Impact Of Demographic Profile On Quality Of Work Life Of Teachers Of Dimapur District, Nagaland

[1]Mrs. Nimmi Pappachan, [2]Dr.V.T.Vasagan

[1]Research Scholar,[2]Research Guide
[1]Department of Management Studies,
[1]ICFAI University Nagaland, Dimapur,India

Abstract: A nation's education system plays a crucial role in shaping future citizens. Hence, quality education needs to be imparted which greatly relies on teachers. These teachers need a conducive work environment in which they can foster their potentials at optimum level. According to **Hasanmoradi (2011)**,"QWL includes aspects of work-related life such as wages and hours, work environment, benefits and services, career prospects and human relations, which is possibly relevant to worker satisfaction and motivation". Hence, organizations, particularly schools need to provide quality of work life to the teachers to ensure deliver quality education. Hence, quality work life environment has to be provided to all the teachers irrespective of any demographic profile. It is crucial to examine demographic factors like age, gender, and the nature of the job to determine whether they have an impact on the quality of work life, which in turn affects school productivity. Hence, this paper attempts to explore whether certain selected demographic variables such as age, gender and nature of job influence Quality of Work Life of teachers.

Hence, primary data were collected from 1554 teachers working in 146 schools consisting of Government and Private schools of Dimapur District, Nagaland. The considered hypothesis was tested with the help of one-way ANOVA.

It was observed that there is difference in the quality of work life of the Teachers of Secondary Schools of Dimapur District, Nagaland in respect of age and nature of job while the quality of work life is not influenced by gender. Thus, certain demographic variables do influence the quality of work life of teachers.

Index Terms - **Demographic variables, Quality of Work Life, School, Productivity.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality of work life is a vital notion that is extremely important in the lives of all employees of any organization particularly in the schools. If teachers are asked to generate the best results, then the school administration must provide them with an optimal work environment in which they are able to expose the best of their abilities. The school's work environment must optimally match the social, personal, and professional needs of teachers. Quality of work life is a process that enables employees at all levels to participate actively in the day to-day functions of the organization efficiently to realize expected outcomes. It is a value-based process aimed to achieve twin goals, on one side organizational effectiveness and on other the quality of life at work for the employees.

According to **Akar & Ustuner (2019),** The Quality of work life is a strategy that attempts to meet the needs, hopes, security, well-being, tranquilly, and joy of teachers in order for the teacher-centered school to stay effective and productive. When teachers are given the best possible working conditions, it not only motivate by improving their performance but also their attitude toward the school, their co-workers, and the students. This can be realized in the performance of the students. Hence, the organization particularly schools need to provide quality of work life to the teachers to ensure to deliver quality education. Hence, quality work life environment has to be provided to all the teachers irrespective of any demographics profile of teachers. It is crucial to examine demographic factors like age, gender, and the nature of the job to determine whether they have an impact on the quality of work life, which in turn affects school productivity and teachers' work life.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to **Rao et al (2013)**, QWL is a continuous process of adjusting and enhancing the workplace such that the interaction of people, technology, and organization offers a more joyful work experience for employees while also attaining desired organizational goals**. Hamidi &Mohamadi (2012)**, stated that the Quality of work life is a practice which offers every employee with direct and appropriate path via which they may communicate any concerns they may have about their job**. Verma & Monga (2014)**, opined that the QWL is a person's perceptions of all aspects of job, including financial compensation and benefits, job security, work conditions, interpersonal and organizational relationships, and the job's overall significance in their lives. **Bharathi et al (2011),** claims that there is a link between teachers' age and quality of work life in the schools, with older instructors reporting higher levels of QWL than younger teachers. **Tabassum et al (2012)**, in their research found a significant difference in overall QWL between male and female faculty members, department, qualifications, work experience, employment and marital status. **Elias & Saha (2005),** viewed that worker in older age groups perceived a better quality of life at work than those in younger age groups and quality of work life of females was substantially lower than male colleagues. **Hoque & Rahman (1999),** in their study

on industrial workers in the public and private sectors, discovered that private sector employee's QWL was substantially greater than public sector counterparts. **Rasak et al (2019),** discovered that there was a discrepancy in the socio demographic characteristics of the academic staff, with the majority of male respondents claiming satisfaction with their work while the majority of employees in the 30- to-39-year-old age bracket expressed contentment with their jobs and greater level of educational qualifications employees were more satisfied with their job. **Anyaoku (2016)**, revealed a large gender difference in the quality of librarians' working lives, with males reporting greater opportunities to use their knowledge while age had a significant impact on work life quality, with librarians between the ages of 45 and 60 expressing much higher levels of satisfaction with being recognized. The sort of institution had a considerable impact on the working lives of librarians too. **Akram & Amir (2020)**, in their study found that there were considerable differences in the quality of work life for university professors of both genders. The quality of their work life varied with age and was higher for university faculty in the public sector than for academics in private universities. The present study also attempts to explore whether certain selected demographic variables such as age, gender and nature of job influence Quality of Work Life of teachers.

III. RESEARCH GAP

A number of studies have investigated the influence of demographic characteristics on quality of work life and prospective repercussions, but none have been conducted among the teachers of Dimapur. The quality of work life and its effects in the educational sector have been discussed in earlier literature. The current study seeks to fill the knowledge gap in the Dimapur area of Nagaland regarding the influence of selected demographic variables on quality of work life. The current study seeks to explore whether certain selected demographic variables such as age, gender and nature of job influence Quality of Work Life of teachers. In view of this, it is proposed to conduct an exploratory study entitled on **"Impact of Demographic Profile on Quality of Work Life of Teachers of Dimapur District, Nagaland"**

IV. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Given the survey of literature and scope, the following objective established for the purpose of the study is:

[1] To examine the extent to which **'Socio - Demographic Factors'** influence the **'Quality of Work Life'** of the Teachers of Secondary Schools, Dimapur District, Nagaland.

V. HYPOTHESIS

Given the objectives, survey of literature and scope, the following hypotheses are established for the purpose of the study is:

[1] The Socio - Demographic Factors' such as '**Age, Gender, and Nature of Job'** does not make any difference in the **'Quality of Work Life'** of the Teachers of Secondary Schools.

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study considered purposive sample method to collect data. Data was collected with the help of questionnaires from 1554 teachers who are working in 146 Government and Private Schools of Dimapur District, Nagaland. The values of quality of work life are measured in the order of 0 -1 very low quality, 1-2 low quality, 2-3 moderate quality, 3-4 high quality and 4-5 very high quality of work life.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Quality of Work Life and Age

[1] H_a: There is no significant difference in the **'Quality of Work Life'** in respect of **'Age'** of the Teachers of Secondary Schools.

Table No: 1
Descriptive Statistics for overall data for Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Age

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	3.9103	.47142	1554
Age	1.99	.457	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Table No.1 represents the mean value of Quality of Wok Life in respect of Age. It has been observed that the mean value of quality of wok life of the teachers is 3.9103 which fall under high quality of work life category and the mean of Age of the teachers is 1.99 which falls under the category of 26 – 50 years with the variation of 0.47142 and 0.457 respectively. This denotes that teachers who have participated in the research fall under the category of 26 – 50 years have high quality of work life. The correlation between the Quality of Wok Life and Age is presented in the following table.

Table No: 2
Degree of Correlation between Quality of Work Life of the Teachers and Age

Pearson Correlation	**Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers**	1.000	.045
	Age	.045	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	**Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers**	.	.037
	Age	.037	.
N	**Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers**	1554	1554
	Age	1554	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

From the above table 2, it is observed that there exists a low level of positive association between [a] the level of Quality of Work Life and [b] the category of Age of the Teachers. The correlation between these variables is 0.045 which signifies 4.5% of relationship between variables. This situation is further analyzed with the One Way ANOVA, presented in the following table

Table No: 3
ANOVA for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.986	2	2.993	13.688	.000
Within Groups	339.141	1551	.219		
Total	345.127	1553			

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Here, the ANOVA Table No-3 indicates the statistical significance of 'Quality of Work Life' of the Teachers with 'Age'. One way ANOVA represents the result of omnibus hypothesis. The first row, *Between Groups* represent the variability due to Quality of Work Life, The second row *Within Groups* represent the variability due to random error and the third row represent total variability. Here, the **F-**value is **13.688** and the corresponding 'p' – value is **0.000**. Here, the calculated 'p' value is smaller than 0.05 at 95% of confident level, therefore the null hypotheses is rejected. Hence, the Quality of Work Life is not same according to Age of the Teachers. Hence, there is significant difference in the 'Quality of Work Life' in respect of 'Age' of the Teachers of Secondary Schools in which **$F_{(2,1552)} = 13.688, p < 0.05$.** The variation further explored by **Descriptive Statistics,** presented in the following table:

Table No: 4
Descriptive Statistics for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Age

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
21 - 25 years		170	3.9721	.46822	.03591	3.9012	4.0430	1.95	4.95	
26 - 50 years		1230	3.8809	.47026	.01341	3.8546	3.9072	1.95	5.00	
50 years and above		154	4.0769	.44502	.03586	4.0061	4.1478	3.00	5.00	
Total		1554	3.9103	.47142	.01196	3.8869	3.9338	1.95	5.00	
Model	Fixed Effects			.46761	.01186	3.8871	3.9336			
	Random Effects				.08198	3.5576	4.2631			.01015

Source: **Compiled from Survey Data**

The above Table No: 4 discernable that there exists variation in Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Age. **The mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in Age group of 21 – 25 years is 3.9721 which fall under High Quality of Work Life category at the same time the mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in Age group of 26 – 50 years is 3.8809 which also fall under High Quality of Work Life category and the mean value for Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in Age group of 50 years and above is 4.0769 which fall under Very High Quality of Work Life category. This situation is found to be true both in the sample as well as in the population as per the statistical results**.

[B] Quality of Work Life and Gender
[2] H$_b$: There is no significant difference in the **'Quality of Work Life'** in respect of **'Gender'** of the Teachers of Secondary Schools.

Table No: 6
Descriptive Statistics for overall data for Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Gender

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	3.9103	.47142	1554
Gender	1.64	.479	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Table No.6 represents the mean value of Quality of Wok Life in respect of Gender i.e Male and Female. It has been observed that the mean value of Quality of Wok Life of the teachers is 3.9103 which fall under High Quality of Work Life category and the mean Gender of the teachers is 1.64 which represent more female teachers are working in schools, with the variation of 0.47142 and 0.479 respectively. The correlation between the Quality of Wok Life and Gender is presented in the following table.

Table No: 7
Degree of Correlation between Quality of Work Life of the Teachers and Gender

Pearson Correlation	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	1.000	-.095
	Gender	-.095	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	.	.000
	Gender	.000	.
N	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	1554	1554
	Gender	1554	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

From the above table 7, it is observed that there exists a high level of negative association between [a] the level of Quality of Work Life and [b] the Gender of the Teachers i.e Male and Female. The correlation between these variables is -0.095 which signifies -9.5% of relationship between variables. In other words, the level of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers has negative association with Gender of the Teachers of Secondary Schools. This situation is further analyzed with the One Way ANOVA, presented in the following table:

Table No: 8
ANOVA for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers and Gender

Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.092	1	3.092	14.031	.060
Within Groups	342.035	1552	.220		
Total	345.127	1553			

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Here, the ANOVA Table No-8 indicates the statistical significance of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Gender. One way ANOVA represents the result of omnibus hypothesis. The first row, **Between Groups** represent the variability due to Quality of Work Life, the second row represent **Within Groups** represent the variability due to random error and the third row represent total variability. Here, the **F-**value is **14.031** and the corresponding 'p' – value is **0.060**. Here, the calculated 'p' value is smaller than 0.05 at 95% of confident level, therefore the null hypotheses is accepted. Thus, the Quality of Work Life is same according to Gender of the Teachers. Hence, there is no significant difference in the 'Quality of Work Life' in respect of 'Gender' of the Teachers of Secondary Schools in which **F(1,1552) = 14.031, p < 0.05.** The situation is further explored by **Descriptive Statistics,** presented in the following table:

Table No: 9
Descriptive Statistics for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Gender

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Male		553	3.8703	.49571	.02108	3.9289	4.0118	1.95	5.00	
Female		1001	3.8772	.45430	.01436	3.8490	3.9054	1.95	5.00	
Total		1554	3.9103	.47142	.01196	3.8869	3.9338	1.95	5.00	
Model	Fixed Effects			.46945	.01191	3.8870	3.9337			
	Random Effects				.04822	3.2977	4.5230			.00403

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

The above Table No: 9, it is discernable that there exists no variation in Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Gender. The mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Male Teachers is 3.8703 which fall under High Quality of Work Life category at the same time the mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Female Teachers is 3.8772 which also fall under High Quality of Work Life category. **Though, there is no difference in the Quality of Work Life of Male and Female teachers, it falls under the category of High Quality of Work Life. Hence it is concluded that both the Male and Female teachers have same quality of work life. This situation is found to be true both in the sample as well as in the population as per the statistical results.**

[C] Quality of Work Life and Nature of Job

[3] H$_c$: There is no significant difference in the **'Quality of Work Life'** in respect of **'Nature of Job'** of the Teachers of Secondary Schools.

Table No: 10
Descriptive Statistics for Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Nature of Job

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	3.9103	.47142	1554
Nature of Job	1.21	.405	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Table No.10 represents the mean value of Quality of Wok Life in respect of Nature of Job. The nature of job represents whether Teachers are serving in Government schools or in Private schools. It has been observed that the mean value of Quality of Wok Life of the teachers is 3.9103 which fall under High Quality of Work Life category and the mean Nature of job of the teachers is 1.21 which denotes that more teachers are working in Private schools, with the variation of 0.47142 and 0.405. The correlation between the Quality of Wok Life in respect of Nature of job is presented in the following table.

Table No: 11
Degree of Correlation between Quality of Work Life of the Teachers and Nature of Job

Pearson Correlation	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	1.000	.143
	Nature of Job	.143	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	.	.000
	Nature of Job	.000	.
N	Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers	1554	1554
	Nature of Job	1554	1554

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

From the above table 11, it is observed that there exists low level of positive association between [a] the level of Quality of Work Life and [b] the Nature of Job of the Teachers. The correlation between these variables is 0.143 which represent 14.3% of relationship between variables. This situation is further analyzed with the One Way ANOVA, presented in the following table:

Table No: 12
ANOVA for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers and Nature of Job

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.090	1	7.090	32.551	**.000**
Within Groups	338.037	1552	.218		
Total	345.127	1553			

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Here, the ANOVA Table No 12 indicates the statistical significance of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers with Nature of Job. One way ANOVA represents the result of the analysis for omnibus hypothesis. The first row, *Between Groups* represent the variability due to Quality of Work Life, The second row *Within Groups* represent the variability due to random error and the third row represent total variability. Here, the **F-**value is **32.551** and the corresponding 'p' – value is **0.000**. Here, the calculated p value is smaller than 0.05 at 95% of confident level so null hypotheses is rejected. Thus, the Quality of Work Life is not same according to Nature of Job of the Teachers. Hence, there is significance difference in the 'Quality of Work Life' in respect of 'Nature of Job' of the Teachers of Secondary Schools in which **F(1,1552) = 32.551, p < 0.05.** The variation further explored by **Descriptive Statistics,** presented in the following table:

Table No: 13
Descriptive Statistics for Degree of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Nature of Job

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Between-Component Variance
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Private		1234	**3.8759**	.47837	.01362	3.8492	3.9026	1.95	5.00	
Government		320	**4.0430**	.41852	.02340	3.9969	4.0890	3.00	5.00	
Total		1554	3.9103	.47142	.01196	3.8869	3.9338	1.95	5.00	
Model	Fixed Effects			.46670	.01184	3.8871	3.9336			
	Random Effects				.09613	2.6889	5.1317			.01352

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

The above Table No: 13, it is discernable that there exists variation in Quality of Work Life of the Teachers in respect of Nature of Job. The mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers who are working in Private Schools is 3.8759 which fall under High Quality of Work Life category at same time the mean value of Quality of Work Life of the Teachers who are working in Government Schools is 4.0430 which fall under Very High Quality of Work Life category. **Thus, the teachers who are working in Government Schools have Very High Quality of Work Life than the teachers working in Private Schools.**

VII. Findings

According to the study, teachers who are at the 50 years and above have a very good quality of work life. Here, government school teachers have a higher quality of work life than private school teachers. The study also found that teachers, regardless of gender, had a very high quality of work life. A committed, diligent teacher succeeds for the school and deserves high credit. Schools can retain the best personnel and enable them to perform at the highest level by building a safe, amiable, peaceful and pleasant working environment.

VIII. Conclusion

Teachers have an influence on students' lives and nurture them. Dealing with students from various origins and with different psychological requirements makes teaching a challenging profession that requires patience and careful thought. They have one of the hardest tasks, therefore the ideal work place increases the productivity and efficacy. Every school should prioritise a superior work environment in order to recruit the best staff and provide the best education for the society.

REFERENCES

[1] Akar, H., & Ustuner, M. (2019). The relationships between perceptions of teachers' transformational leadership, organizational justice, organizational support and quality of work life. International Journal of Research in Education and Science, 5(1), 309-322.

[2] Akram, M., & Amir, M. (2020). Comparing the quality of work life among university teachers in Punjab. Bulletin of Education and Research, 42(2), 219-234.

[3] Anyaoku, E. N. (2016). Demographic determinants of quality of work life of librarians working in Nigeria International Journal of Advanced Library and Information Science, 4(1),312-323.

[4] Bharathi, P. S., Umaselvi, M., & Kumar, N. S. (2011). Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers. Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies, 2(1),47-69.

[5] Elias, M. S., &Saha, N. K. (2005). Environmental pollution and quality of working life in tobacco industries. Journal of Life Earth Science, 1(1), 21-24.

[6] Gupta, B. (2015). An empirical study of impact of demographic variables on quality of work life among insurance sector employees in Indore Division. Pacific Business Review International, 8(1), 24-32.

[7] Hamidi, F., &Mohamadi, B. (2012). Teachers' quality of work life in secondary schools. International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 4(1), 1-5.

[8] Hasanmoradi, N. (2011). Relationship between the quality of work life and job satisfaction among the teachers of public and non-public schools in Tehran. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 4(25), 279.

[9] Heck, R. H. (2009). Teacher effectiveness and student achievement: Investigating a multilevel cross classified model. Journal of educational Administration, 47(2), 227-249.

[10] Hoque, M. E., & Rahman, A. (1999). Quality of working life and job behaviour of workers in Bangladesh: A comparative study of private and public sectors. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 175-184.

[11] Nair, G. S. (2013). A study on the effect of quality of work life (QWL) on organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB)-with special reference to college teachers is Thrissur District, Kerala. Integral Review, 6(1), 34-46.

[12] Rao, T., Arora, R. S., &Vashisht, A. K. (2013). Quality of work life: a study of Jammu   University teachers. Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management, 2(1), 20.

[13] Rasak, B., Isaac, O., Festus Femi, A., & Egbide, B. C. (2019).Quality of Work Life (QWL) of Academic Staff in Private Universities in North Central Nigeria.International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology,10(03).

[14] Sharma, M. M. (2017). Teacher in a digital era. Global Journal of Computer Science and   Technology, 17(G3), 11-14.

[15] Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K. (2012). An Evaluation of the quality of work life: a study of the faculty members of private universities in Bangladesh. ABAC Journal, 32(3).

[16] Velayudhan, T. M., &Yameni, M. D. (2017). Quality of work life–a study. In IOP   Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering. Vol. 197, No. 1, p. 012057

[17] Verma, P. O. O. J. A., & Monga, O. P. (2014). Attitudinal study of quality of work life at an electronics company. European Academic Research, II (6), set.