



Quality of Work Life (QWL) Amongst the Faculties of Public Universities in Bangladesh

Dr. Md. Asfaqur Rahman^{1*}, Dr. Md. Hasebur Rahman² & Dr. M. Zafor Sadique³

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 30th December, 2023

Accepted: 20th May, 2024

Keywords:

Autonomous,
Faculty,
Government,
Quality of Work Life,
University.

JEL Classification:

I20, J17, L33, L84

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Teachers are one of the main foundations of society and have a significant impact on how future generations develop, which in turn shapes nations. They therefore want and deserve a fulfilling career. The present empirical study will conduct amongst the faculties of the public universities operating in Bangladesh to examine what factors are responsible for the quality of work life perceived by the respondents.

Methodology: This research conducted only on academic staff (teachers/faculty members) working in public universities of Bangladesh. Using the purposive sampling method 4 autonomous universities (Dhaka, Chittagong, Rajshahi and Jahangirnagar) have been chosen and 7 government universities have been chosen purposively by applying 20% stratified random sampling on 33 government universities. The survey's empirical data were gathered through structured questionnaire pertaining to the factors involved.

Findings: This study finds that among the seven factors of quality of work life, teachers across the universities are more concerned with lowering their "Work Stress" but showing least priority over "Work Motivation". By comparing the mean statistics this study confirms that out of seven factors of quality of work life, public (government) university teachers possess four cases with high to low mean value namely Organizational Commitment ($\bar{x}$ =3.6300), Empowerment ($\bar{x}$ =3.6065), Job Characteristics ($\bar{x}$ =3.5172) and Work Motivation ($\bar{x}$ =3.2936). The remaining three factors confirmed by public (autonomous) university teachers namely Work Stress ($\bar{x}$ =3.9900), Work-Life Balance ($\bar{x}$ =3.9900) and Job Satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ =3.8477).

Practical Implications: The research result may aid the research scholars, students, QWL practitioners, behavioral scientists, psychologists and consultants to sculpt a better understanding about the quality of work life gap prevailed in the organization.

Originality: Tamhane's T2 Multiple Comparisons post hoc test showed that there is no statistically significant difference between the public (autonomous) and public (government) (p =.319) universities. As most of

¹Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Pabna University of Science and Technology, Pabna-6600, Bangladesh.E-mail: asfaq@pust.ac.bd (*Corresponding Author)

² Professor, Department of Business Administration, Pabna University of Science and Technology, Pabna-6600, Bangladesh.E-mail: haseb@pust.ac.bd

³ Professor, Department of Management Studies, Rajshahi University, Rajshahi-6205, Bangladesh, E-mail: zafor9867@ru.ac.bd

the universities do not promote strong policies or support their faculty members, the factors identified in this study are expected to contribute in enhancing the understanding of the quality of work life of public university teachers in Bangladesh.

Research Limitations: Though all of the factors have been examined, the impact of each factor on the factor of quality of work life has not been examined. As a result, further research could be conducted on specific dimensions of quality of work life, or individual universities could be included in the study to get more expected outcome.

1. Introduction

The term ‘Quality of Work Life’ has become more and more associated in recent years with the increasing prevalence of specific environmental and humanistic ideals that industrialized cultures have neglected in favor of industrial productivity, economic expansion, and technical advancement. This has a similar function in employee performance satisfaction, attendance, and retention. This acts as a parallel role in the retention, attendance, and satisfaction of employee performance (Efraty & Sirgy, 1990). There are numerous aspects of the workplace that make employees happy. The satisfaction a person derives from their work is specifically linked to their “Quality of Work Life”. Greater the job satisfaction, the more is the work performance (Lawler, 1982). Workers who are happy in their careers are considered to have a high quality of work life, whilst dissatisfied workers are said to have a low quality of work life. The topic of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is significant in the field of management studies. It has been thoroughly examined by a large number of writers from throughout the world in relation to a variety of sectors, including as agriculture, engineering, medicine, education, and the information technology sector (Bagtasos, 2011). QWL is crucial to an organization’s ability to function smoothly. Additionally, it supports the recruitment and retention of competent workers for the appropriate job profile, which promotes the success of people as well as companies (Ramawickrama et. al., 2017). The success of an educational organization is contingent upon the professional knowledge, engagement, and contributions of its faculty. Teachers are the most important people in education because they are involved in so many important aspects of students' academic lives, including their entire growth.

According to the information of University Grants Commission of Bangladesh (2020), the numbers of total public universities are 51 and private universities are 107. According to the Ordinance of 1973 four (4) universities in Bangladesh are autonomous which are: 1) Dhaka University (DU), 2) Rajshahi University (RU), 3) Jahangirnagar University (JU), and 4) Chattogram University (CU). They have their own rules and regulations for management and control and in which the government cannot directly intervene. Autonomous universities may or may not be dependent on the government for budgeting. The remaining public universities were formed and are primarily funded by the government, which gives them the ability to indirectly influence them even though they do not, in practice, have the same autonomy as the aforementioned four universities.

They are offering their knowledge, abilities, and efforts in an important way to economic prosperity. According to Mannan (2009) Private universities in Bangladesh suffer from a substantially greater percentage of employee turnover than public universities due to a multitude of factors, including a lack of career development opportunities, a lack of flexibility and freedom, lower compensation, discrimination in rewards and benefits, conflicts between faculty and management, a lack of an academic and research environment, limited opportunities for job designing, etc. Since quality of work life addresses both the internal and external elements of jobs, all these factors are fundamentally connected to it (Tabassum, 2012). The primary aspects of QWL, according to Havlovic (1991), are career security, career satisfaction, an improved reward system, employee benefits, employee involvement, and organizational success. Others cited the following as crucial factors: burnout, stress, workload, and other related issues; career fulfillment; motivation; efficiency; productivity; and health, safety, and welfare at work (Arts et.al., 2001).

Finally the researcher choose seven (7) variables to compare QWL between Autonomous Universities and Government Universities in terms of job characteristics, work motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, empowerment, work stress, and work-life balance.

2. Objectives of the Study

The researchers were motivated to investigate the Quality of Work Life (QWL) at public universities in Bangladesh by all of the aforementioned factors, in order to fulfill the following objectives:

- A. To assess the level of quality of work life of public universities in Bangladesh.
- B. To measure the differences in terms of QWL among the faculties of public (autonomous) and public (government) universities in Bangladesh.

3. Review of Literature

The term Quality of Work Life (QWL) was first introduced in the late 1960s as a way of focusing on the effects of employment on health, job security and general well-being and ways to enhance the quality of a person's on-the-job experience. Quality of work life, in its broadest definition, refers to the totality of values—material and non-material—that an employee has developed throughout the course of his or her professional life. The term “quality of work life” refers to components of working life that may have an impact on employee motivation and satisfaction, such as pay and hours worked, the workplace atmosphere, perks and services, career opportunities, and interpersonal relationships (Sadique, 2001). The International Labor Relations Conference held in 1972 defines quality of work life as determining the prerequisites for a compassionate working environment. Since employees are human, they should be treated with compassion, kindness, and understanding (Lau & May, 1998). Frye and Breugh (2004) described quality of work life as the way an individual perceives and evaluates the characteristics intrinsic to his/her past experience,

education, race and culture. From the study of Boas and Morin (2013) it was found that there is a significant association between quality of work life and quality of life in teaching environment.

3.1 Work Life of Faculty Members

As a special occupation, faculties' quality of work life can not only have effect on their own development, but also on students and even the educational development. A faculty member's quality of work life is defined as the range of emotions and experiences they have had while working for an organization. This is made possible by the organization providing for their material and psychological needs. When teachers feel satisfied in their work, they are more likely to have positive experiences, feel more empowered to take on responsibility for their work, participate more in it, and feel more satisfied overall. All of these factors help the organization achieve its goals. Academicians today face numerous problems, so they have higher expectations for their performance. This population has been overextended due to the emphasis on self-directed learning, the necessity to keep up with the use of technology and contemporary learning resources, and the high level of preparation for dynamic curriculum.

3.2 Job Characteristics and QWL

The success of any organization depends upon the collection of individuals, including leaders and subordinates, and their feeling towards their job. Poulin (1994) pointed out that workplace are more productive when people are happy with their work. Happy workers are more likely to be very satisfied with their jobs since they feel at ease in the company. The relationship between job characteristics and individual responses to work is described by Hackman & Oldham's (1974) job characteristics model. They suggested that five core job dimensions affect certain personal and work related outcomes including job satisfaction. The five core job dimensions identified are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback from job. This theory also includes individual differences variables as moderator of the relationship between the characteristics and the outcome variables. The present study has an intention to investigate the relationship between job characteristics and QWL among the faculty members of Public Universities of Bangladesh.

3.3 Work Motivation and QWL

When given the right resources, highly motivated academic staff members can establish a solid professional, research, and publishing reputation for themselves and the institution on a national and worldwide scale (Machado-Taylor *et.al.*, 2011). Numerous studies have been carried out in various academic fields to examine and evaluate the QWL. It has been discovered that the main factors affecting maintaining a high quality of work life are money, advancement and evaluations, developmental concerns, a balanced personal life, the work environment, creativity, decision-making autonomy, job security, recognition and appreciation, etc. Sustaining each of these components is essential for a high QWL because they all affect the workers' total QWL.

3.4 Job Satisfaction and QWL

The most important thing of everyone's life and work is satisfaction (Rahman & Nurullah, 2014). The degree of satisfaction is determined by the ratio of outcomes against the desire of employees from their respective jobs (Rana, Islam & Ali, 2018). Employee satisfaction depends on the ratio of outcomes to what they want from their jobs. It is in regard to one's feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of their work. The term 'job satisfaction' means individual's emotional reaction to job (Parveen & Tariq, 2014). When one feels that their work appears to fulfill significant employment values, they experience this happy emotional state (Zaman, Mahmud & Jahan, 2014).

Universities are regarded as the best places to learn and create awareness. They are also places where people can receive training in a variety of professions (Khalid, Irshad & Mahmood, 2012). Basak and Govender (2015) in their empirical study emphasized on academic work satisfaction among faculty members which requires a favorable and healthy environment. Faculty members can carry out their responsibilities more successfully when they are happy in their positions.

3.5 Organizational Commitment and QWL

Whyte initially provided a definition of organizational commitment in 1956: "...white collar employees in large organizations live their lives dominated by the company life and their commitment. A man not only works for the organization, but also commits himself to the organization, and feels as if he belongs to it" (Whyte, 1956:143). Information regarding employees' level of commitment to their organizations can be found in their organizational commitment. Consequently, a number of studies have shown that organizational commitment positively affects employee performance and efficiency, which in turn affects the effectiveness of the organization. Employees who exhibit higher levels of organizational commitment are also more productive and efficient than those who do not (Chisholm, 1983; Nadler & Lawler, 1983; Mirvis & Lawler, 1984; Shore & Wayne, 1993).

3.6 Empowerment and QWL

The idea of teacher empowerment has been gaining ground over time. Although there are different definitions of teacher empowerment, it highlights the crucial roles that educators play in making professional decisions regarding teaching and learning (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2005). Bolin (1989) defined teacher empowerment as "providing teachers the freedom to make professional decisions regarding what and how to teach, as well as to take part in the formulation of academic goals and procedures". This description was also echoed by Lee (1991), who also underlined the need to create a setting where teachers act and are treated as professionals. According to Lightfoot (1986), empowerment is the combination of a person's chances for authority, independence, responsibility, and choice by adding an empirical foundation to this idea within the context of education. The concept has been categorized by Short and Rinehart (1992) into six dimensions: (1) teacher autonomy, or the ability to control some aspects of their work life; (2) teacher impact as an indicator of

influencing their professional life; (3) teacher status regarding professional respect from colleagues; (4) professional development opportunities to enhance continuous learning and expand one's skills; and (6) self-efficacy, or the idea that one has the skills and ability to help students learn.

3.7 Work Stress and QWL

According to Gillespie et al. (2001), teachers believe that the main barriers to increased productivity and quality standards are inadequate funding of universities and a shortage of both people and material resources. Poor interpersonal relationships, a lack of prospects for growth, and job insecurity all contribute to the low morale of university teachers—particularly the absence of support from superiors and/or colleagues and a sense that their work is not sufficiently valued and compensated (Malik, Björkqvist & Österman, 2017).

3.8 Work-Life Balance and QWL

The importance of work-life balance has been widely acknowledged by researchers. It is linked to an individual's psychological health and sense of overall harmony in life, and it is a sign of a healthy balance between the roles of the family and the job (Clark, 2000). Work-life balance, on the other hand, improves individuals' well-being and family happiness. In the family domain, persons who suffer a lack of work-life balance face threats to important aspects of their personal lives (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). In the workplace, a lack of work-life balance results in subpar work output and more employee absenteeism; yet, a healthy work-family balance is linked to higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Glazer & Kruse, 2008).

University teachers play a pivotal role in shaping the future through education and research, but this noble endeavor often comes at the cost of their own work-life balance. Managing work-life balance is a challenge for university teachers in Bangladesh, as it is for professionals in many other fields. Achieving work-life balance is an ongoing process that requires experimentation and adjustments. What works for one person may not work for another, so it is important to find a balance that suits individual needs and circumstances.

4. Hypothesis of the Study

Following hypothesis will be statistically tested to derive pertinent conclusion with respect to objectives of the study:

Sl.	Hypothesis
01	H₁: There is significant difference between Teachers of Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) Universities in their perception regarding QWL.

5. Methodology of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the degree of quality of work-life among the teachers of public universities in Bangladesh. Eleven public universities have been specifically chosen

at this point to improve the study's demographic coverage (Table-1). Krejcie, & Morgan, (1970) on their study "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities" proposed formula for finite population. They opined that 'If the target population is finite, the following formula may be used to determine the sample size.'

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP (1 - P)}{d^2 (N - 1) + X^2 P (1 - P)}$$

Where:

S = required sample size.

X^2 = the table value of chi-square @ 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level 0.05 (1.96×1.96) = 3.841.

N = the population size.

P = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (0.05).

According to Krejcie, & Morgan, the maximum sample size will be 186 for finite population. For better representation of the public universities in Bangladesh, the sample size rounded up to 200 among them 100 samples were collected from public (autonomous) universities and 100 samples were collected from public (government) universities of Bangladesh.

Table-1: Frequency Table of Sample Public Universities Teachers

Total Number of Sample Teachers in Public Universities					
Public University	Sl. No.	University	Population	Sample	Cumulative
Autonomous Universities	01	University of Dhaka	2188	40	40
	02	University of Chittagong	1311	24	64
	03	University of Rajshahi	1215	22	86
	04	Jahangirnagar University	755	14	100
		Total	5469	100	100
Government Universities	05	Islamic University, Bangladesh	410	19	19
	06	Shahjalal University of Science and Technology	552	26	45
	07	Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science & Technology University	287	13	58
	08	Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University	207	10	68
	09	Noakhali Science and Technology University	331	15	83
	10	Pabna University of Science and Technology	171	8	91

	11	University of Barisal	180	9	100
		Total	2138	100	100
Total Number of Sample Teachers in Public Universities					200

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

A review of the scientific literature served as the foundation for developing the study's questionnaire. To serve the perception of faculties on QWL, a 5-point Likert type scale was used.

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation

6.1 Reliability Statistics

132 statement-based questions were given to 200 respondents in order to assess the statistical reliability of the quality of work life at the public universities of Bangladesh. Table-2 displays the acquired results:

Table-2: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics				
Sl.	Factors of QWL	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Internal Consistency
01	Overall QWL	0.973	132	Excellent

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

Since the overall Cronbach's Alpha in this case is.973, higher than what Nunnally suggests, the data gathered for this study can be regarded as highly reliable.

6.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table-3: Descriptive Statistics of Public Universities

Report									
University	Designation		JC	WM	JS	OC	Emp	WS	WLB
Public (Autonomous)	Lecturer (N=38)	C	3.4737	2.9474	2.9474	4.4737	3.4737	4.0000	3.9474
		σ	.50601	1.01202	1.01202	.50601	.50601	.00000	1.0120
	Assistant Professor (N=20)	$\bar{x}$	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	3.0000	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000
		σ	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000
	Associate Professor (N=20)	$\bar{x}$	4.0000	4.0000	3.0000	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
		σ	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000
	Professor	$\bar{x}$	4.0000	4.0000	3.9545	3.0000	3.0455	3.0455	4.0000
		σ	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000	.00000

	(N=22)	σ	.00000	.00000	.21320	.00000	.21320	.21320	.00000
	Total	$\bar{x}$	3.8000	3.6000	3.3900	3.5600	3.3900	3.7900	3.9800
	(N=100)	σ	.40202	.80403	.80271	.78264	.49021	.40936	.61922
Public (Government)	Lecturer (N=33)	$\bar{x}$	3.5455	3.4545	3.0303	3.0000	3.3939	3.5455	3.5152
		σ	.50565	.50565	.58549	.61237	.74747	.50565	.50752
	Assistant Professor (N=30)	$\bar{x}$	3.9667	3.5000	2.5000	3.7000	3.3000	3.4000	3.3000
		σ	.71840	.82001	.57235	.46609	.59596	.49827	.53498
	Associate Professor (N=22)	$\bar{x}$	3.5455	3.5455	3.5909	3.8636	4.1818	3.6818	2.4091
		σ	.91168	.91168	.50324	.83355	.58849	.47673	.50324
	Professor (N=15)	$\bar{x}$	4.0667	4.0667	3.5333	4.5333	4.0667	3.5333	3.8667
		σ	.25820	.25820	.51640	.51640	.25820	.51640	.51640
	Total (N=100)	$\bar{x}$	3.7500	3.5800	3.0700	3.6300	3.6400	3.5300	3.2600
		σ	.68718	.71322	.70000	.79968	.71802	.50161	.70525

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

The Table-3 shows that Public (Government) university teachers possess 4 (four) high mean value. Among them Professors perceived highly regarding Job Characteristics ($\bar{x}$ =4.0667), Work Motivation ($\bar{x}$ =4.0667) and Organizational Commitment ($\bar{x}$ =4.5333) and Associate Professors focused highly on Empowerment ($\bar{x}$ =4.1818). The remaining three (3) factors of QWL have undertaken by the teachers of Public (Autonomous) universities. Assistant Professors perceived highly regarding Job Satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ =4.0000), as well as they have similar mean value regarding Work Stress (along with Lecturer and Associate Professor) and Work-Life Balance (along with Associate Professor and Professor).

6.3 Difference between Teachers of Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) Universities

The R Square values for Public (Autonomous) universities (86.8%) and Public (Government) universities (89.5%) are appropriate for elucidating the QWL of Public University Teachers in Bangladesh.

Table-4: Regression Analysis

Model Summary ^a						ANOVA ^a	
University	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
Public (Autonomous)	1	.924 ^b	.868	.847	.14774	103.381	.000
Public	1	.946 ^c	.895	.887	.16869	112.163	.000

(Government)							
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life							
b,c,d. Predictors: (Constant), JC, WM, JS, OC, EMP, WS, WLB							

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

ANOVA indicates that the model is significant at $\alpha=.000$. The overall model is reasonably fit and there is a statistically significant difference between Teachers of Public Universities in their perception regarding QWL.

Table-5: Regression Analysis of Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) Universities

Coefficients ^a							
University	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
Public (Autonomous)	1	(Constant)	-.376	.196		-2.706	.034
		JC	.851	.102	.360	-2.061	.001
		WM	-.716	.071	-.846	2.261	.026
		JS	.196	.052	.246	3.789	.000
		OC	.125	.039	.212	3.236	.001
		EMP	.517	.069	.669	7.485	.000
		WS	.357	.073	.389	6.271	.012
		WLB	.197	.035	.283	8.424	.000
Public (Government)	1	(Constant)	-.424	.177		-2.398	.018
		JC	-.621	.102	-.735	-6.061	.000
		WM	.160	.071	.191	2.261	.026
		JS	.013	.063	.015	.201	.841
		OC	.387	.041	.570	9.514	.000
		EMP	.432	.097	.409	3.485	.000
		WS	.379	.052	.346	7.271	.000
		WLB	.294	.035	.413	8.424	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life							

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

The regression table demonstrates that public (autonomous) universities are the most significant in every case, rejecting the null hypothesis. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis " H_1 : There is a statistically significant difference between Teachers of Public (Autonomous) Universities in their perception regarding QWL" is accepted. The regression model based on

the study is-

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \epsilon$$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + (1 - R^2)$$

So,

$$QWL = -.376 + 0.013(X_1) + 0.387(X_2) + 0.379(X_3) + 0.294(X_4) - 0.621(X_5) + 0.160(X_6) + 0.432(X_7) + 0.132$$

Public (Government) universities are also found to be very significant in six cases except Job Satisfaction (($\beta = .013$, $t = .201$, $p = .841$) thus the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis “ H_1 : There is a statistically significant difference between Teachers of Public (Government) Universities in their perception regarding QWL” is accepted. The regression model based on the study is-

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + \epsilon$$

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \beta_6 X_6 + \beta_7 X_7 + (1 - R^2)$$

$$\text{So, } QWL = .808 - 0.017(X_1) + 0.069(X_2) + 0.196(X_3) + 0.125(X_4) + 0.048(X_5) - 0.073(X_6) + 0.266(X_7) + 0.105$$

7. Findings of the Study

7.1 Rank Order of QWL across Universities

This study finds that among the seven factors of QWL, teachers across the universities prioritized “Work Stress” (Rank-1) high in determining the QWL showing a significant association and is supported by the study of Mancing (1991). And the other common thing across the universities that the teachers have least priority over “Work Motivation” (Rank-7) in determining the QWL showing a significant association and is supported by the study of Siddiqi & Tangem (2018). The remaining rank orders across the universities in determining QWL has been observed in the Table-6.

Table-6: Rank Order of QWL across Universities

University	Public (Autonomous)		Public (Government)		Overall	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Job Characteristics	5	3.4553	4	3.5172	6	3.3132
Work Motivation	7	3.2878	7	3.2936	7	3.0571
Job Satisfaction	3	3.8447	6	3.3767	3	3.4264
Organizational Commitment	4	3.4967	2	3.6800	4	3.3225
Empowerment	6	3.3510	3	3.6065	5	3.3138

Work Stress	1	3.9961	1	3.6928	1	3.7199
Work Life Balance	2	3.9933	5	3.3829	2	3.4465

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

7.2 Rank Order of QWL Satisfier and Dissatisfiers Variables

Table-7 provides a rank order of QWL (Satisfiers) variables from high mean value to low extracted from the seven factors of QWL across the public universities teachers of Bangladesh. The most important factor that the teachers perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-1) to “Time for Family” ($\bar{x}=4.3167$) from the factor Work-Life Balance indicates a balance between personal and professional life. Following that the teachers perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-2) to “Affective Commitment” ($\bar{x}=4.0800$) from the factor Organizational Commitment indicates the emotional attachment and involvement with their university. Teachers prioritized “Work from Home” ($\bar{x}=4.0700$) from the factor Work Stress in their perception regarding QWL (Rank-3) as they have to engage themselves with academic and research work at home beyond their official working hours. In this relation the teachers across the universities prioritized “Research Work” ($\bar{x}=4.0533$) from the factor Job Satisfaction in their perception regarding QWL (Rank-4) depends on their passion, research grants, and publication in quality (indexed) journals. Following that the teachers perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-5) to “Compensation and Benefits” ($\bar{x}=3.9450$) from the factor Work Motivation indicates their policy regarding adequate and fair compensation. Teachers comparatively provide less priority over “Task Significance” ($\bar{x}=3.6900$) from the factor Job Characteristics in their perception regarding QWL (Rank-6) as they have little concern about how their job affects other people. Finally, the teachers perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-7) to “Change Agent” ($\bar{x}=3.6350$) from the factor Empowerment as they are always aware of doing things in new and better ways.

Table-7: Rank Order of QWL Satisfier and Dissatisfiers Variables

Rank	QWL (Satisfier) Variables	Mean	QWL (Dissatisfiers) Variables	Mean
1	Time for Family (WLB)	4.3167	Recognition (WM)	2.8450
2	Affective Commitment (OC)	4.0800	Feedback from Job (JC)	3.0767
3	Work from Home (WS)	4.0700	Continuance Commitment (OC)	3.3200
4	Research Work (JS)	4.0533	Leadership Explorer (EMP)	3.5780
5	Compensation and Benefits (WM)	3.9450	Academic Work (JS)	3.6360
6	Task Significance (JC)	3.6900	Time for Society (WLB)	3.6700
7	Change Agent (EMP)	3.6350	Quality of Students (WS)	3.9033

Source: Field Survey and Ananlysis, 2023

Table-7 also provides a rank order of QWL (Dissatisfiers) variables from low mean value to high extracted from the seven factors of QWL across the public universities teachers of Bangladesh. The least important factor that the teachers perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-1) to “Recognition” ($\bar{x}$ =2.8450) from the factor Work Motivation as there is no suitable framework regarding this across the universities. Following that the teachers perceive less regarding their QWL (Rank-2) to “Feedback from Job” ($\bar{x}$ =3.0767) from the factor Job Characteristics indicates the authority do not provide feedback timely nor any clues to perform adequately. This negatively affects the teachers’ “Continuance Commitment” ($\bar{x}$ =3.3200) (Rank-3) from the factor Organizational Commitment in perception regarding their QWL because they wished to remain with their university. Following that the teachers moderately perceive regarding their QWL (Rank-4) to “Leadership Explorer” ($\bar{x}$ =3.5780) from the factor Empowerment indicates the teachers wanted to be valued by any means. Teachers across the universities somewhat perceived their dissatisfaction to “Academic Work” ($\bar{x}$ =3.6360) regarding their QWL (Rank-5) from the factor Job Satisfaction indicates the inadequacy of supportive materials to perform their job effectively. Teachers across the universities perceived some sort of dissatisfaction over their work-life balance perception regarding their QWL (Rank-6) is “Time for Society” ($\bar{x}$ =3.6700). Finally, the teachers have a little dissatisfaction over their perception regarding QWL (Rank-7) “Quality of Students” ($\bar{x}$ =3.9033) from the factor Work Stress because their expectations from the students does not fulfill all the time.

Finally to test the hypotheses of the study, regression weights along with other statistical analysis were estimated (Hypotheses-1) and found the test was statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$) and accepted the alternative hypotheses.

8. Conclusion

According to Kaur (2016), QWL in the education sector is the relationship that exists between university faculty and their work environment. The correlations between QWL and factors such job characteristics, work motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, empowerment, work stress, and work-life balance were the main focus of this study, which looked only at QWL in public universities of Bangladesh. Nevertheless, this study also looked into the QWL of the teacher using demographic factors as gender, age, title, level of education, work experience, and income. This study is also assessed the leading QWL (satisfier) variables named as: time for family, affective commitment, work from home, research work, compensation and benefits, task significance, change agent and QWL (dissatisfier) variables named as: quality of students, time for society, academic work, leadership explorer, continuance commitment, feedback from job, and recognition have been identified as major determinants of QWL for the teachers working in Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) Universities of Bangladesh.

To measure the association between the variables of the study only 1 hypothesis was tested and the hypothesis was accepted. Finally, by comparing the mean statistics this study

confirms that out of seven factors of QWL Public (Government) university teachers possess four cases with high to low mean value namely Organizational Commitment ($\bar{x}$ =3.6300), Empowerment ($\bar{x}$ =3.6065), Job Characteristics ($\bar{x}$ =3.5172) and Work Motivation ($\bar{x}$ =3.2936). The remaining three factors confirmed by Public (Autonomous) university teachers namely Work Stress ($\bar{x}$ =3.9900), Work-Life Balance ($\bar{x}$ =3.9900) and Job Satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ =3.8477).

9. Recommendations

- Among the teachers of Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) of Bangladesh most of the teachers pointed about the quality of students, which is a major source of teachers' work stress. Implementing effective coping strategies and providing support can help teachers manage the stress associated with change. A heavy teaching load can contribute to increased work stress, especially when teachers lack the necessary support, resources, and control counted as another major source of stress. But some teachers have no objection regarding working hours and have minimal effect on work stress. Based on the findings, both Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) administrations and relevant authorities should collaborate to develop comprehensive strategies aimed at reducing work stress, improving QWL, and ensuring the overall well-being of university teachers.
- University teachers play a pivotal role in shaping the future through education and research, but this noble endeavor often comes at the cost of their own work-life balance. The pressures of publishing research, preparing lectures, and engaging in administrative tasks can lead to burnout and reduced job satisfaction. There are a multiple options to balance between work-life and quality of work life such as: balancing work commitments with meaningful interactions and shared experiences with family members contributes to a fulfilling and satisfying life. By dedicating time to self-care, personal growth, and meaningful activities, individuals can lead more fulfilling lives, improve their mental and emotional health, and enhance their capacity to thrive in both their personal and professional spheres. Engaging with the community, contributing to social causes, and connecting with diverse groups of people can enrich an individual's personal growth, emotional well-being, and sense of purpose.
- Since personal and professional achievements play an important role in the growth and performance of universities, ensuring a high level of QWL would benefit the university in the long run. Fair allocation of opportunities, resources, and rewards through fair policies and procedures could lead to better QWL for universities in Bangladesh.
- The government should intervene and make more stringent legislation to safeguard the interests of the teachers of universities in Bangladesh. Universities, along with UGC and IQAC, should play a mediating role in enhancing QWL side by side with what they do to improve the teaching, learning, and research quality of both Public (Autonomous) and Public (Government) universities in Bangladesh.

- The public universities of Bangladesh should provide a work atmosphere that guarantees both psychological and physical safety. To improve their employees' dedication to and engagement at work, they need to come up with novel and creative ways to train their employees.

References

- Arts, S. E., Kerkstra, A., van der Zee, J., & Abu-Saad, H. H. (2001). Quality of working life and workload in home help services: A review of the literature a proposal for a research model. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 15(1), 12-24.
- Bagtasos, M. R. (2011). Quality of Work Life: A Review of Literature. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, 20(2).
- Basak, S. K., & Govender, D. W. (2015). Theoretical Framework Of The Factors Affecting University Academics Job Satisfaction. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 14(2), 317-326.
- Boas, A. A. V., & Morin, E. M. (2013). Quality of working life in public higher education institutions: the perception of Brazilian and Canadian professors. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(12).
- Bolin, F. S. (1989). Empowering Leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 91(1), 81-96.
- Chisholm, R. F. (1983). Quality of working life: critical issue for the 80s. *Public Productivity Review*, 10-25.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Frye, N. K., & Breugh, J. A. (2004). Family-friendly policies, supervisor support, work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and satisfaction: A test of a conceptual model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(2), 197-220.
- Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M. H. W. A., Winefield, A. H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & stress*, 15(1), 53-72.
- Glazer, S., & Kruse, B. (2008). The role of organizational commitment in occupational stress models. *International Journal of stress management*, 15(4), 329.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of management review*, 10(1), 76-88.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1974). The Job Diagnostic Survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects.
- Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of work life and human resource outcomes. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 30(3), 469-479.

- Kaur, K. (2016). Impact of quality of work life on overall job satisfaction level and motivational level: a study of government universities in Punjab. *Pacific Business Review International*, 8(8), 125-140.
- Khalid, S., Irshad, M. Z., & Mahmood, B. (2012). Job satisfaction among academic staff: A comparative analysis between public and private sector universities of Punjab, Pakistan. *International journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 126.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Lau, R. S. M., & May, B. E. (1998). A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3), 211-226.
- Lawler, E. E. (1982). Strategies for improving the quality of work life. *American psychologist*, 37(5), 486.
- Lee, W. R. (1991). Empowering music teachers: A catalyst for change. *Music Educators Journal*, 78(1), 36-39.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness in schools: Themes of empowerment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 63(3), 9-28.
- Machado-Taylor, M. D. L., Soares, V. M., Ferreira, J. B., & Gouveia, O. M. R. (2011). What factors of satisfaction and motivation are affecting the development of the academic career in Portuguese higher education institutions?. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 45(1), 33-44.
- Malik, N. A. A., Björkqvist, K., & Österman, K. (2017). Factors associated with occupational stress among university teachers in Pakistan and Finland. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 6(2), 1-14.
- Mannan, A. (2009). Higher Education in the 21st. century Bangladesh. *Retrieved July, 1, 2011*.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Lawler III, E. E. (1984). Accounting for the quality of work life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 5(3), 197-212.
- Nadler, D. A., & Lawler III, E. E. (1983). Quality of work life: perspectives and directions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11(3), 20-30.
- Parveen, S., & Tariq, A. (2014). Leadership style, gender and job satisfaction: a situational leadership approach. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 3(12), 1-6.
- Poulin, J. E. (1994). Job task and organizational predictors of social worker job satisfaction change: A panel study. *Administration in Social Work*, 18(1), 21-38.
- Rahman, M. H., & Nurullah, S. M. (2014). A comparative study of motivating potential score of employees of public and private commercial Banks: An assessment of demographics influence. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 14(4), 1-13.
- Ramawickrama, J., Opatha, H. H. D. N. P., & Pushpa Kumari, M. D. (2017). Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction, and the Facets of the Relationship between the Two Constructs. *International Business Research*, 10(4), 167.

- Rana, M. M., Islam, M. R., & Ali, M. J. (2018). Job Satisfaction among Female Teachers in Rangpur, Bangladesh. *Global Journal of Management And Business Research*.
- Sadique, Z. (2001). A study of quality of work life in sugar industry in Bangladesh (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Bengal).
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology, 78*(5), 774.
- Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment within the school environment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*(4), 951-960.
- Siddiqi, T., & Tangem, S. (2018). Impact Of Work Environment, Compensation And Motivation On The Performance Of Employees In The Insurance Companies Of Bangladesh. *South East Asia Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law, 15*(5), 153-162.
- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N. P., Wu, J., & Efraty, D. (2008). A work-life identity model of well-being: Towards a research agenda linking quality-of-work-life (QWL) programs with quality of life (QOL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 3*(3), 181-202.
- Tabassum, A. (2012). Interrelations between quality of work life dimensions and faculty member job satisfaction in the Private Universities of Bangladesh. *European journal of business and management, 4*(2), 78-89.
- UGC (2020) List of Universities, [Retrieved from: <http://www.ugc.gov.bd/en>]
- Whyte, W. H. (2013). *The organization man*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Zaman, S., Mahmud, A. L., & Jahan, A. (2014). Job satisfaction of university teachers a study on private universities in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management, 6*(31), 138-14.
- Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. C. (2005). Modeling teacher empowerment: The role of job satisfaction. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 11*(5), 433-459.

