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Abstract

Background: This study was aimed to investigate the various dimensions of quality of work life of higher educational teachers working in engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA, Anantapur. And the relationship among six-dimensional Quality of work life with job satisfaction, organizational commitments and turnover intention.

Methods: A cross-sectional survey was used in this study. Data were collected using Brooks’ Quality of Work Life, the Anticipated Turnover Scale and demographic data questions. A total of 500 faculty working in private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur in Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh is selected base on stratified random sampling method is adopted. Descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, correlation and multiple regression were applied for analysis using SPSS v 21 for Windows.

Results: The findings suggest the importance of overall Quality of work life of engineering teachers in enhancing their commitment and retention. The present study concludes that employees’ perceptions on the relationship among Quality of work life, organizational commitment and turnover intention will improve, if organization approaches its employees’ management activities from the perspective of cultivating Quality of work life that should be reflected in the formal organizational policy and procedures.
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1.INTRODUCTION

Since the early eighties, due to rapid industrialization and economic growth, engineering and technical education in India have been developing faster than anywhere else in the world, and India now has the second largest number of engineering students in the world. Recent Indian scientific, industrial and technological development, particularly in space, nuclear and missile technology, computer engineering and information science has achieved a lot. Since technical education determines the development and socioeconomic condition of a nation, there is a greater need for high quality technical education to produce technically skilled manpower in India. The basic components of a technical institute are the students, the infrastructure, the teachers, the curriculum, the teaching and learning aids, the linkage mechanism with industry-institute and other user system, the management system, the support services system, the guidance and counselling, the internal and external evaluation system, the feedback system, etc. There are other important components which are called the process components. They are, way of teaching, the way the students learning, students activities beyond the regular time table, the motivation of both faculty and students, attitude of the management, the overall academic climate, the opportunities and encouragement for innovations and creativity, research and development, the openness of communications, the leadership qualities of head of institutions and of departments, the sense of involvement in providing quality services, the organization structure, the quality of team work, the reward and recognition system, the faculty development programme, the appraisal system, the clarity in the vision and objectives of the organization.

Today engineering colleges must not only provide their graduates with the intellectual development and superb technical capabilities but following industry’s lead, colleges must educate their students to work as part of teams, communicate well, and understand the economic, social, environmental and international context of their professional activities. These changes are vital to the nation’s industrial strength and to the ability of engineers to serve as technology and policy decision makers.

2.CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND TURNOVER

Quality of Work Life bears different meanings based on different interpretations and practices. The American Society of Training and Development established a task force on the QWL in 1979 and the task force defined QWL as “a process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to actively participate in shaping...
the organization’s environment, methods and outcomes. This value-based process is aimed towards meeting the twin goals of enhanced effectiveness of organization and improved quality of life at work for employees”.

Nadler and Lawler[4] have shown that the definition of QWL has undergone a progression of change overtime. QWL which was conceived as a ‘variable’ during the period 1969-1972, it became ‘an approach’ during 1969-75, and came to be regarded as ‘methods’ during 1972-1975. During 1975-1980, it became a ‘movement’; and during the period from 1979-1982, it became an umbrella concept embracing everything relating to men at work.

QWL, as a variable, signifies an individual’s reaction to work or the personal consequences of the work experience. It focused on such individual outcomes as job satisfaction or mental health, with an emphasis on the impact of the work on the individual. As an approach QWL focused on the individual rather than organizational outcomes, but the emphasis seemed to be on the joint labour- management co-operative projects, particularly those aimed at improving outcomes for both the individual and the organisation.

QWL is seen as a set of the methods, approaches or technologies for enhancing the work environment and making it more productive and more satisfying. Here, the QWL is more synonymous with such concepts as autonomous work groups, job enrichment, on the design of new plants as integrated social and technical systems.

3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Elizur & Samuel [2] conducted from study on a sample of Hungarian workers based on the hypothesis that the structure of the total universe of quality of work life and quality of life is conical. Quality of life occupies the base of the cone and quality of work life the top. Satisfaction with life and work were found to be located between the two and the hypothesis was proved to be true in the study. The major objective was to suggest a comprehensive definitional framework for the quality of work life concept and to empirically test its structure. A definition of quality of work life and its relation to quality of life in general based on action systemic concepts was proposed in the study which provides guidelines for the selection of items and the formulation of hypotheses about the structure of interrelationships among components of quality of work life. The findings reflect two facets of the definition of quality of work life. The first is the mode of functioning i.e. expressive, integrative, adaptive and conservative; and the second one reflects its field of functioning i.e. psychological, physical, social and cultural.

Serey[3] expanded the definition of quality of work life by including variables like “opportunity to exercise one’s talents and capacities, to face challenges and situations that require independent initiative and self-direction; (ii) an activity thought to be worthwhile by the individuals involved; (iii) an activity in which one understands the role the individual plays in the achievement of some overall goals; and (iv) a sense of taking pride in what one is doing and in doing it well.” Even in case of any one dimension missing in the above four, the quality of work life of the employees is considered to be incomplete.

Sirgy, et al[4] in their handbook suggested to balance between the rights and responsibilities of the employees they have towards the organization. Employees often face role dilemmas between their ethical obligations towards the organization and between their non- work roles. Some degree of autonomy must be allowed to them so that they can enter into collaborative goals and build an environment based on employer- employee mutual trust which they repose in each other. The role and responsibility based conflicting situations faced by employees fall in three categories in work organizations i.e. individual, organizational (internal policies and procedures), and cultural (social forces external to the organization). The organizations must try to address these role conflicts so that employees can have a better work environment. The authors in the handbook suggest the definition of employee well-being which means that employees are being engaged in meaningful work. This provides the employees with a sense of purpose and pride and their self-esteem enhances.

Jain (1991) [5] studied the effect of quality of work life on group behavior in the organization; hypothesizing that group behavior is influenced by quality of work life suggested that quality of work life is not a single or specific notion. Rather, its umbrella encompasses several concepts like: industrial effectiveness, development of human resource, organizational effectiveness, work restructing, job restructure working humanization, group work concept, labour-management cooperation, working together, workers’ involvement, and workers’ participation.

Krishnamurthy [6] defined quality of the work life on the basis of research conducted on human resources management which reveals that the best service which a human resource function can do is to make the employees feel that they are working in the right place, doing the right work and getting paid justly as long as the employee remains in service. He pointed out a few norms for employee compensation such as annual pay and perquisites, grade or positional based remuneration, remuneration based on number of years’ service, rewarding performance with increments has a permanent impact on quality of work life.

Gordon[7] in this research proved that implementation of quality of working life program leads to the reduction of job complaints and absenteeism in the organizations as it helps in improving the attitude of the employees; draws more and more participation of the employees in organizational decision making, and enhances the job satisfaction of the employees.

Cascio [8] suggested certain common indicators of quality of work life i.e. ‘salaries and benefits, health care, utilities, insurance and pensions and that surely these factors make up part of the quality of work life. Quality of work life includes giving employees the opportunity to take decisions of at least the areas concerning them’. The new economic environment invites innovation, flexibility, flat organizational structures and the freedom to do continuous experimentation with fresh ideas. The study suggests two ways of discerning quality of work life. One is focused upon objective organizational conditions and practices like promotion from within, democratic supervision, involvement of employees and safe working conditions. The other way is related to the degree to which employees’ needs are met i.e. the perception of employees that they
are safe and contended, they are involved in decision making process and they have justified work life balance.

Warr [9] investigated the quality of working life and considered a range of apparently relevant factors, including-Work involvement, Intrinsic job motivation, Higher order needs strength, perceived intrinsic job characteristics, Job satisfaction, Life satisfaction, Happiness, and Self rated anxiety. They discussed a range of correlations derived from their work, such as those between work involvement and job satisfaction, intrinsic job motivation and job Satisfaction, and perceived intrinsic job characteristics and job satisfaction. In particular, 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.

Mohiadden & Hussein [10] quality of work life (QWL) is not only one of the most important domains in peoples’ lives, but also affects and shapes many of the components of the general/total quality of life (wellness) of organizational members, as well as other peoples at the community, national, regional and even global levels. There has been ample research studying QWL, but very little attempts have been made to link QWL with general wellness/well-being. As peoples everywhere suffer from the many unfortunate and sad crises and outcomes brought by organizations, QWL deserves more intensive and indepth research, especially examining QWL linkage with whole well-being. This paper attempts to provide a framework of guidelines to help organizations create and develop high QWL that can enhance and promote the welfare, goodness and total wellness, not only of organizational members, but also all other stakeholders and the broader societies at community, national and global levels. Thus, developing and nurturing among organizational members not only good organizational citizenship behavior, but also good national and even global citizenship behavior.

Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy [11] a high quality of work life is essential for organizations to continue to attract and retain employees. QWL is a process in which organizations recognize their responsibility to develop job and working conditions that are excellent for the employee and organization. An effective leader influences the followers in a desired manner to achieve goals. It is evident from the literature different leadership styles may affect organization effectiveness and performance. The interventions of QWL will effectively utilize the employee potentials by ensuring great participation and involvement of workers. This paper focuses and analyses the literature findings which involves QWL and Leadership styles.

Yukthamarani et al. [12] examined the relationship between the quality of work life (QWL), employees’ job involvement and affective commitment among the employees of the public and private sector organizations in Malaysia. A total of 334 middle management level employees were selected to participate in this study. QWL was measured with five dimensions which are „fair and appropriate salary‟, „working conditions‟, „capacities at work‟, „opportunities at work‟ and „organization climate‟. The intervening and dependent variables are job involvement and affective commitment respectively. The results indicated that working conditions, opportunities at work and climate organization had a relatively higher impact on „job involvement‟ and „affective commitment‟. Findings of this study contributed to the knowledge and understanding of the effect of the selected factors, which leads to better understanding among the practice for both public and private organizations in Malaysia towards attainment of a superior level of efficiency to thrive in an ever-competitive business world.

Khalid & Balaji [13] quality of Work Life (QWL) of employees in any organization plays a very vital role in shaping of both the employees and the organization. The objective of this research is to highlight the prominence of training and development programmes adopted in manufacturing industries encompassing the private and public sectors and the impact that it exerts on the quality of work life of employees in these sectors. It is assumed that employees who undergo T & D programme either in private or public sectors enjoy better QWL. Here a comparative study among the employees of private and public manufacturing industries is carried out to measure the QWL of employees in these respective sectors. Hence the research concludes that the QWL enjoyed by the employees of private industries is superior to the QWL of employees of public industries.

Surya Kumar & Shani [14,15] the paper aims to measure and identify the quality of work life among the employees at Metro Engineering. The empirical base is formed by survey among the employees by taking a sample size of 120. The factors include personal data, Information about the job, organizational work life, job vs. personal life.

4.Statement of The Problem

Since the early eighties, due to rapid industrialization and economic growth, engineering and technical education in India have been developing faster than anywhere else in the world, and India now has the second largest number of engineering students in the world. Recent Indian scientific, industrial and technological development, particularly in space, nuclear and missile technology, computer engineering and information science has achieved a lot. Since technical education determines the development and socioeconomic condition of a nation, there is a greater need for high quality technical education to produce technically skilled manpower in India. The basic components of a technical institute are the students, the infrastructure, the teachers, the curriculum, the teaching and learning aids, the linkage mechanism with industry-institute and other user system, the management system, the support services system, the guidance and counselling, the internal and external evaluation system, the feedback system, etc. There are other important components which are called the process components. They are, way of teaching, the way the students learning, students activities beyond the regular time table, the motivation of both faculty and students, attitude of the management, the overall academic climate, the opportunities and encouragement for innovations and creativity, research and development, the openness of communications, the leadership qualities of head of institutions and of departments, the sense of involvement in providing quality services, the organization structure, the quality of team work, the reward and recognition...
system, the faculty development programme, the appraisal system, the clarity in the vision and objectives of the organization.

Today engineering colleges must not only provide their graduates with the intellectual development and superb technical capabilities but following industry’s lead, colleges must educate their students to work as part of teams, communicate well, and understand the economic, social, environmental and international context of their professional activities. These changes are vital to the nation’s industrial strength and to the ability of engineers to serve as technology and policy decision makers.

5. Need and Importance of the Study
This is a period of social transformation. Transformation has taken place everywhere—from economies based on different transportation to the dependence on networks and computers. Now-a-days creation of wealth purely depends upon application of new knowledge. This era is an era of knowledge. Knowledge can be created, absorbed and applied only by well-educated minds. Core competencies required for college teachers to bring in knowledge, to face the competitive global environment are; Professional competencies, Knowledge of information access, Personal and Career Development, Self-motivation, Willingness to adapt and accept change and Leadership etc.,

Students who pursue higher education require few competencies like effective communication, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking and technology skills. Hence, it is very clear that competency identification, development, evaluation and feedback are important to the student community and it becomes important for the teachers to facilitate the same.

Higher educational institutions play vital role in evolving technical knowledge in the fast-moving global environment through their faculty members. They play a significant role and contribute to transmission of knowledge. Higher educational institutions give autonomy to the institutions in selecting their staff, which determine curriculum and degree standards, and in turn are also made accountable to the system. The main focus of higher education is ensuring quality in teaching learning process. There are various factors which contribute to quality in higher education. The most important factor is the process of teaching and teacher characteristics and their QWL. Since teachers directly interact with the students, all factors which enhance the quality are transformed through teachers to the students. Teachers have high potential for enhancing the quality of education and in educational process they play a vital role. The effectiveness of teaching thus lies in both the internal and external factors that affect their quality of performance and these factors distinguish effective teachers from others.

The concept of QWL has been implemented in public and private organizations to facilitate their effective functioning, but in the educational field, QWL is still an unfamiliar concept. QWL is a useful term to describe voluntary teacher behavior that goes “an extra mile” to help students and colleagues to succeed.

To sustain and progress in competitive environment, skills and competencies of teachers are upgraded and attuned to specific needs. Therefore, it becomes necessary to pay attention to the ‘Teacher’s excellence’ in terms of performance of the institutional as well as on the individual level.

QWL of teachers ultimately gained momentum, and has become both ‘means and ends. It is end as it is the key of all development. Simultaneously it is the means also which involves decision making, participation, autonomy, creativity and innovativeness and thus improving productivity and overall performance like skills and competencies of teachers. Thus, the study of QWL of teachers has become vital so as to motivate them to work, going beyond their formal role, requirements and making the climate of colleges more human centred.

6. Objectives of the Study
- To study the perception of teachers towards the state of Quality of Work Life prevalent in engineering institutions
- To know various of dimensions of Quality of Work Life of Teachers of Higher Education
- To examine the relationship between Quality of Work Life and Turner Relation.

Hypothesis of the study
H01: There is no significant relationship between perceived overall Quality of work life and dimensions of quality of work life.
H02: Perceived degree of quality of work life will not have an inverse relationship with the turnover intention of teachers.

Research Method and Design
A quantitative cross-sectional survey-based on research design was used in this study.

7.1 Unit of analysis
The unit of analysis in this study was the teachers working in private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur in Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh.

7.2 Sampling design
The sample design of the present study comprises of the following elements:

- **a) Area of study**
  Private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur in Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh

- **b) Population for the study**
  The study population from which the sample was drawn consists of 116 engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur.

- **c) Sampling frame**
  The sampling for the study was drawn from the academic departments of selected engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA, Anantapur.

- **d) Sampling unit**
  The population targeted in this study included full time teachers bearing the designations of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor from the selected engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA, Anantapur.

- **e) Selection of sample colleges**
  Selection of sample colleges for the study based on Multi-Stage Sampling Method.
In this study, the coefficient alpha analysis is performed on each scale. The coefficient alpha values are shown in the table no 2.

Research variables

The independent variable was quality of work life and dependent variable is turnover intention.

Data analysis

The data collected is edited, codified and classified and transformed into a meaningful and usable format to conduct the statistical analysis. The SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 23) programs were used to analyse the data.

Tools of Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

- Frequency
- Percentage
- Mean
- Standard Deviation

Inferential Statistics

- Reliability Analysis
- Chi-Square
- One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests
- t-test

Criteria for inclusion of colleges in the study:

- Two colleges from each district of Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh
- More than 10 years old colleges
- Either accredited by NBA or NAAC
- Having autonomous status

f) Selection of the sample size

As the population targeted in this study included full time teachers working in private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur in Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh, the population is a finite population. There are approximately 2,953 full time faculty members who are working in the selected in private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur. The proposed sample size for the study has been estimated on the basis of the following formula developed by Taro Yamane (Yamane, 1973):

\[ n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \]

Sample Required: 352
Sample taken: 500

Sampling Technique

For the purpose of selecting the sample of faculty working in private engineering colleges affiliated to JNTUA Anantapur in Rayalaseema region and Nellore district of Andhra Pradesh is selected base on stratified random sampling method is adopted.

Sources of Data

The main sources of data for the present research consists of both primary and secondary sources. The primary data is collected with the help of administration of well-structured questionnaire. The secondary sources of data are journals, books, articles, reports, records and through internet sources.

Data collecting procedure

The data used for the present study is primary in nature. The primary data was collected through the field survey. Survey instrument

The respondents were administered from structured questionnaire.

Reliability and Validity of Instrument

In this study, the coefficient alpha analysis is performed on each scale. The coefficient alpha values are shown in the table no 2.

Analysis and Discussion

From the above table 3 it is found that the sample unit comprises of 71.4% of male faculties and 28.6% of female faculties working in self-financing engineering colleges. It is concluded that the considerable percentage of male and female reflect the quality of work life.

Age of the faculties

From the above table 4, it is found that out of total samples, 42% of faculties are below 30 years age, 29.8 percent of faculties are between the age group of 31-40 years, 25.8 percent of faculties are between the age group of 41-50 years and 2.4 percent of faculties are above 50 years of age. It is concluded that in the sample unit, the maximum representation is found in the below 30 years of age group.

It is found that the sample unit comprises of 76.8% of married respondents and 23.2% of respondents are unmarried.

The above table explains that 58.4% are working as assistant professors, 27.2% work as associate professors, 14.4% contribute their services as professors. The perception of the respondents will vary and will have direct or indirect effect on quality of work life.

Educational qualification

From the table it is found that 68% of faculties are postgraduates and 32% are Doctorates.

Teaching Experience in Years

The teaching experience of the respondents in the institution is requested them to indicate their tenure in terms of years. About 46.7% of the participants’ tenure in the specific institution is less than 5 years (N=168), 31.7% (N = 114) of them have 6 to 10 years’ experience, whereas 21.7% of them have more than 10 years of experience (N = 78).

The total teaching experience of the respondents is collected from them in terms of years. About 31.8 % of the participants’ tenure is less than 5 years (N=159), 33.2% (N = 166) of them have 6 to 10 years’ experience, whereas 35% of them have more than 10 years of experience (N = 175).

The research experience of the respondents is collected from them in terms of years. About 20.6 % of the participants' research experience is less than 5 years (N=52), 7.2 % (N = 36) of them have 6 to 10 years' experience, whereas 2% of them have more than 10 years of experience (N = 5) and majority of 70.22 % (N=285) of them have no research experience.

Nature of Appointment

Of the 500 respondents, 93.6 % were the full-time employees (N = 468) and 6.4 % were part-time employees (N =32).

In the table number 12 shows, descriptive statistics for various quality of work life dimensions and the it is found that all mean score from 3.91 to 4.04 which is under the strongly agree category. The overall quality of work life mean value is 4.45(S. D=1.33) shows under strongly agree
The statistical data presented in the table number 13 concern the Turnover Intention among teachers working in higher educational institutions. It is seemed that all quality of work life and turnover intention. From the results it is inferred that quality of work life has inverse relationship with turnover intention.

**Table 1 Scale development**

| S.No | Scale                              | Number of items | Reference                                      |
|------|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Demographic details               | 15              | Self-prepared                                  |
| 2    | Perceived Quality of Work Life    | 36              | Almaghrabi (2007)                              |
| 3    | Turnover Intention               | 3               | Modified Scale Adopted from Mobley, Horner; Hollingsworth (1978) |

**Table 2 Reliability of instruments**

| S.No | Scale                              | Number of items | Reliability- Cronbach Alpha (α) |
|------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 1    | Perceived Quality of Work Life     | 36              | Composite Reliability-.852      |
| 1.1  | Work Moral Environment             | 6               | .821                            |
| 1.2  | Job Characteristics                | 6               | .793                            |
| 1.3  | Wages and Remuneration             | 6               | .681                            |
| 1.4  | Work Group Factors                | 6               | .684                            |
| 1.5  | Supervision Style Factors          | 6               | .763                            |
| 1.6  | Decision Making Factors            | 6               | .781                            |
| 2    | Turnover Intention                | 3               | .784                            |

**Table 3 Gender of the Respondent**

| Gender of the Respondent | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Male               | 357       | 71.4    | 71.4          | 71.4               |
| Female                   | 143       | 28.6    | 28.6          | 100.0              |
| Total                    | 500       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Table 4 Age of the Respondent**

| Age of the Respondent | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Below 30 years  | 210       | 42.0    | 42.0          | 42.0               |
| 31 to 40 years        | 149       | 29.8    | 29.8          | 71.8               |
| 41 to 50 years        | 129       | 25.8    | 25.8          | 97.6               |
| Above 50 years        | 12        | 2.4     | 2.4           | 100.0              |
| Total                 | 500       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

**Table 5 Marital Status of the Respondents**

| Marital Status of the Respondents | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Married                      | 384       | 76.8    | 76.8          | 76.8               |
| Unmarried                         | 116       | 23.2    | 23.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                             | 500       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
Table 6 Designation of the Respondents

| Designation of the Respondents | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Assistant Professor     | 292       | 58.4    | 58.4          | 58.4               |
| Associate Professor           | 136       | 27.2    | 27.2          | 85.6               |
| Professor                     | 72        | 14.4    | 14.4          | 100.0              |
| Total                         | 500       | 100.0   |               | 100.0              |

Table 7 Education Qualification of the Respondent

| Education Qualification of the Respondent | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid PG Degree                           | 340       | 68.0    | 68.0          | 68.0               |
| Doctorate Degree                          | 160       | 32.0    | 32.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                                     | 500       | 100.0   |               | 100.0              |

Table 8 Teaching Experience in Years

| Teaching Experience in Years | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 5 years      | 168       | 33.6    | 33.6          | 33.6               |
| 6 to 10 years                | 177       | 35.4    | 35.4          | 69.0               |
| More than 10 years           | 155       | 31.0    | 31.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                        | 500       | 100.0   |               | 100.0              |

Table 9 Total Work Experience in Years

| Total Work Experience in Years | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 5 years        | 159       | 31.8    | 31.8          | 31.8               |
| 6 to 10 years                  | 166       | 33.2    | 33.2          | 65.0               |
| More than 10 years             | 175       | 35.0    | 35.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 500       | 100.0   |               | 100.0              |

Table 10 Research Experience in Years

| Research Experience in Years   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 5 years        | 103       | 20.6    | 20.6          | 20.6               |
| 6 to 10 years                  | 36        | 7.2     | 7.2           | 27.8               |
| More than 10 years             | 10        | 2.0     | 2.0           | 29.8               |
| No research experience         | 351       | 70.2    | 70.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 500       | 100.0   |               | 100.0              |
Table 11 Nature of Appointment

| Appointment    | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Full Time| 468       | 93.6    | 93.6          | 93.6               |
| Part Time      | 32        | 6.4     | 6.4           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 500       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Of the 500 respondents, 93.6% were full-time employees (N = 468) and 6.4% were part-time employees (N = 32).

Table 12 descriptive statistics of quality of work life

| S. No. | Factor Name                      | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--------|----------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| 1      | Work Group                       | 4.0120| 1.36953        |
| 2      | Wages and Remuneration           | 3.9700| 1.36998        |
| 3      | Work Moral Environment           | 3.9160| 1.39457        |
| 4      | Job Characteristics              | 4.0460| 1.33846        |
| 5      | Decision Making Factors          | 4.0000| 1.37250        |
| 6      | Supervision Style                | 3.9380| 1.37766        |
| 7      | Overall Quality of work life     | 4.4500| 1.33250        |

Note: Mean Value = 1.00 to 2.50 Disagree, 2.51 to 3.50 Moderately agree and 3.51 to 5.00 strongly Agree

Table 13 Descriptive Statistics- Turnover Intention

| Descriptive Statistics          | N       | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| I often think about quitting his/her present job. | 500     | 1.00    | 5.00    | 1.3760 | .85328         |
| I would probably look for a new job in the near future. | 500     | 1.00    | 5.00    | 1.4760 | .94827         |
| As soon as possible, I would leave this organization. | 500     | 1.00    | 5.00    | 1.6840 | 1.17256        |
| Turnover Intention              | 500     | 1.00    | 5.00    | 1.5120 | .81107         |

Note: Mean Value = 1.00 to 2.50 Low Turnover Intention, 2.51 to 3.50 Moderate Turnover Intention and 3.51 to 5.00 High Turnover Intention
Table 14 Correlations Matrix between quality of work life and it's dimensions

|                          | Perceived Quality of Work Life | WME       | JOC       | WAR       | WGF       | SSF       | DMF       |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                          | **Correlation**                | 1         | .944**    | .966**    | .960**    | .927**    | .933**    | .906**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            |           | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |
| Work Moral               | Pearson Correlation            | .944**    | 1         | .950**    | .942**    | .909**    | .915**    | .888**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |
| Job                      | Pearson Correlation            | .966**    | .950**    | 1         | .964**    | .931**    | .937**    | .911**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |
| Wages and Work Group     | Pearson Correlation            | .960**    | .942**    | .964**    | 1         | .926**    | .932**    | .905**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |
| Supervision Style        | Pearson Correlation            | .927**    | .909**    | .931**    | .926**    | 1         | .899**    | .872**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |
| Decision Making          | Pearson Correlation            | .933**    | .915**    | .937**    | .932**    | .899**    | 1         | .879**    |
|                          | **Sig. (2-tailed)**            | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      | .000      |
|                          | **N**                          | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       | 500       |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Table 15 Pearson Correlation between quality of work life and turnover intention

|                         | Perceived Quality of Work Life | Turnover Intention |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| **Correlations**        |                               |                   |
| Perceived Quality of Work Life | Pearson Correlation            | 1                 |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)                | -.942**           |
|                         | N                              | 500               |
| Turnover Intention      | Pearson Correlation            | -.942**           |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)                | .000              |
|                         | N                              | 500               |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Conclusion

Quality of work life, as a variable, signifies an individual’s reaction to work or the personal consequences of the work experience. It focused on such individual outcomes as job satisfaction or mental health, with an emphasis on the impact of the work on the individual. As an approach Quality of work life focused on the individual rather than organizational outcomes, but the emphasis seemed to be on the joint labour-management cooperative projects, particularly those aimed at improving outcomes for both the individual and the organisation. quality of work life is seen as a set of methods, approaches or technologies for enhancing the work environment and making it more productive and more satisfying.
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