



---

## **ROLE OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN JOB SATISFACTION AMONG UNIVERSITY TEACHERS**

**Dr. Dayanand Paswan**

Head, Department of Psychology, U. R. College, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga,  
India

**Dr. Mohd. Ahamar Khan**

Guest Teacher, Department of Psychology, U. R. College, Lalit Narayan Mithila University,  
Darbhanga, India

### **Abstract**

The present study investigated the relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction. It was also intended to examine the role of quality of work life factors as predictors of job satisfaction. Quality of Work Life Scale (Ansari, Khan, & Khan, 2016) and Job Satisfaction Scale (Singh, 1990) were used to measure the study variables. Sample consisted of 300 university teachers from AMU, India within age range of 26 to 64 years ( $M = 45.28$ ,  $SD = 10.01$ ). Results showed that all study variables positively and significantly correlated with each other. Results further showed that quality of work life factors such as citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, organizational climate, and belongingness were significantly predicted the job satisfaction. It is assumed that this research would be useful for creating high quality of work life in higher academic setting.

**Keywords:** Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, University Teachers.

### **Introduction**

Higher educational teachers are the key success factor of any nation which uplifts the holistic development of any nation leading to the growth of the whole nation as well. They produced trained manpower in different domains and motivated young minds for research and development to cultivate the nation. Apart from teaching and training of students; they also shoulders research role, service/administrative role, social role and political role etc. In this regard, QWL can be considered an efficient source because it comprises many key variables that can be help, if improved, to boost up beneficial organizational and desirable outcomes in a variety of domains. In support of this proposition, QWL is considered as workplace strategic arrangements that enhance job satisfaction and improve working conditions for employees. Moreover, it is obvious from past research that QWL initiatives can greatly help to improve employees' self-esteem and job satisfaction (Suttle, 1977), lead workers to provide better services, and increase customer satisfaction (Griffith, 2001; Johnson, 1996). Moreover, QWL



programs can improve work performance and the quality of life among employees (Islam & Siengthai, 2009; Sadique, 2003). In a related context, QWL was positively associated with organizational commitment (Roehling, Roehling, & Moen, 2001; Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, & Lee, 2001). Conversely, a weak level of QWL causes job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, low motivation, low morale, rising accident rates, and poor productivity, which therefore cause poor organizational performance (Stephen & Dhanapal, 2012). Fajemisin (2002) found that QWL is crucial for organizational success and competitive advantage. Subsequently, Dada (2006) confirmed that QWL influences employees in terms of organizational identification, job satisfaction, job involvement, job effort, job performance, intention to leave, turnover and organizational alienation.

The review of literature articulates to the fact that the present work has never been studied in undertaking the population of university teachers. By taking this study, it will provide the definite role of quality of work life in relation to the job satisfaction, especially working in higher academic institutions. Researchers assume that the findings of present study shall also help to policy makers to implement proper intervention to uphold the job satisfaction of teachers.

### **Objectives**

The objectives of present study are following:

1. To explore the relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction.
2. To examine the role of Quality of Work Life factors as predictors of Job Satisfaction.

### **Hypotheses**

Following assumptions were hypothesized o the basis of literature review:

1. There will be positive relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction.
2. Quality of Work Life factors will predict the Job Satisfaction.

### **Method**

#### **Sample**

The sample for this research comprised of 300 university teachers within age range of 26 to 64 years ( $M = 45.28$ ,  $SD = 10.01$ ) and their experience ranges from 2 to 35 years ( $M = 16.51$ ,  $SD = 10.33$ ). Both male (50%) and female (51.4%) teachers became the part of this research. In terms of educational qualification, 90 teachers were Post Graduates and 210 PhDs respectively. In academic rank, 134 were Assistant Professors, 89 Associate Professors and 77 Professors. The sample was employed by stratified random sampling technique from different faculties of Aligarh Muslim University, India.



---

## **Instruments**

A demographic sheet was used to obtain information about the participants along with following instruments:

### **Quality of Work Life Scale**

Quality of work life scale developed and standardized by Ansari, Khan, and Khan (2016) on the target sample was used in this study. The scale measuring eight dimensions of QWL such as citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, opportunity for growth & development, work relations, organizational climate, belongingness, and organizational transparency. The scale comprises with 33 items on a 5-point Likert scale with anchored from “1” (Strongly Disagree) to “5” (Strongly Agree). Possible range of scores was from 33 to 165. Thus higher scores state higher level of QWL. Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was observed 0.92 and showed an excellent reliability of the scale (George & Mallery, 2003). Exploratory Factor Analysis explained 57.71% of the total variance. Further, inter-dimension correlations was found to be significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

### **Job Satisfaction Scale**

Job satisfaction scale developed by Singh (1990) was used. This scale composed of 20 items. The responses were on a 5-point Likert rating scale had anchors of “1” (Highly Dissatisfied) to “5” (Highly Satisfied). Possible range of scores was from 20 to 100. Thus higher scores state higher level of organizational commitment. The reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.96. The reliability of the scale was found to be excellent with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 in the preset study (George & Mallery, 2003).

## **Procedure**

Prior to administration of questionnaires; the utility and relevance of the study was explained to them and requested with due respect to extend their cooperation for success of the study. The teachers were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and will be utilized only for the research purposes. Brief instructions as well as verbal narratives were given so as to enhance genuine filling of the questionnaires. In the end, teachers were generously thanked for their cooperation and participation in the research.

## **Results**

### **Pearson Correlation Analysis**

Pearson correlation was computed to evaluate the relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction. Table 1 revealed that QWL total and its’ all factors significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction ( $p < 0.01$ ). Therefore, H1 is supported.



Table 1

*Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction*

Variab les	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	-									
2	0.59* *	-								
3	0.55 **	0.47 **	-							
4	0.56 **	0.50 **	0.42 **	-						
5	0.53 **	0.51 **	0.45 **	0.36 **	-					
6	0.43 **	0.53 **	0.42 **	0.41 **	0.33 **	-				
7	0.33 **	0.42 **	0.32 **	0.38 **	0.24 **	0.41 **	-			
8	0.64 **	0.41 **	0.48 **	0.49 **	0.35 **	0.33 **	0.27 **	-		
9	0.89 **	0.79 **	0.72 **	0.70 **	0.66 **	0.62 **	0.51 **	0.70 **	-	
10	0.77 **	0.64 **	0.58 **	0.55 **	0.53 **	0.53 **	0.43 **	0.53 **	0.82 **	-

\*\* $p < 0.01$ .

1= citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, 2=confidence in management, 3=working conditions, 4=opportunity for growth & development, 5=work relations, 6=organizational climate, 7= belongingness, 8=organizational transparency, 9= QWL total, 10=job satisfaction.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

Table 2 shows regression analysis of quality of work life factors and job satisfaction. Citizenship behavior & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, organizational climate, and belongingness passed the criteria to predict the job satisfaction and accounted significant amount of variance ( $\beta=0.67, R^2=0.689, F=6.49, p<0.01$ ). Therefore, H2 is supported.



Table 2

*Regression Analysis of Quality of Work Life Factors and Job Satisfaction*

Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	F	df	P
X <sub>1</sub>	0.90	0.77	0.598	-	443.38	(1,298)	0.01
X <sub>2</sub>	0.48	0.81	0.650	0.052	44.29	(1,297)	0.01
X <sub>6</sub>	0.82	0.82	0.670	0.019	17.42	(1,296)	0.01
X <sub>3</sub>	0.50	0.83	0.682	0.012	11.56	(1,295)	0.01
X <sub>7</sub>	0.67	0.83	0.689	0.007	6.49	(1,294)	0.01

*X<sub>1</sub>=citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, X<sub>2</sub>=confidence in management, X<sub>3</sub>=working conditions, X<sub>6</sub>=organizational climate, X<sub>7</sub>=belongingness*

**Discussion**

The obtained results confirmed that quality of work life and job satisfaction significantly and positively correlated with each other. Furthermore, factors of quality of work life such as citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, organizational climate, and belongingness significantly and positively predict the job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with those of previous researches which showed that quality of work life has a positive impact on employees’ job satisfaction (Dada, 2006; Suttle, 1977). Thus, it can be inferred that university teachers who experienced higher level of quality of work life showed higher level of satisfaction with their job.

**Conclusion**

Aforementioned, findings concluded that high quality of work life in educational environment play very important role in accomplishment of teachers’ satisfaction with their job. Employees’ high job satisfaction brings the greater job motivation, positive emotion, attitude and reduces turnover, absenteeism among the employees which enables them to show a maximum effort in achieving the organizational goals. Because, satisfaction can trigger immediate emotional reactions, therefore, it can play a central role in the development of teachers’ overall performance. Consequently, it appears that quality of work life shapes and stabilizes satisfaction.



---

## References

- Ansari, S. A., Khan, S. M., & Khan, M. A. (2016). Quality of work life scale (QWLS). Agra: Agra Psychological Research Cell.
- Dada, F. J. (2006). An empirical investigation of job stress, social support, service length and job strain. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 27(2), 279-302.
- Fajemisin, T. A. (2002). Quality of work life: A study of employees in West Africa. *African Business Review*, 13(4), 501-517.
- Griffith, J. (2001). Do satisfied employees satisfy customers? Support-services staff morale and satisfaction among public school administrators, students, and parents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(8), 1627-1658.
- Islam, M. Z., & Siengthai, S. (2009). *Quality of work life and organizational performance: Empirical evidence from Dhaka export processing zone*. Proceeding of ILO Conference on Regulating for Decent Work. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Johnson, J. W. (1996). Linking employee perceptions of service climate to customer satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(4), 831-851.
- Roehling, P. V., Roehling, M. V., & Moen, P. (2001). The relationship between work-life policies and practices and employment loyalty: A life course perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 141-170.
- Sadique, Z. (2003). Quality of work life among white collar and blue collar employees. *Journal of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies*, 26, 169-174.
- Singh, S. (1990). Organizational stress and executive behaviour. Unpublished Research Monograph. New Delhi: Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations & Human Resources.
- Sirgy, J. M., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 3, 241-302.
- Stephen, A., & Dhanapal, D. (2012). Quality of work life in small scale industrial units: employers and employees perspectives. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 28(2), 262-271.
- Suttle, J. L. (1977). Improving life at work: Problems and prospects. In J. R. Hackman, & J. L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work: Behavioral science approach to organizational change*. (pp. 1-29). California: Goodyear Publishing Company.