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1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life is a philosophy, a set of principles, which holds that people are the most important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making valuable contribution and they deserve to be treated with dignity and respect. In recent years Quality of Work Life is being increasingly identified as progressive indicators related to the function and sustainability of academic institutions and business organizations. On the other hand, management recognizes that a productive workforce will provide a global, sustainable competitive advantage for academic institutions and business organizations. Knowing Quality of work life in an organization/institution will clarify weak and strong points in the interface between the organization/institution and its employees. This recognition will lead to productivity and higher performance.

This research attempts to understand the various factors determining Quality of Work life of Teaching Faculty members of Government and Private Engineering Institutions in Chennai District.

1.1 QUALITY OF WORK LIFE – An Overview

The evolution of Quality of Work life began in late 1960s emphasizing the human dimensions of work by focusing on the quality of the relationship between the worker and the working environment. Personal life is the course of an individual’s life, especially when
viewed as the sum of personal choices. Public life is the work that involved interaction with lot of people in a community or a country. It is a term of public service by an appointed or elected official. Professional life involves a career in industrial or commercial or professional activities. Work is an integral part of our everyday life, as it is our livelihood, career or business. On an average, a person spends around twelve hours daily in the work place, that is one third of his entire life and it does influence the overall quality of our life. Hence the work should yield job satisfaction, give peace of mind, a fulfilment of having done a task as it is expected without any flaw and a sense of spending the time fruitfully, constructively and purposefully.

Quality of working life has been differentiated from the broader concept of quality of life. To some degree, this may be overly simplistic, as Elizur and Shye, (1990) concluded that quality of work performance is affected by quality of life as well as quality of working life. However, it is argued that the specific attention to work-related aspects of quality of life is valid.

1.1.1 QUALITY OF LIFE

The term quality of life is used to evaluate the general well-being of individuals and societies. Standard indicators of the quality of life include not only wealth and employment, but also the built environment, physical and mental health, education, recreation and leisure time, and social belonging.

Quality of Life is the degree to which a person enjoys the important possibilities of his/her life. Three major life domains are identified in quality of Life: Being, Belonging, and Becoming.

**Being** domain includes the basic aspects of "who one is" and has three sub-domains. Physical being includes aspects of physical health, personal hygiene, nutrition, exercise, grooming, clothing, and physical appearance. Psychological being includes the person's psychological health and adjustment, cognitions, feelings and evaluations concerning the self and self-control. Spiritual being reflects personal values, personal standards of conduct, and spiritual beliefs which may or may not be associated with organized religions.

**Belonging** includes the person's fit with his/her environments and also has three sub-domains. Physical Belonging is defined as the connections the person has with his/her physical environments such as home, workplace, neighborhood, school and community. Social Belonging includes links with social environments and includes the sense of acceptance by intimate others, family, friends, co-workers, and neighborhood and community. Community belonging represents access to resources normally available to community members such as adequate income, health and social services, employment, educational and recreational programs, and community activities.

**Becoming** refers to the purposeful activities carried out to achieve personal goals, hopes, and wishes. Practical Becoming describes day-to-day actions such as domestic activities, paid work, school or voluntary activities, and looking into health or social needs. Leisure Becoming includes activities that promote relaxation and stress reduction. These include card games, neighborhood walks, and family visits and longer duration activities such as vacations or holidays.

Whilst quality of life has been more widely studied, quality of working life remains relatively unexplored and unexplained. A clearer understanding of the inter-relationship of the various facets of quality of life and quality of working life offers the opportunity for improved analysis of cause and effect in the workplace.
1.1.2 QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

The quality of working life is a wide term covering an immense variety of programmes, techniques, theories and management styles through which organizations and jobs are designed so as to grant autonomy, responsibility and authority for the employees. As every employer wants a good employee every employee wants a good employer. The main yardstick is the Quality of work life which every company offers to its employees. Quality of work life is all about the conducive and congenial environment created at the work place as it is one of the main reasons for better performance and productivity.

Various authors and researchers have proposed models of quality of working life which include a wide range of factors.

Hackman and Oldham (1976) drew attention to what they described as psychological growth needs as relevant to the consideration of Quality of working life. Several such needs were identified:

- Skill variety,
- Task Identity,
- Task significance,
- Autonomy and
- Feedback

They suggested that such needs have to be addressed if employees are to experience high quality of working life.

Warr and colleagues (1979), in an investigation of quality of working life, considered a range of apparently relevant factors, including:

- work involvement,
- intrinsic job motivation,
- higher order need strength,
- perceived intrinsic job characteristics,
- job satisfaction,
- life satisfaction,
- happiness, and
- Self-rated anxiety.

Warr et al. found evidence for a moderate association between total job satisfaction and total life satisfaction and happiness, with a less strong, but significant association with self-rated anxiety.

Mirvis and Lawler (1984) suggested that quality of working life is associated with satisfaction in wages, hours and working conditions by describing the “basic elements of a good quality of work life” as:

- safe work environment
- equitable wages
- equal employment opportunities and
- Opportunities for advancement.

Baba and Jamal (1991) listed the typical indicators of quality of working life as:

- job satisfaction
• job involvement
• work role ambiguity
• work role conflict
• work role overload
• job stress
• Organizational commitment and Turn-over intentions.

Sirgy et al. (2001) suggested that the key factors in quality of working life are:
• need satisfaction based on job requirements,
• need satisfaction based on work environment,
• need satisfaction based on supervisory behaviour,
• need satisfaction based on ancillary programmes
• Organizational commitment.

In contrast to such theory based models, Taylor (1979) more pragmatically identified the essential components of quality of working life as basic extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions, and the intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work itself. Some authors have emphasized the workplace aspects in quality of working life and others have identified the relevance of personality factors, psychological well being, and broader concepts of happiness and satisfaction. Factors more obviously and directly affecting work has however served as the main focus of attention as researchers have tried to extort out the important influences on quality of working life in the workplace.

In summary, authors differ in their views on the core constituents of Quality of Working Life (e.g. Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001 and Warr, Cook & Wall, 1979). It has generally been agreed however that Quality of Working Life is conceptually similar to well-being of employees but differs from job satisfaction which solely represents the workplace domain (Lawler, 1982). Quality of Working Life is not a unitary concept, but has been seen as incorporating a hierarchy of perspectives that not only include work-based factors such as job satisfaction, satisfaction with pay, relationships with work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

1.1.3 FACTORS INFLUENCING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Several notable factors that influence quality of work life is Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunity to Use and Develop human Capabilities, Opportunity for Career Growth etc. QWL provides for a balanced relationship among work, non- work and family aspects of life. In other words, family life and social life should not be strained by working hours including overtime work, work during inconvenient hours, business travel, transfers, vacations, etc. Most significant factors that influence and decide the Quality of work life are:

Attitude: The person who is entrusted with a particular job needs to have sufficient knowledge, required skill and expertise, enough experience, enthusiasm, energy level, willingness to learn new things, dynamism, sense of belongingness in the organization, involvement in the job, interpersonal relations, adaptability to changes in the situation, openness for innovative ideas, competitiveness, zeal, ability to work under pressure, leadership qualities and Team spirit. Attitudes are pervasive and every individual has some
kind of attitude towards the objects in his / her environment. In fact, attitudes are forced in
the socialization process which may very well relate to the Quality of Work Life.

**Environment**: Basically, the work environment factors affect the Quality of Work life,
individual Quality of work life outcomes and organization outcomes. In the work
environment certain tasks need to be performed and the individual contributes skills to
perform the tasks. The job may involve dealing with customers who have varied tolerance
level, preferences, behavioral pattern, level of understanding; it may involve working with
dangerous machines like drilling pipes, cranes, lathe machines, welding and soldering
machines, or even with animals where maximum safety precautions have to be observed:
some jobs may need lot of concentration, alertness, presence of mind, quick with involuntary
actions, synchronization of eyes, hands and body, sometimes high level of patience,
tactfulness, empathy and compassion and control over emotions. The environment and the
individual need to meet each other’s requirements for the Quality of work life to be
maintained.

**Opportunities**: One of the most important determinants of Quality of work life is the
opportunities for Career growth. Some jobs offer opportunities for learning, research,
 discovery, self-development, enhancement of skills, room for innovation, public recognition,
 exploration, celebrity-status and loads and loads of fame which are quite interesting and
 much rewarding too. Lau, Wong, Chan and Law (2001) defined Quality of work life as the
 favourable working conditions that support and enhance satisfaction by providing employees
 with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities.

**Nature of Job**: A driller in the oil drilling unit, a diver, a fire-fighter, traffic policeman, train
engine driver, construction laborers, welder, miner, lathe mechanic are involved in dangerous
jobs where they are required to be more alert in order to avoid any loss of limb, or loss of life
which is irreparable whereas A pilot, doctor, judge, journalist have to be more prudent and
tactful in handling the situation; a CEO, a professor, a teacher need to have more
responsibility and accountability; a cashier or a security guard cannot afford to be careless in
his job as it involves loss of money, property and wealth; a politician or a public figure
cannot afford to be careless, for his reputation and goodwill is at stake. Some jobs need soft
skills, leadership qualities, intelligence, decision making abilities, abilities to train and extract
work from others; other jobs need forethought, vision and yet other jobs need motor skills,
perfection and extreme carefulness. In today’s world, the structure, content and process of
work have been changed. Work is now more cognitively complex, more team based and
collaborative, more dependent on social skills, more dependent on technological competence.
Organisations need to concentrate on job designs and nature of work to enhance Quality of
Work life among employees.

**People**: Almost everyone has to deal with three set of people in the work place namely boss,
co-workers in the same level and subordinates. Apart from this, some professions need
interaction with people like patients, media persons, public, customers, thieves, robbers,
physically disabled people, mentally challenged children, foreign delegates, gangsters,
politicians, public figures and celebrities. These situations demand high level of prudence,
cool temper, tactfulness, humor, kindness, diplomacy and sensitiveness. It is understood that
the Quality of work environment and the Quality of work life are influenced by people,
within the organization and outside the organisation.

**Stress Level**: Stress is of different types - mental stress/physical stress and psychological or
emotional stress. A Managing Director of a company will have mental stress, a laborer will
have physical stress, and a psychiatrist will have emotional stress. Mental stress and
Emotional stress lead to more damage than Physical stress. In the work environment stress occurs due to demand that exceeds the individuals coping ability, disrupting their psychological equilibrium. Various studies extend the claim that occupational stress impacts on the organization members’ well being. A clearer understanding of the interrelationship of the various facets of stress in an organization offers the opportunity for the employers to develop efficient coping strategies to manage the stress level of the employees.

**Career Prospects:** To satisfy the new generation work force, organization needs to concentrate on the career prospects of the employees. Every job should offer career development which is an important factor that decides the quality of work life. Status improvement, more recognition from the Management and appreciations are the motivating factors for anyone to take keen interest in his job. The work atmosphere should be conducive to achieve organizational goal as well as individual development. It is a win-win situation for both the parties. An employee should be rewarded appropriately for his good work and recognized for extra efforts and sincerity. This motivates the employee to work with more zeal, which ultimately gives better quality of work life and strive for better performance.

**Challenges:** Challenging job enables an employee to upgrade his knowledge and skill and capabilities; whereas the monotony of the job makes a person dull, non-enthusiastic, dissatisfied, frustrating, complacent, initiative - less and uninteresting. Challenge is the fire that keeps the innovation and thrill alive. A well-accomplished challenging job yields greater satisfaction than a monetary perk; it boosts the self-confidence and provides quality of work life.

**Recognition and Reward:** Generally reward or compensation is directly proportional to the quantum of work, man-hours, nature and extent of responsibility, accountability, delegated powers, authority of position in the organizational chart, risk involved level of expected commitment, deadlines and targets, industry, country, demand and supply of skilled manpower and even political stability and economic policies of a nation. Recognition reinforces individual and group motivation to achieve and take responsibility and contributes to work improvement.

**1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The field of Engineering Education like many other sectors is adjusting to the multiple changes in the workplace over the past two decades. Also decades have passed since the catch phrase Quality of Work Life is becoming a prominent phenomenon in the growing Engineering Education field of India. Recognizing this, the Engineering Education sector is in need to prompt greater interest in teaching faculty members’ involvement and quality of work life. The Engineering Education which is growing day by day may attain long term sustainable quality consciousness and service responsiveness and lead to better productivity and higher economic growth of our country. The study purports to explore the differences observed in the Quality of Work Life of teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions. This study” A Comparative analysis of the Quality of Work Life of the teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai” may create an urge to the Managements of Engineering Institutions to identify the underlying situations and reasons to bring out Quality of work Life into consideration.
1.6 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To gain a clarity about the conceptual background of Quality of Work life.
2. To measure the factors influence the Quality of work life of the teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai.
3. To compare the Quality of Work life of teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai.

Since Quality of Work Life is predominant to the employees of the teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai for their contribution to the progress of students, institutions and economy as a whole, the study aims to construe that a happy and healthy quality of Work Life among teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions will ultimately lead the graph of our country’s economy on the high. So transforming the workplace proactively using a combination of well designed QWL initiatives for the employees of teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions will yield competitive advantage as it will increase Faculty job satisfaction. This in turn will motivate the faculty members to perform in superior way, leading the institutions, their stakeholders and the country’s financial status to a better future by yielding a plausible outcome.

2. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The study employed the Survey Exploratory method using a structured questionnaire which is said to be the most appropriate method for drawing responses when the geographical dispersion is large. (Sekharan 2003). For practical reasons, the Government and Private Self financing Engineering Colleges affiliated to Anna University are considered as Engineering Institutions in this study. As there was practical difficulty in data collection, the researcher forwarded the questionnaire to the teaching faculty members of both Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai through e mails. The response rate was 60%. The number of responses received was 373. This includes faculty members from Anna University Departments, Central Institute of Plastics engineering and Technology and 4 self financing engineering colleges. The responses were obtained on a 5 point Likert type scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The sampling frame included the Deans, Directors, Principals, professors and Assistant Professors from self financing Engineering Colleges, Aided Engineering Colleges, Central Government Engineering Institutions,.. The instrument was compiled to include three sections.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS IN CHENNAI

Teaching faculty members belonging to both Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions in Chennai have much influence on factors such as Remuneration, Recognition, Inter-relationship, Career advancement, Leadership and morale.
These factors illustrate the Quality of work life of teaching faculty members of both Government Engineering Institutions and private engineering institutions.

### 3.1 Two Sample T-Test for Equality of Means for “Remuneration” in Teaching Faculty Members of Government and Private Engineering Institutions in Chennai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levine’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>27.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the t value is 3.569 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.000 which is less than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is an average difference in the influence of ‘remuneration’ in the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.

### 3.2 Two Sample T-Test for Equality of Means for “Recognition” in Teaching Faculty Members of Government and Private Engineering Institutions in Chennai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levine’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>61.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the t value is 2.048 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.041 which is less than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is an average difference in the influence of ‘recognition’ in the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.
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3.3 TWO SAMPLE T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS FOR “INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP” IN TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS IN CHENNAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t- test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance Assumption</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>15.325</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the t value is 1.123 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.262 which is greater than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we accept the null hypothesis and reject alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is no difference in the influence of ‘Interpersonal relationship’ in the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.

3.4 TWO SAMPLE T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS FOR “LEADERSHIP” IN TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS IN CHENNAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t- test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance Assumption</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the t value is 6.477 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.000 which is less than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is an average difference in the
influence of ‘Leadership’ in the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.

3.5 TWO SAMPLE T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS FOR “CAREER ADVANCEMENT IN TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS IN CHENNAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER ADVANCEMENT</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t- test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the t value is 3.221 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.001 which is less than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is an average difference in the influence of ‘Career Advancement’ among the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.

3.6. TWO SAMPLE T-TEST FOR EQUALITY OF MEANS FOR “MORALE” IN TEACHING FACULTY MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENGINEERING INSTITUTIONS IN CHENNAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORALE</th>
<th>Levine’s Test for Quality of Variance</th>
<th>t- test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Variance Assumed</td>
<td>3.893</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the t value is 1.491 with 354 degrees of freedom, the significant p value is 0.137 which is greater than our 0.05 significance level. Therefore we accept the null hypothesis and reject alternative hypothesis. This clearly shows that there is no difference in the influence of ‘Morale’ in the teaching faculty members of Government and private Engineering Colleges.

4. FINDINGS

From the study it is observed that Remuneration of teaching faculty members belonging to Government Engineering Colleges is higher than that of Remuneration of teaching faculty members in Private Engineering Colleges. The teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Colleges are recognized higher than that of teaching faculty members belonging to Private Engineering Colleges in Chennai. Interpersonal Relationship among teaching faculty members is equal, in both Government and Private Engineering Colleges in Chennai. The leadership style observed in the teaching faculty members of Private Engineering Colleges is not much compatible with the Leadership style of the teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions in Chennai. The teaching faculty members of Government Engineering Institutions are provided with good avenues for Career Advancement when compared to the employees of teaching faculty members of Private Engineering Colleges Chennai. The teaching faculty members of both Private Engineering Colleges and Government Engineering Institutions do maintain good morale equally. No variation is observed in sustaining the morale among the teaching faculty members of Private Engineering Colleges and Government Engineering Institutions in Chennai. The teaching faculty members of both the sectors need to maintain good relationship with their colleagues. Generally people do not wish to work alone. In order to be successful, an individual need to be able to positively influence the people around them in the work place to gain cooperation, respect and support. The Engineering education sector may provide exclusive work atmosphere with periodical refreshments like fun games and sports where the teaching faculty members can develop the personal insight necessary to work effectively with people. This will enable to read the reactions of others and modify an individual’s approach whenever necessary. When the employees are facilitated to have good interpersonal relationship, the employees will have their relationships improved and their stress level dropped, to contribute more their work. The study supports the Career Advancement that place strong emphasis on personal growth as part of their careers. This further suggests that a successful family life carries over into an individual’s work life and make him/her satisfied with personal achievements. This is related to having harmonious home environment that is highly valued where Quality of Work Life is expected to provide some impact as found in this study. Hence the teaching faculty members of Private Engineering Colleges may be encouraged to upgrade themselves with qualifications related to academic practice.

5. CONCLUSION

The growth of Engineering Education Sector is becoming a hot topic in the present scenario. Every institution needs to sustain in the Competitive World with its competing Technological advancements. Man Power requirements are in par with the technological advancements of the industry and the industry is in a position to satisfy the faculty members by providing their needs and demands. Satisfied and motivated faculty members are the
source of achieving the institutional goals and objectives. In order to use the maximum potential of the human resource, the institution is required to provide them with the best quality of their working life. The Engineering Education sector which leverages our country’s economy with the People’s technical knowhow, learning and innovation to update and improve the quality of work life of the faculty members who make better contribution to production, quality and productivity.
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