different from public institutions. No such facilities as mentioned in above statement is provided to faculties which acts as a de-motivation factor, which ultimately leads to high attrition rate and job hopping in private institutions.

Recommendations:

- As it was found in the study that there is significant association between QWL and job related variables thus suggesting that institutions should consider the importance of above mentioned variables and try to increase the level of extent of actual dimensions with regard to the capabilities of individuals.
- Further it is suggesting that institutions should try to minimize the gap between their actual dimensions and expected one so that the dissatisfaction level of faculties can be controlled.
- It was found in the present investigation that employees have given critical responses towards various statements thus suggesting that organizations should try to understand the employees' priority likewise faculties perceives themselves only for academics but when they are asked to do non teaching activities they show reluctance behavior which leads to them towards dissatisfaction level.
- Further suggesting that institutions should not pressurize for extra work load so that it does not become hindrance in their academics and research work.
- The study further suggesting that institutions should give the all amenities like PF, medical leave, maternity leave, LTC and others etc which prevails in government institutions to control the job hopping.

References:

[1] Beukema, L., 1987. "Kwaliteit Van De Arbeidstijdverkorting [Quality of reduction of working hours]. Groningen: Karstapel". *In*: Suzanne, E.J. Arts, Ada Kerkstra,

[2] Jouke Van Der Zee, and Huda Huyer Abu Saad, (eds.) (2001). Quality of Working Life and Workload in Home Help Services: A Review of the Literature and a Proposal for a Research Model. *ScandinavianJournal of Caring Society, 15,* pp. 12-24.

[3] Elisa, J.GV. and A.E., Ellen, 2001. "An Examination of Work and Personal Life Conflict, Organizational Support and Employee Health Among International Expatriates". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*, pp. 261-278.

[4] Fujigaki, Y., T., Asakura, And T., Haratani, 1994. "Work Stress and Depressive Symptoms Among Japanese Information Systems Managers". *Industrial Health, 32*(4), pp. 231-238.

[5] Hackman, J.R., and G.R., Oldham, 1980. *Work Redesign*. Reading, M.A: Addison-Wesley. Lawler E. E., LLL, 1982. "Strategies for Improving the Quality of Work Life". *American Psychologist, 37,* pp. 486-693.

[6] Heskett, J.L., Sasser, W.E., Jr and L.A., Schlesinger, 1997. "The service profit chain". New York: The Free Press.

[7] Lau, T., Y.H., Wong, K.F., Chan, and M., Law, "Information Technology and the Work Environment-Does it Change the Way People Interact at Work". *Human Systems Management,20*(3), pp. 267-280.

[8] Martinsons, M.G., and C., Cheung, 2001. "The Impact of Emerging Practices on IS Specialists:Perceptions, Attitude and Role Changes in Hong Kong". *Information and Management, 30,* pp.167-183.

[9] Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development, 1996. "*Technology, Productivity and Job Creation",* Vol. 1 & 2, OECD, Paris.

[10] Scully, J., A., Kirkpatrick, and E., Locke, 1995. "Locus of Knowledge as a Determination of the Effects of Participation on Performance, Affect, and Perceptions". *Organizational Behavior Human Decision Making Process, 61*, pp. 276-288.

[11] Wall, T.D., J., Cordery, and C.W., Clegg, 2002. "Empowerment, Performance and Operational Uncertainty: A Theoretical Integration". *Journal of Applied Psychology: International Review, 51,* pp.146-169.

****