CHAPTER V
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter narrates the findings, suggestions and conclusion with reference to the study undertaken by the researcher.

5.2 FINDINGS

1 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF FACULTY MEMBERS

Gender-wise analysis shows that 56.4 percent of the respondents are female and 43.6 percent are male. From the analysis, it can be understood that female members are more in higher education institutions rather than the male.

The age-wise analysis presents – 36.4% (182) respondents belong to age group of 30-35 years followed by (147) 29.4 % belong to below 30 years group. From the analysis it can be understood that these age group are reluctant to shift, else they are settled with current working and family situation does not permit them.

Regarding marital status 74.4 % (372) of them are married followed by (128) 25.6% are bachelors/spinsters. As per the gender-wise analysis most are female, due to marriage and as per the Indian culture and tradition, female used to settle with their spouse and seek a job which is conducive to their family condition, in such case, education department is chosen, hence, more number of married respondents have presented their views in this study.
The observations on the educational qualification show that among the total respondents 67% (335) are having PG with M.Phil. It can be understood that most of the faculty members have the minimum qualification required for teaching in higher educational institutions, however they are required to upgrade their qualification with Ph.D or SLET/NET.

Designation analysis shows 86% of the faculty members belong to the group of Assistant Professor followed by 12% are Associate Professors. Designation depending upon their qualification and years of service varies.

Most of the respondents (219) 43.8% monthly income is Rs.10,000 to Rs.20,000. From the analysis it is found that most of the faculty members belong to the self-financing institutions, where salary is less, this will lead to poor Quality of Work Life.

It is clear that among the respondents majority 53% belong to rural nativity, followed by 32% belong to urban nativity. Most of the respondents residing in rural areas, this is because the self-finance higher educational institutions are now-a-days situated in rural surroundings.

Of the total respondents, 53.6% (268) of them belong to joint family whereas the rest of 46.4% (232) belong to nuclear family. From the family analysis it is found that the joint family system exist which is a tradition of India.

Most of the respondents 65.6% have 4-5 dependents and 28.8% have a minimum of three dependents. The analysis shows that since the faculty members belong to the joint family, the existence of dependents is more.

Family Annual Income reveals that 60.8% have an annual family income below Rs.50,000.
The analysis of faculty members’ length of service in the present institution presents a highlight that most 48.8 percent (244) of the faculty members are having below 5 years of experience, followed by 31.4% (157) have between 5-10 years of service.

Total service in teaching analysis shows that 40.4 percent of the faculty members have been in teaching for 5-10 years and 18.4 percent (92) faculty members have been in teaching for 10-15 years.

The analysis of faculty members’ strength in a department is that 48.2 percent and 28.2 percent have reported above eight faculty members and followed by 5-8 faculty members in their department respectively.

Work load analysis presents that majority of the faculty members have 15-18 hours per week, followed by 12.8 % have below 15 years per week. It is found that the work load is acceptable since it is the norm prescribed by the University Grants Commission.

It is seen from the analysis, that majority have reported the accreditation status in their Institutions, whereas 10.8% have reported that their Institution has no accreditation status to their Institution.

Most of the faculty members have reported that they have realistic working conditions, followed by 32.8 % have reported that they have teachers’ motivation. It is found that there exists good working condition and faculty motivation in the higher educational institutions.
II - FACTOR DETERMINING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND JOB SATISFACTION

**Adequate and Fair Compensation** statements (S1-S6) mean score ranged from 3.252 to 3.670 and the statement S3 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S4 secured least score and stood at last. It is understood that most of the faculty members are highly satisfied with their compensation and will continue with the present institution irrespective of the pay.

**Safe and Healthy Working Conditions** statements (S1-S7) mean score ranged from 2.806 to 3.180 and the statement S7 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S2 secured least score and stood at last. Most of the faculty members are of opinion that their management provides good infrastructure for the members of the faculty.

**Opportunities for Development** Statements (S1-S6) mean score ranged from 3.772 to 4.046 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S2 secured least score and stood at last. From the analysis it is found that most of the institutions provide the faculty with the opportunity for utilizing Information, Communication and Technology for teaching and learning.

**Opportunities for Growth and Security** statements (S1-S8) mean score ranged from 3.712 to 4.130 and the statement S5 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S1 secured least score and stood at last. It is understood that the respondents are getting opportunity to improve their individual skills in the institution.
Social Integration statements (S1-S10) mean score ranged from 3.172 to 3.824 and the statement S6 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S9 secured least score and stood at last. It is concluded that members of different levels work as a team at the institution provides a social integration and sharing of knowledge and ideas.

Constitutionalism statements (S1-S5) mean score ranged from 3.460 to 3.762 and the statement S5 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S3 secured least score and stood at last. Most of the respondents are of opinion that their institution encourages the faculty members to interact with the professionals other than the organization.

Social Relevance and Work Life statements (S1-S5) mean score ranged from 3.842 to 4.214 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S5 secured least score and stood at last. The respondents are of opinion that there exists a status in the society as a faculty member of a certain institution.

Work and Total Life Space statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.142 to 3.472 and the statement S3 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S1 secured least score and stood at last. The analysis shows that the respondents feel a balanced work load in association to personal life is available in the institution.

The agreeableness mean scores on Quality of Work Life Dimensions overall mean score ranged from 3.394 to 4.043 and the dimension Social Relevance and Work Life secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the dimension Adequate and Fair Compensation secured least score and stood at last. Of the eight
dimensions given the respondents are of the opinion that Social Relevance and Work Life has the highest impact, second is sought for the Opportunities for Growth and Security, and the least option is opined for Work and Total Life Space.

**JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS**

**Involvement in the Academic Process** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.994 to 4.404 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S4 secured least score and stood at last. The analysis findings shows that most of the faculty members are the opinion that clear planning for teaching provides with involvement in academic process, and autonomy in job is very less.

**Work Place Values and Environment** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.500 to 3.947 and the statement S3 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S4 secured least score and stood at last. They also feel that the job is of secured nature with a rank of second, however they feel less satisfied with the participative decision making which has scored second rank and regarding rewards for abilities has the least score of fourth rank.

The 4 agreeability scores on **Pay and Benefits** statements (S1-S4) work break for enrichment of personal life and leave benefits has scored first and second respectively with a score of 3.452 and 3.378. But the faculty member are having a low satisfaction regarding salary and increment and the fourth rank is awarded for fulfilling financial needs, it means that third and fourth rank respectively provides less satisfaction among the faculty members. The analysis result shows that the faculty members Work break for enrichment of personal life has a high score among the
faculty members, whereas financial need has low score with regards to pay and benefits in relation to the job satisfaction.

**Teaching and Learning** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.904 to 4.022 and the mean score is on par among 4 statements. From the analysis it presents a finding that most of the faculty members have opined that development of teaching and learning is supported, and encouragement towards the use of Information and Communication Technology in teaching that provides job satisfaction.

**Students Support and Progression** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.726 to 4.258 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S4 secured least score and stood at last. The analysis shows that faculty members are satisfied with the student progression and with the placement assistance provided by the management for the students’.

**Research Consultancy and Extension** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.478 to 3.934 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S3 secured least score and stood at last. The analysis of the result shows that the faculty members are satisfied with the management that permits them to take up research projects and consultancy services and supports them towards publications in national and international journals.

**Work Load** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.004 to 3.996 and the statement S3 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S2 secured least score and stood at last. It is found that the faculty members have sufficient time to devote towards counseling; secondly they are of the opinion that they are responsible for the completion of syllabus and they have mentioned that administrative work burdens them.
**Performance Appraisal** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.474 to 3.658 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S3 secured least score and stood at last. It is observed and concluded that the faculty members are of the opinion that appraisal is transparent, but does not have any impact for increment or promotion.

**Support and Recognition** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 3.668 to 6.902 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S2 secured least score and stood at last. This shows that grievance attention should be improved for improving satisfaction of faculty members and management should appreciate and reward staff merits.

**Infrastructure and Facilities** statements (S1-S4) mean score ranged from 2.798 to 3.936 and the statement S1 secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the statement S4 secured least score and stood at last. The respondents are of the opinion that the tutorial rooms are spacious materialized and further the institution has a well equipped library.

Among the 10 agreeability scores on **Job satisfaction Factors**, overall mean score ranged from 3.371 to 4.219 and the factor Involvement in Academic Process secured higher mean score and stood at top whereas the factor pay and benefits secured least score and stood at last. The analysis of the overall job satisfaction factor among the faculty member shows that the involvement in the academic and Student Support System are highly satisfied whereas Pay and Benefit and Infrastructure Facilities have scored least satisfaction.
Faculty members’ perception of the various job satisfaction factors analysis result shows that they are having high level satisfaction in relation to research consultancy, medium level of satisfaction with regards to workload, and low level of satisfaction regarding the work place values and environment.

**FACTOR ANALYSIS**

Twelve factors were identified as being maximum percentage variance accounted. The 8 statements 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 (Social integration dimension) and 41 were grouped together as factor I and accounts 27.75% of the total variance. The 8 statements 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, (Opportunity for Development dimension) and 27 constituted the factor II and accounts 5.66% of the total variance. Four statements 48, 49, 50 and 51 (Work and Total Life Space) constituted the factor III and accounts 5.08% of the total variance.

Nine factors were identified as being maximum percentage variance accounted. The 7 statements S29, S30, S31, S31, S32, S33, S34 and S35 were grouped together as factor I (Performance appraisal, Support and recognition) and accounts 9.26% of the total variance. The 4 statements S21, S22, S23 and S24 constituted the factor II (Research consultancy and extension) and accounts 7.94% of the total variance. Four statements S13, S14, S15 and S16 constituted the factor III (Teaching and Learning) and accounts 7.38% of the total variance. The 6 statements S1, S18, S19, S20, S27 and S36 constituted the factor IV (Student Support and Progression) and accounts 7.37% of the total variance.

**INTER-CORRELATION MATRIX**

Inter-correlation matrix reveals that the correlation between the explanatory variables (Dimensions) D1 to D8 is highly significant and positively correlated with the dependent variable - Y Quality of Work Life.
It is seen from the analysis that among the ten explanatory variables, four explanatory variables namely Work place values and environment, Pay and benefits, Research consultancy and extension, Work load and Support and Recognition factors had higher positive direct effect on the dependent variable Y-Job Satisfaction.

**PATH ANALYSIS**

Among the explanatory variables (Dimensions) D1 – D8, variables Adequate and fair compensation, Opportunities for Development, Constitutionalism, Work and Total life space had higher positive direct effect on Y-QWL.

It is seen from the above tables that among the explanatory variables, Involvement in academic process, Work place values and environment, Pay and benefits and Infrastructure and facilities factors had higher positive direct effect on Y-Job satisfaction.

**III - LEVEL OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND JOB SATISFACTION**

With regard to the overall Quality of Work Life 28.2% of the respondents perceived high level of Quality of Work Life and 21.2% of the respondents perceived low level of Quality of Work Life and the remaining 50.4% are having moderate.

With regard to the overall job satisfaction level in teaching environment 54.8% of the respondents perceived high level of job satisfaction and 45.2% of the respondents are low level of satisfaction.

**CHI-SQUARE TEST**

- The significant chi-square indicates that there is an association between the age and perception level of Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
- The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the gender and Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
• The non-significant chi-square indicates that there is no association between the designation and Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the income per annum and Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the salary and Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Teaching staff in the department and Quality of Work Life among the Respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Work load per week and Quality of Work Life among the Respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Accreditation Status and Quality of Work Life among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Reason for choosing teaching and Quality of Work Life among the Respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is an association between the age and job satisfaction level among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the gender and level of job satisfaction among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is no association between the designation and level of satisfaction among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the salary and job satisfaction among the respondents.
• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the nativity and job satisfaction among the respondents.

• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Teaching staff in the department and job satisfaction level among the respondents.

• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Work load per week and satisfaction among the respondents.

• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the Accreditation Status and satisfaction among the respondents.

• The significant chi-square indicates that there is association between the reason for choosing teaching and job satisfaction among the respondents.

FRIEDMAN’S TEST

• There is significant difference in overall mean rank of Quality of Work Life among the qualifications groups of respondents and it is higher (4.50) in PG with SLT/NET group than all other groups of respondents and is least in PG group of respondents (1.25)

• There is significant difference in overall mean ranks among the groups of respondents and it is higher (3.00) in 10-15 & >15 years groups than all other group of respondents and is least in <5years group of respondents (1.8).

THE KRUSKAL -WALLIS TEST

• There is no significant difference in the mean rank and the overall job satisfaction score among the educational groups is on par.

• There is no significant difference in the mean rank and the overall job satisfaction among the years of experience groups is on par.
IV - VARIATIONS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND JOB
SATISFACTION

t - TEST

- It is inferred from the above table that, there is a significant difference between the sex of the respondents with regard to the various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunities for Development, Opportunities for growth and security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work and total life space.

- It is found from the above table that, there is a significant difference between Work place values and Environment, Teaching and Learning, Research consultancy and Extension, Work Load, Support & Recognition and Infrastructure and Facilities.

ANOVA

- There is a significant difference among various age groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Constitutionalism, Social Relevance and Work life.

- There is a significant difference among various qualification groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunities for Development, Social Relevance and Work life.

- There is a significant difference among various age groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Opportunities for Development.

- There is a significant difference among various experience groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life
namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Social Relevance and Work life.

- There is a significant difference among various experience groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Social Relevance and Work life.

- There is a significant difference among number of teaching staffs groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunities for Development, Opportunities for growth and security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Social relevance and work life and Work Total Life space.

- There is a significant difference among various age groups of the respondents with regard to various dimensions of Quality of Work Life namely, Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Opportunities for Development, Opportunities for growth and security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Social relevance and Work life, Work and Total Life space.

- There is a significant difference among various qualification groups of the respondents with regard to various job satisfaction factors namely, workplace value and environment, pay and benefits, student support and progression and infrastructure and facilities.

- There is a significant difference among various monthly salary groups of the respondents with regard to various job satisfaction factors namely, pay and benefits and infrastructure and facilities.

- There is a significant difference among various numbers of teaching staff in the department groups of the respondents with regard to various job
satisfaction factors namely, work place values and environment, pay and benefits, teaching and learning, student support and progression, work load, performance appraisal and support and recognition.

- There is a significant difference among various work load groups of the respondents with regard to various job satisfaction factors namely, work place values and environment, pay and benefits, research consultancy and extension, and work load.

V – RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND JOB SATISFACTION

INTER-CORRELATION MATRIX

- The correlations between the explanatory variables D1 – D8 are highly significant and positive. Further it is also seen that all these explanatory variables are highly, significantly and positively correlated with the dependent variable Y- Job satisfaction.

- The Path coefficient analysis showed that five explanatory variables namely D3, D4, D6, D7 and D8 had higher positive direct effect on the dependent variable Y – Job Satisfaction.

- The correlations between the explanatory variables F1–F10 are highly significant and positively correlated with the dependent variable Y-QWL.

- It is seen from the above table that among the five explanatory variables, four explanatory variables namely F2, F3, F6, F7 and F9 had higher positive direct effect on the dependent variable Y-QWL.
DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION

- Among the job satisfaction factors under study, three factors namely, Work place values and environment, Pay and benefits, Work load and Support and recognition are substantially important factors in discriminating between groups namely faculty members with lower and with higher Quality of Work Life scales.

- Among the variables under study, three variables namely, Work and Total Life Space, Social Relevance and Work Life and Social integration are substantially important variables in discriminating between groups namely faculty members with lower and with higher job satisfaction.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

- The step wise multiple regression model indicated that out of the explanatory variables under study, all variables D1 – D8 have significantly contributing to Y- Job Satisfaction.

- The multiple regression models indicated that out of the explanatory variables under study, all variables except F1 (Involvement in Academic Process) and F5 (Student Support and Progression) have significantly contributing to Y-Quality of Work Life.
5.3 SUGGESTIONS

Work is an integral part of everyday life as it is our livelihood whether it may be a career or business. On an average we spend twelve hours daily that occupies one third of our entire life. Research on Quality of Work Life is considered to be more important at the individual and organisational level. Quality of Work Life is considered for both the employees and organization and it is involved with job satisfaction, productivity, job involvement, job enrichment etc.,

A large number of faculty members are assets in the higher educational institutions. They are playing a significant role for economic growth by contributing their knowledge, skills and efforts. So transforming the workplace proactively using a combination of well designed Quality of Work Life initiatives for the faculty members will yield competitive advantage as it will increase the job satisfaction of the faculty members. This in turn will motivate them to perform in superior way, leading the institutions and their stakeholders to a better future by yielding the expected outcome.

Thus in the higher educational institutions management should emphasize on the policy implications based on the concerned issues of Quality of Work Life improvement. There is no doubt that an improved Quality of Work Life can lead to higher level of job satisfaction, which in turn will reduce the faculty members turnover rate that is prevailing in the higher educational institutions.

This study provides valuable implications for the higher educational institutions that have growing interest in attracting and retaining quality of faculty members. The study revealed statistically significant positive correlation between the dimensions of Quality of Work Life and faculty members’ job satisfaction.
To encourage the faculty members, they should use motivational factors such as, providing compensation and salary, adequate conditions for work, perfect appreciation of their work; develop a sense of belonging and collaboration to do duty, sympathetic understanding etc. These should be considered as satisfying motivators.

Adoption and access to technology, infrastructure development, and recognition for achievements, support for undertaking research and consultancy, appropriate work breaks and work sharing, freeness to share views with the management and peers for the development of the students’ community and the institutions.

Organizational climate should be designed in a way that provides the essential conditions for the creation of collaboration and morale of collective work in all levels of the organizational structure.

Caring and support for personal and family related problems, providing social status, and introduction of programs for health care initiatives, student support system through parent teachers meetings, providing job security are required to be considered by the management to improve the Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction.

Effective factors in increasing overall life space should be studied and reinforced and trans-organizational factors that affect the improvement of faculty job satisfaction should be recognized and considered.

It is better, if institutions’ principals and authorities provide member access to information, opportunity in designing and planning, authority for decision making in related areas of operation, so that faculty members can develop their capabilities.
5.4. CONCLUSION

An attempt is made by the researcher to find out the perception and relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction of faculty members. It is observed that a positive perception among the faculty members’ except few dimensions such as adequate and fair remuneration, infrastructure and facilities, work and total life space, social integration.

It is the responsibility of the institutions to increase the satisfaction level of the faculty members for better holistic performance of the faculty members in their institutions. The Quality of Work Life has a direct impact on Job Satisfaction of the faculty members of higher educational institutions. “Improved work environment provides Quality of Work Life; improved Quality of Work Life will provide Job Satisfaction”. It is concluded that Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction cannot be separated; they are inter-connected with the job itself. If the suggestions of the researcher are implemented it will bring a better academic scenario in higher learning institutions by and large.

5.4 SCOPE FOR FUTURE STUDIES

✧ Implementing Quality of Work Life in organisations based on Walton’s Model
✧ Employees Perception towards Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction.
✧ Study on the status of Quality of Work Life in select business organisations.
✧ Improving Quality of Work Life in state owned enterprises.
✧ Quality of Work Life and morale of faculty in higher educational institutions.
✧ Morale development through improving Quality of Work Life.
✧ Quality of Work Life and commitment to work.