



Pelagia Research Library

European Journal of Experimental Biology, 2013, 3(1):443-448



The relationship between quality of work life and faculty members' productivity in Islamic Azad Universities in district 4 of Iran

AmirtashAli Mohammad, Mozaffari Syed Amir Ahmad and Askari Ahmad Reza*

Department of Physical Education, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Bearing in mind that the role of work life should have an acceptable quality in faculty members of Islamic Azad university in improving the quantity and quality of education and research as well as improving their efficiency and increasing their productivity; this research was conducted with the goal of investigating the relationship between quality of work life and faculty members' productivity in Islamic Azad universities in district 4 of country. This is a correlational research whose population consists of all full time male faculty members of Islamic Azad University in district 4 of Islamic Republic of Iran with a total number of 1461 persons. 224 people were selected with a 2 step cluster and simple random sampling as the population. In this research, Walton's quality of work life and Hershey and Goldsmith's (achieve Model) Manpower Productivity questionnaires were utilized. Their face and content validity was approved by experts and their internal stabilities are 0.874 and 0.907, respectively. In addition, their time stabilities were obtained 0.977 and 0.967. In this research descriptive statistics was used for describing research variables and for investigating the relationship between research variables, simple correlation coefficient, determination coefficient and multiple regressions were used. In all cases, recognition level $\alpha=0.05$ has been determined. The results of the research demonstrated that the mean of scores on quality of work life equals 3.2 with the standard deviation of 0.579. 49.9 percent of changes and variance related to scores man power productivity by changes and variance related to scores quality of work life can be described, explained and interpreted. Components of quality of work life, except work life social dependence and work life environment, are appropriate predictors for manpower productivity; therefore manpower productivity can be predicted through quality of work life variable.

Kew words: Quality of Work Life, Manpower Productivity, Faculty Member

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, wealth, economic power and welfare of each country is in optimal use of facilities and human resources of that country. In this regard, the more working manpower in different service, industrial and educational sections are powerful, motivated, with better tendencies and with a healthier spirit and body, the more successful and developed that country will be in different economical, industrial, social and cultural areas. There is no doubt that reaching such great purposes needs longitudinal and strategic theories towards keeping and improving human resources in every organization.

One of the important and influential rules in keeping and improving human resources in any organization is management and improving the quality level of manpower and preventing from reduction of productivity in work place. Research in the last three decades shows that one of the difficulties managers and administrators face in big industrial and educational organizations is decrease in individual and organizational output and efficiency. Despite great investment and scheduling as well as professional training, these organizations, on one hand, face the losses of low motivation, weak functioning and low productivity of their employees, and on the other hand encounter the considerable expenses that are imposed on them due to absenteeism, movement, resigning from work, sickness and early retirement of the personnel. These institutes and organizations undergo millions of dollars of loss due to losing thousands of hours of beneficial work [1]. Pertinent to this, higher education centers, among which is Islamic Azad university, due to the fact that it carries the prophecy toward education and training the necessary manpower for other organizations and in general for the society, on the one hand, needs healthy, powerful, creative, motivated, confident and efficient educational personnel and on the other hand, other organizations because of personal, organizational and ultra organizational reasons are subject to their own low efficiency, particularly in educational sections. Therefore, in recent years many researchers with different perspectives have investigated the causes and consequences of decrease in output and efficiency and tried to find effective ways for preventing from it. A group of researchers believing in structural and organizational reasons as the main cause for reduction in output and efficiency, suggested structure reformation, developing research and educational facilities, cooperation, job security and social support as the basic remedies for balancing or preventing from reduction in output and efficiency. Another group of scholars found individual and personal reasons as important causes for decrease in output and efficiency and introduced education, changing ideas and viewpoints, improving the quality of life and creating positive habits like healthy and active leisure time as well as doing physical activities and exercising as solutions. Thus, bearing in mind the important role of quality of work life of faculty members of Islamic Azad University in the Iran and quality of educating the young in country and research in the field of society's needs, the purpose of the current study is to investigate the relationship between quality of work life and manpower productivity among faculty members of Islamic Azad universities in district 4 of Iran.

The variable investigated in this study is quality of work life. Quality of work life is one of those topics which has been discussed and investigated from different aspects in consecutive years and yet varying ideas exist related to its obvious facets. In some periods of time, sometimes quite a few subjects get special importance, and the need for a more efficient use is felt more than before. Improving quality of work life leads to realization of cooperative decision making, job security, improving conditions as well as workplace, feeling possession and autonomy, creating opportunities for career improvement, gratitude for career and development and job enrichment, satisfying the need for self-actualization in personnel and creating motivation for maintaining in the organization. Therefore, we can claim that all of the above mentioned causes and other causes could probably be related to manpower productivity in a way that in recent years the relationship between quality of work life and manpower productivity has become the focus of attention and study of many scientific centers [2-3-4]. Quality of work life and manpower productivity is among important topics related to human resources that has specified a considerable amount of attention of scholars towards itself. Therefore, as you can see some researches have delineated the effect of improving quality of work life on manpower productivity and others have specified the effect of physical exercise on manpower productivity. Researchers' viewpoints state that decrease in physical exercises and subsequently reduction of quality of work life, In addition to diminishing manpower productivity, it also results in substantial financial and human loss. In this regard, scholars having considered different aspects of the subject, introduced several individual and organizational solutions among which is paying attention to the role and effect of doing physical exercise on maintaining and improving health and workforce fitness, improving quality of life and work life and increase in individual and organizational efficiency [2-3-4-5-6]. People who are at an appropriate level regarding quality of work life factors have time for thinking and doing other activities in life (happiness and physical health) and are more successful in social and individual activities and it can bring about better functioning in personal and work life [7].

Another variable discussed in this study, apparent from what we have already mentioned is manpower productivity. Productivity is one of the most important and complex issues that all organizations encounter. Reaching high productivity is the goal of all organizations on the one hand, and on the other hand there are many factors that influence productivity. Among these factors, manpower is one of the most important factors that is most effective particularly in service and educational sections. It is crystal clear that success in every organization depends on proficiency, utilizing appropriate tools and equipment, facilities, money, raw materials and manpower of that

organization in performing the tasks and programs. And such a thing is possible only if these organizations can utilize their employees' skills, abilities, personal and collective characteristics regarding the organization's goals [8]. Now regarding the particular importance of presenting service to different groups of people and the effective role that universities' manpower have in educating proficient workforce for improving and developing an active society, the researcher intends, In addition to investigating the status of quality of work life of faculty members in district 4 of Islamic Azad University of Iran, investigate the relationship between the variables and productivity in the mentioned society and answer the basic research question that: Can the level of quality of work life among faculty members in district 4 of Islamic Azad Universities have a relationship with improving their productivity and finally increase the university's function and efficiency?

Hejazi and Behravan (2010) have studied the relationship between personal and organizational reasons and research productivity of faculty members in agriculture departments in Tehran province. The research findings demonstrated no meaningful relationship between personal factors and research productivity in agriculture department in Tarbiat Modares (teacher training) university[9]. Yavari, Amirtash and Tondnevis (2010) conducted a research on "comparing quality of work life and its trivial measures among faculty members of physical education departments and educational groups in state universities". The acquired results state that the mean of quality of work life in physical education departments is 51.78 percent and in educational groups equals 49.46 percent. The quality of work life among physical education faculty members is of average level and it is similar in physical educational departments and educational centers[10]. Mehdizadeh Sharafi and Ilka (2012) investigated the relationship between quality of work life and employees' functioning based on Walton's Model in Islamic Azad University - Firoozkooh branch. The results showed that there is a relationship between quality of work life and workforce functioning. There is also a meaningful relationship between quality of work life variables[11]. Stoenhuis&DeBruijn (2006) in their research found that the better physical conditions of work (flexible work hours and efficient and suitable technology) and economical conditions of job (appropriate and fair salary), the higher the level of productivity of employees and finally the higher the organization's productivity will be[12]. In Ahmadi's study (2009) the effect of three factors of quality of work life, empowering and motivation were investigated. The findings of this study demonstrated that all the three factors had positive effects on organization productivity and specially work force productivity[13].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is a correlational research. The population of this research includes all full time male faculty members of Islamic Azad universities in district 4 of Iran. Based on the presented statistics from the secretariat of district 4 at the time of conducting this research the total number of population is 1461 people. The number of samples in this research regarding the number of population, 224 people were selected using a 2 stage cluster random sampling equivalent to the sample's volume. Data has been collected using Richard Walton's quality of work life questionnaire and Hershey and Goldsmith's manpower productivity evaluation questionnaire. Face and content validity of questionnaires have been approved by experts. Internal stabilities are 0.874 and 0.907, respectively and their time stabilities were obtained 0.977 and 0.967, respectively. In order to determine the naturalness of dispersion, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used. The results approved the naturalness of dispersions. In this study descriptive statistics was used to describe research variables and in order to investigate the relationship between research variables the simple correlation coefficient, determination coefficient and multiple regressions were utilized. Moreover, in this study the meaningful level with the minimum of $\alpha=0.05$ has been determined.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that 24.6 percent of the subjects under investigation have majored physical education and the remaining 75.4 percent are graduates of other majors. 14.7 percent of the sample are single and 85.3 percent of them are married. 14.7 percent are 30 years old or younger, 52.7 percent are between 30 to 40, and 32.6 percent are 41 years old or older. 62.5 percent of the sample under investigation have 10 years or less of working experience, 30.4 percent of them have within 11 to 20 years working experience, and 7.1 percent of them have 21 years or more working experience. 74.6 percent are instructors, 22.8 percent are assistant professors, and 2.7 percent are associate professors of professors. 37.2 teach practical courses and 63.8 teach theoretical-practical courses. Following is a list of statistical indexes of quality of work life scores, manpower productivity and their components.

As you can see in table 1 the mean of Fair and appropriate salary is 3.14 with the standard deviation of 0.769, the mean of Hygienic and safe work place equals 3.456 with the standard deviation of 0.718, the mean of Making continuous development and security opportunities illustrates 3.197 with the standard deviation of 0.803, the mean of Obedience in organization is 2.873 with the standard deviation of 0.991, the mean of Social work life dependence is 3.212 with the standard deviation of 0.792, the mean of General life environment equals 3.281 with the standard deviation of 0.734, the mean of Social unity and solidarity in organization illustrates 3.2 with the standard deviation of 0.652, the mean of Developing human capabilities is 3.263 with the standard deviation of 0.75 and the mean of General quality of work life is 3.2 with the standard deviation of 0.579. Also the minimum and maximum amounts demonstrate that the minimum score has been 1 and the maximum 5. Also the amplitude of scores have been undulating from 2.75 to 4. Therefore, the findings show that the average of all components were above the mean and the highest mean is related to Hygienic and safe work place and the lowest one is related to Fair and appropriate salary.

As you can see in table 2 the mean score of Power factor is 3.753 with the standard deviation of 0.424, the mean score of Job recognition factor equals 3.536 with the standard deviation of 0.479, the mean score of Organizational support factor illustrates 3.022 with the standard deviation of 0.605, the mean score of Motivation factor shows 3.187 with the standard deviation of 0.377, the mean score of Environment compatibility factor is 3/884 with the standard deviation of 0.579, the mean score of Credit factor with the standard deviation of 0.517, the mean score of Organizational factor illustrates 3.644 with the standard deviation of 0.58, and the mean score of Entire manpower productivity is 3.435 with the standard deviation of 0.339. Also the minimum and maximum scores demonstrate that the minimum score has been 2 related to the scores of Organizational support and the maximum score has been 5 related to Power factor, organizational support, Environmental and organizational compatibility. Thus, the results indicate that the average of all manpower productivity components is higher than the mean and among productivity components; the highest mean is related to power factor and the lowest related to organizational support factor.

Research hypothesis: there is a multiple meaningful relationship between quality of work life components and manpower productivity.

The results of table 3 demonstrate that multiple correlations between quality of work life and manpower productivity is 0.719 and adjusted determination coefficient is 0.499. This coefficient shows that 49.9 percent of changes and variance related to scores of manpower productivity by quality of work life can be described, explained and interpreted. The calculated F with 8 and 215 degree of freedom is meaningful within $\alpha=0.01$. Therefore, we can expand the acquired level of multiple correlations and determination coefficient to the population with 99 percent certainty. The results of table 4 also demonstrate that correlation coefficients between Fair and appropriate salary is 0.153, Hygienic and safe work place shows 0.32, Making continuous development and security opportunities indicates 0.201, Obedience in organization demonstrates 0.166, Social work life dependence illustrates 0/04, General life environment is 0.03, Social unity and solidarity in organization indicates 0.268, and Developing human capabilities is 0.174. The amounts of t for all quality of work life components except Social work life dependence and work life environment is meaningful at the recognition level $\alpha=0.01$. The prediction equation in this model is as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.153X_1 + 0.32X_2 + 0.201X_3 + 0.166X_4 + 0.268X_5 + 0.174X_6$$

Table1: Description of quality of work life and their subscales

Statistic Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Amplitude
Fair and appropriate Salary	3.14	0.769	1	4.33	3.33
Hygienic and safe work place	3.456	0.718	1.67	5	3.33
Making continuous development and security opportunities	3.197	0.803	1	5	4
Obedience in organization	2.873	0.991	1	4.67	3.67
Social work life dependence	3.212	0.792	1	5	4
General life environment	3.281	0.734	1.67	5	3.33
Social unity and solidarity in job organization	3.2	0.652	1.33	5	3.67
Developing human capabilities	3.263	0.75	1	5	4
Total quality of work life	3.2	0.579	1.79	4.54	2.75

Table2: Description of manpower productivity and its subscales

Statistic Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Amplitude
Power factor	3.753	0.424	2.8	5	2.2
Job recognition factor	3.536	0.479	2.4	4.8	2.4
Organizational support factor	3.022	0.605	2	5	3
Motivation factor	3.187	0.377	2.45	4.55	2.09
Environment compatibility factor	3.884	0.579	2.67	5	2.33
Credit factor	3.249	0.517	2.25	4.75	2.5
Organizational factor	3.644	0.58	2.13	5	2.88
Total manpower productivity	3.435	0.339	2.7	4.58	1.88

Table 3: Multiple regression for determining and predicting manpower productivity

Statistic Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.
Regression	13.308	8	1.663	28.79	0.0001
Residual	12.422	215	0.058		
Total	256.73	223			

$$R = R^2 0.719 = R^2 \text{Adjusted} 0.517 = 0.499$$

Table 4: Analysis of manpower productivity regression based on quality of work life subscales

Statistic Variable	B	SEB	β	T	P
Fixed amount	1.875	0.115	-	16.33	0.0001
Fair and appropriate salary	0.068	0.031	0.153	2.21	0.02
Hygienic and safe work place	0.151	0.027	0.32	5.59	0.0001
Making continuous development and security opportunities	0.085	0.032	0.201	2.63	0.009
Obedience in organization	0.06	0.027	0.166	2.08	0.038
Social work life dependence	0.017	0.028	0.04	0.601	0.549
General life environment	0.013	0.03	0.03	0.45	0.65
Social unity and solidarity in job organization	0.14	0.033	0.268	4.22	0.0001
Developing human capabilities	0.079	0.03	0.174	2.63	0.009

CONCLUSION

The investigations show among 244 of the sample under investigation nearly 86 percent are married and the rest are single. More than half of the faculty members in Islamic Azad University in district 4 of Iran are within 31 to 40 years old. In addition, the findings show that almost 63 percent of faculty members have less than 10 years experience. By investigating the acquired findings from the personal characteristics it seems that a considerable percent of the faculty members in Islamic Azad University in district 4 of Iran are young. However, considering the fact that nearly 75 percent of faculty members are instructors and the rest are assistant professors, associate professors and professors, the majority of these young instructors do not have PhD.

In previous researches it was specified that Khorvash (2010) and Mostahfezian (2010) who also conducted their research on the same population mentioned the youth of the samples. It seems that after passing several years Azad University has not sought a solution for improving its faculty members yet, most of whom are still young.

The findings of the other research indicates that the entire mean of the quality of work life scores is 3.2 with the standard deviation of 0.579 which is compatible with Yavari's (2010) research. Also the findings demonstrated that among the components of quality of work life, the highest mean is related to Hygienic and safe work place and the lowest related to Fair and appropriate salary (table 1). In other words, the faculty members of the university enjoy Hygienic and safe work place but don't receive a Fair and appropriate salary. The total mean score of manpower productivity is 3.435 with the standard deviation of 0.339 which is an indicator of average productivity among faculty members of the university. Among the productivity components the highest mean is related to power factor and the lowest related to organizational support factor (table 2).

Having the results of table 4 in mind, the quality of work life components except social work life dependence and work life environment are good predictors for manpower productivity. Thus, manpower productivity is predictable via quality of work life variable (table4). These results are compatible with findings of Yavari (2010),

MehdizadehAshrafi (2012), Stonius (2006), Ahmadi (2011), but is incompatible with findings of Hejazi's research (2010). Therefore, it seems that fair and appropriate Salary, Hygienic and safe work place, Making continuous development and security opportunities, Obedience in organization, Social unity and solidarity in organization and developing human capabilities can be effective factors on faculty members' productivity. Thus, we can claim that setting goals for training faculty members of university and reforming organizational structures in the university can have an effect on their productivity.

It is suggested that other similar studies be conducted in other universities with the measurement tools of this research and compared with the acquired results.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to express his appreciation to the subjects for their participation in this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Saatchi; *The Productivity Psychology*, Institute of Virayesh Publications, Tehran, **2006**.
- [2] P. Ebrifam, PhD thesis, Allameh Tabatabaei University, (Tehran, Iran, **2010**).
- [3] L.H.Chen, *Int. J. of Manpower*, **2003**, 24(3), 229-318.
- [4] L.Layer, W.Karwowski, F. Furr, *Int. J. Industrial Ergonomics*, **2009**, 39, 413-421.
- [5] R.Deljudehi, PhD thesis, Allameh Tabatabaei University, (Tehran, Iran, **2002**).
- [6] M.Khorvash, *J. sport management & behavior movement*, **2009**, 5(10), 49-60.
- [7] M.Mostahfezian, A.A.Mozaffari, A.M.Amirtash, *Research in sport sciences quarterly*, **2010**, 4(25), 113-121.
- [8] S.R. SeyedJavadein; Quality of work life in entrepreneurship organizations based on Walton's model, *Moallem Publications*, Tehran, **2006**.
- [9] Y. Hejazi, Z.Behravan, *J. Iran's agricultural teaching and promoting sciences*, **2010**, 5(1), 1.
- [10] Y. Yavari, A.M Amirtash, F.Tondnevis, *J. movement & sport sciences*, **2010**, 1(13), 1.
- [11] A. MahdizadehAshrafi, H.A. Ilka, *Quarterly Scientific J. Management*, **2011**, 7(20), 1-8.
- [12] H. Stoenhuis, E. DeBruijn, *J. Manufacturing technology Management*, **2006**, 17(1), 42-55.
- [13] F. Ahmadi, *Int. J. Contemporary Research in Business*, **2011**, 3(3).