



Quality of Work Life and Satisfaction Among Teachers in Higher Education Institutions

Ms. Deeksha Gupta

Research Scholar of Babu Banarasi Das University, Lucknow, India

Dr. Pooja Aggarwal

Associate Professor of Babu Banarasi Das University, Lucknow, India

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

Quality of Work Life (QWL), Satisfaction, Improvement, Well-Being.

ABSTRACT

Quality of work life (QWL) is considered to be one of the essential components for enhancing job satisfaction and human motivation. Both public and commercial organisations strive to enhance the well-being of their workforce, enabling them to perform their jobs with motivation and fulfilment, which can lead to superior organisational performance. Since higher education enhances a country's economic potential and thereby fosters its development, it is widely understood that it is a key to a nation's success. A catalyst for change, higher education creates entrepreneurs, generates labour for industry, and inspires young people to pursue research and development. Teachers are responsible for better understanding the mission that has been entrusted to them to effectively and efficiently increase and enhance students' knowledge. Quality of work life is one of the most crucial and useful instruments in human resources management, according to numerous earlier research. Notably, work-life balance initiatives boost job satisfaction for all staff members, motivate teachers to constantly perform better, and strike a balance between work and personal and social lives. The primary goal of the current study is to examine and ascertain whether there may be a relationship between faculty members' job satisfaction and their quality of life at work at the University of Lucknow. This study aims to

emphasize teachers' quality of life at work in several ways. The nature of his educational purpose, the workplace, and the development of his career may provide the educator with additional obstacles in the modern period. Several faculties at the University of Lucknow were the subject of the investigation conducted for this paper. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to code and analyze the gathered data. Furthermore, a number of statistical tests were used to match and validate the hypotheses.

1. Introduction

Every nation's foundation is its educational system. Since it equips people with the abilities and information needed to find work and progress in their professional careers, it is typically seen as the secret to success in their professional careers. Regarding higher education, it is essential to a nation's economic growth. Thus, for instructors in higher education institutions, the quality of their working environment is crucial. Additionally, the idea of quality of work life, first proposed by Louis Davis in 1972, is a measure of a society's level of freedom from oppression, injustice, inequity, enslavement, and limitations on the advancement of human growth. This study's main goal is to demonstrate that when educators put up their best efforts to deliver high-quality instruction, which eventually advances the country, the goal of education may be successfully fulfilled. In order for teachers to perform at their highest level without feeling under pressure, managers and leaders should prioritize the quality of their professional lives. With all of the advancements that have already been made, the conventional idea of teaching is changing more quickly. No one denies that an individual can perform better if they are happy in their workplace and enjoy their work. Numerous benefits result from meeting someone's wants and demands, such as increased motivation at work, improved performance, happy emotions, and the drive to perform even better.

2. Literature Review

Universities are widely acknowledged to be essential to a community's progress because they significantly contribute to the advancement of the country. Faculty and staff at universities are the primary drivers of the higher education sector's efficacy. Additionally, enhancing the standard of living in a country requires that the work-life balance of educators be met (Al-Daibat, 2018).... The quality of life at work has been the subject of numerous studies conducted worldwide in this regard. To the best of our knowledge, though,



not much research has been done in Algeria to examine the working conditions in the higher education environment.

Accordingly, Walton (1973) described quality of work life (QWL) as a method by which a company might satisfy the demands of its workers. According to this same author, claims that a system that enables their complete involvement in groups that shape their professional lives must be created. He concentrated especially on enhancing the components that comprise the workplace. After that, he evaluated the quality of life at work using these factors. Some of these factors are fair and sufficient compensation, a safe and healthy work environment, the ability to use and develop human resources right now, prospects for future growth and security, social integration in the workplace, etc. According to (Rethinam & Ismail, M., 2008), other factors such as work-life balance, skill development, job stability, and satisfaction should be considered. In essence, because quality of life and work life are closely intertwined, QWL can be thought of as a subset of QWL. According to Lawler (1982), a person's career is an essential component of their overall life. A person's style of living, surroundings, public health and safety, and/or the neighbourhood in which they reside all have a direct impact on their quality of life. Furthermore, a person's quality of working life includes factors that directly impact her well-being throughout the workplace, such as pay and benefits, facilities, opportunities for promotion, and work-life balance. 2018's Ballou et al.

In order to provide high-quality education, work systems must be created that improve teachers' work-life balance, which will increase their motivation to accomplish their objectives. Swamy, Nanjundeswara swamy, S.T., & Srinivas, R. (2015) examined a number of factors in order to improve the quality of life at work, including the work environment, organisational culture and climate, relationships and cooperation, training and development, compensation and rewards, job satisfaction and job security, work autonomy, and the sufficiency of resources. Similarly, three essential components of quality of work life (QWL) were selected by Sinha (2012). However, Saravanan and K. Elamathi (2015) suggested twenty possible elements that could improve an organization's QWL. Similarly, Hart (2011) created a structural equation model (SEM) and identified three fundamental components of QWL: work satisfaction, distress, and morale. However, Velejudhan & Yameni D. M (2017) proposed that QWL can be enhanced through continuing education, whereas Rao, Arora S. R., & Vashisht, K. A. (2013) found that the teaching experience is directly proportional to QWL.

Additionally, Vashishtha & Mittal (2018) discovered that a person's gender affects a number of quality of work life (QWL) elements, including working conditions, prospects for advancement, and the social relevance of the job. Regarding (Nia et al., 2023), they discovered a favourable correlation between



organisational commitment and QWL. In addition, Ganguly (2010) investigated the connection between work-life quality and job satisfaction. She chose knowledgeable, seasoned individuals who understand the need of a good work-life balance for this. She went on to say that workers are often unhappy with how much autonomy they have. Numerous researchers have developed a variety of QWL factors in various sectors, including Robbins and Fernandes, Walton, Louis, Davis, Rose et al., and many others. These many research indicate that the significance and influence of QWL differ based on the tasks that need to be completed. It is crucial to note that QWL in academic settings is different from that in other types of workplaces. An educational institution's morale, values, motivation, and optimism are its most crucial components.

However, Robbins and Judge (2013) found that effective workplace organisation enables workers to participate in and contribute to decision-making. Additionally, QWL in a particular organisation is a process that allows its members, at all levels, to actively and effectively engage in forming the organisational environment and in making the best decisions, according to Srivastava and Rooma Kanpur (2014). Furthermore, QWL is a human resource management concept that is implemented to enhance employees' social and professional lives (Jha & Srivastava, M., 2014). Organisations can use the research of QWL as a valuable instrument to achieve their strategic goals, which are related to mental health and job satisfaction (Nadler & Lawler, E. E, 1983). Additionally, Vashishtha & Mittal (2018) found that employee happiness is significantly and variably impacted by the quality of work-life aspects. Similar findings were reached by Beh and Raduan Che Rose (2007), who found a strong positive correlation between job performance and QWL. Since QWL enables employees to exchange ideas, policies, and procedures, among other things, it has the potential to strengthen ties between institutions and stakeholders (Althaus, Jean-Luc Kop, & Vincent Grosjean, 2016). QWL has the potential to enhance work by lowering employee absenteeism and increasing productivity, claims Robbins M. (1989). It is commonly acknowledged that reducing overload, stress, and burnout at work enhances employees' quality of work life (QWL). Additionally, QWL helps employees strike a balance between their personal and professional lives. It is important to note that if a worker's family life is disrupted, he may not be able to focus at work, which will undoubtedly impact his performance (Sirgy, Efraty, D, Siegel, P, & Lee, D.-J, 2001). To the best of our knowledge, a significant amount of research has been conducted globally to gauge how QWL affects worker performance. Research has actually demonstrated that QWL significantly affects university faculty members' job satisfaction (Fatehi, A. Karimi, & Kamil Abdollah, 2015), organisational commitment (Ehido, Bahyah Abdul Halim, & Zainudin Awang, 2019), job satisfaction (Aryanto, Moch.



Asmawi, & Mansyur Ramly, 2018), professional burnout, quality of service (Hamidi & Mohamadi, B, 2012), and the decrease in disagreements, accidents, and workplace conflicts (HAVLOVIC, 1991).

3. Objectives of the Study

- To evaluate the level of Quality of Work Life (QWL) of teachers.
- To study the relationship that exists between age groups and quality of life at work (QWL).
- To examine the correlation between gender and quality of work life (QWL) within higher education institutions.
- To investigate the relationship between the rank designation of teachers in higher education establishments and the quality of work life (QWL).
- To study the relation between professional experience and quality of work life (QWL).

4. Hypothesis of the Study

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, it was deemed appropriate to consider the following hypotheses:

1. H01: There is no significant difference between the age groups of teachers and their perception of the quality of life at work.
2. H02: There is no significant difference between the gender of teachers and the quality of life at work.
3. H03: There is no significant difference between teachers' academic ranks and quality of life at work.
4. H04: There is no significant difference between professional experience in a higher education establishment and quality of life at work.

5. Research Methodology

The descriptive survey method was used in the present study. To carry out our work successfully, it was decided to consider a sample of 300 teachers coming from different faculties of the University of Lucknow. Teachers from higher education institutions were selected using proportionate or stratified random sampling.

Through an extensive literature review, a substantial number of studies related to this subject have been identified. Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, learning and development, social relationships

within the organisation, physical condition, compensation and rewards, working environment, organisational climate, motivation, facilities and resources are the 10 dimensions of this study. There are 50 items on the adopted scale. The five-point Likert scale, which ranges from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree," is the basis for this measure.

Additionally, the scale's reliability was determined to be 0.77 using the Cronbach's alpha approach, while the scaled content validity index (SCVI) method revealed that the scale's content validity was 0.83. Additionally, SPSS V27 software's factor analysis was used to prove the factorial validity. It may be concluded from the foregoing that the scale that was chosen for assessing instructors' QWL is very valid and dependable.

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data was analysed objectively to test the null hypotheses in sequence. Furthermore, basic statistical criteria were utilised to assess the level of QWL among teachers. It is important to remember that the mean of standard deviation values indicates a high QWL level. It is important to notice that ($M-1\sigma$) indicates a poor QWL level, whereas the middle group achieves the average QWL across teachers.

S.NO	QWL level	Criteria	Staff	Frequency
1	Low	$M-1\sigma$	55	18.33
2	Average	$M\pm 1\sigma$	154	51.33
3	High	$M+1\sigma$	89	29.66
Total			300	100%

Table 1: QWL levels

According to Table 1, 51.3 percent of teachers correspond to the average QWL category. Based on the preceding findings, this category represents the majority of teachers who say their quality of life at work (QWL) is average. The extreme groupings ($M+1\sigma$) and ($M-1\sigma$) have a smaller number of professors. The Chi-square test was used to identify significant correlations between demographic data, such as age and QWL.

	Age	QWL			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1	Less than 35	22	16	30	68		

		32.35 %	23.52 %	44.11%	100%		
		12.26%	17.85%	%	22.6		
2	From 36 to 50	75	51	14	140	47%	0.00
		53.57 %	36.42 %	10 %	100%		
		47.23%	61.90%	24.52%	46.6		
3	More than 50	63	16	13	92		
		68.47%	17.39 %	14.13%	100%		
		40.49%	20.23%	22.64%	30.6		
	Total	160	83	57	300		

Table 2: Presentation of chi-square values for different age groups and QWL levels

Source: SPSS 27.0

The value in brackets indicates the row percentage, the value in brackets indicates the column percentage. According to Table 2, the chi-square value for each of the three age groups is 47%, which is close to 50%. The null hypothesis is rejected since the p-value is 0.00, which is less than 0.05 (Alpha value). There is a substantial association between age and QWL levels, per the results shown in Table 2.

In order to cross-reference gender with the three levels of quality of working life (QWL), the relationship between gender and teachers' quality of life at work is analysed. Applying the Chi-square test with a cross-tabulation was determined necessary.

	Gender	QWL level			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1	Man	92	42	50	184	1.425	0.490
		(50%)	(22.28%)	(27.17%)	100.0%		
		[56.44]	[50%]	[94.33%]	61.33%		
2	Woman	71	42	3	116		
		(61.20%)	(36.20%)	(2.58%)	100.0%		

		[43.55]	[50%]	[5.66]	38.66%		
	Total	163	84	53	300		

Table 3: Presentation of chi-square values for the correlation between gender and QWL level

Source: SPSS 27.0

There is a computed chi-square value of 1.425 and a p-value of 0.490. Since there is no visible correlation between gender and the different levels of job satisfaction, the null hypothesis H10 may be accepted because the p-value is greater than 0.05 (Alpha value). analysis of the relationship between teachers' job happiness and their experience in the workplace. The chi-square test was employed to evaluate hypothesis H20. Less than ten years of professional experience, eleven to twenty years, twenty-one to thirty years, and thirty-one years or more are the four categories for this study.

Number of years of work		QWL level			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
	Less than 10 years	82	56	25	163	4.57	0.373
		(50.30%)	(34.35%)	(15.33%)	100.0%		
		[50.30%]	[66.66%]	[47.16%]	54.33%		
	From 11 to 20	40	13	17	70		
		(57.14%)	(18.57%)	(24.28%)	100.0%		
		[24.53%]	[15.47%]	[32.07%]	23.33%		
	From 21 to 30 years	26	8	7	41		
		(63.41%)	(19.51%)	(71.07%)	100%		
		[15.95%]	[9.53%]	[13.200%]	13.66%		
	Above 30 years	15	7	4	26		
		(57.69%)	(26.92%)	(15.38%)	100.0%		
		[9.20%]	[8.33%]	[0.75%]	[8.66%]		
	Total	163	84	53	300		

Table 4: Professional experience and quality of work life in higher education establishments

Source: SPSS 27.

The calculated p-value is 0.373, and the chi-square value is 4.57. Since this p-value is higher than 0.05 (the alpha value), the null hypothesis is presumably accepted. An examination of the connection between a teacher's status and productivity at The quality of life at work can also be significantly influenced by a teacher's rank, it was found. The issues that young and older instructors typically experience are primarily related to their academic roles, according to research conducted in recent years. According to this survey, instructors in higher education institutions are divided into three major groups based on their work-life quality: assistant professors, lecturers, and professors.

	Rank	QWL level			Total	Chi Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1	Assistant professor	55	33	29	117	41.21	0.00
		(47%)	(28.20%)	(24.78%)	100.0%		
		[33.74%]	[39.28%]	[54.71%]	39%		
2	Lecturer	98	49	13	160		
		(61.25%)	(30.62%)	(8.12%)	100.0%		
		[60.12%]	[58.3%]	[24.52%]	53.33%		
3	Professor	10	2	11	23		
		(43.47%)	(8.69%)	(47.82%)	100.0%		
		[6.13%]	[2.38%]	[20.75%]	7.66%		
	Total	163	84	53	300		

Table 5: Presentation of the chi-square values between the rank of teachers and the quality of life at work (QWL)

7. Findings and Conclusion

The findings mentioned of the basis of the above conclusions:

The majority of teachers who responded to the study appreciate a satisfactory quality of life at work (QWL), as evidenced by the overall average QWL of teachers at higher education institutions. • There is a substantial correlation between the various age groups of instructors at higher education

institutions when it comes to their training quality; 54.71% of teachers fall into the high category of QWL, while 47.8% fall into the low category.

Additionally, there was a negative tendency in the associations between the QWL of professors in higher education institutions and their age groups. Additionally, as people age, their quality of work life declines. Similar findings were reported by Hossain (1997) in this context. He went on to say that there is a strong correlation between employees' age and their quality of life.

- Women's quality of life at work (QWL) is substantially higher than men's.
- There is a positive relationship between teachers' experience and QWL.
- The quality of a teacher's work life is significantly correlated with their position, indicating that the position of the teacher has a substantial impact on the quality of his work life.

Teachers' professional lives depend significantly on their quality of life at work. It drives them to work for the welfare of students and the university system overall, as well as to provide their all in the fields of general education and higher education. It has also been confirmed that higher QWL levels typically produce better outcomes. The primary goal of this research is to evaluate university instructors' work-life balance. The findings imply that when it comes to determining the standard of living in their workplace, instructors' ages are significant factors.

Additionally, stress reduction is significantly influenced by the quality of life at work. In reality, this study has shown that both men and women gain by having equal access to resources and opportunities in the workplace. With fewer than ten years of professional experience, the younger generation of instructors is more proficient with IT tools than the more seasoned ones. Furthermore, it is highly recommended that more seasoned educators share their pedagogical experiences with new instructors through faculty development programs, workshops, seminars, symposia, orientation, and refresher courses. Thus, it can be said that there is a strong correlation between teachers' academic positions and their level of job satisfaction. It should be highlighted, therefore, that demographic factors (growth, age and gender structure, etc.) are not significantly impacted by inadequate quality of life at work (QWL). Furthermore, implementing a transparency policy can enhance the QWL. Since they are an essential component of the institution, teachers play a crucial role in its decision-making bodies. They serve as the primary tool for putting different policies, guidelines, and norms into effect for a positive learning environment.

8. References

- Aryanto's, T., Moch. Asmawi, & Mansyur Ramly. (2018). The Effect of Emotional Intelligence, Quality of Work Life, and Stress on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention Among The Employees. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*. B. Fatehi, A.
- Ganguly, R. (2010). Quality of worklife and job satisfaction of a group of university employees. *Journal of Management and Research*.
- Hamidi, F., & Mohamadi, B. (2012). Teachers' Quality of Work Life in Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 2.
- Hart, M. P. (2011). Teacher Quality of Work Life: Integrating Work Experiences, Psychological Distress and. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67 (2), 109-132.
- Jha, S., & Srivastava, M. (2014). Organizational Culture and Commitment. *Journal of Management Research*.
- Kaur, K., & Sharma, D. (2016). A Comparative Study of QWL among University Teachers. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 106-119. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals>.
- Lawler, E. (1982). Strategies for Improving the Quality of Work Life. *American Psychologist*.<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.5.486>, 37.
- Nadler, D., & Lawler, E. E. (1983). Quality of Work Life: Perceptions and Directions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 22
- Nia, N. M., & all. (2023). Investigating the Impact of Transformational Leadership and Social Responsibility on Employees' Work Conscience. *International Journal of Advanced Management and Accounting*, 2.
- Rao, T., Arora S. R., & Vashisht, K. A. (2013). Quality of Work Life: A Study of Jammu. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 20-25. Retrieved from: <http://www>.
- Rethinam, G. S., & Ismail, M. (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (1), 58-70. Retrieved from. Robbins, M. (1989). Public Responsibilities and Opportunities in Educating Professionals and Workers. *Toxicology and Industrial Health*.
- Shefali Srivastava, & Rooma Kanpur. (2014). A Study On Quality Of Work Life: Key Elements & It's Implications. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 1.



Sinha, C. (2012). Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: Empirical Evidence from Indian Organizations. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 1(11), 31-40. Retrieved from <http://ajbmr.com/articlepdf/AJB>.

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D, Siegel, P, & Lee, D.-J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. Social Indicators Research, 1.