Impact of Autonomy of The Work and Work Environment on Quality of Work-Life Among Faculty Members of Tribhuvan University

Baburam Lamichhane*

ABSTRACT

QWL of faculties largely depends upon the quality of the people one works with, assisting colleagues at the workplace, salary structure of an organization, nature of work, provision for respect and achievement. But there are some other significant dimensions of QWL such as autonomy of the work and work environment which too have an impact. It is also well established that their performance is not only a function of qualification and competence but also of motivation and better QWL. The aim of the present study, therefore, was to investigate the impact between two dimensions of academic sector autonomy of the work and work environment on QWL of teachers in universities and its spillover relationship and impact on their engagement, satisfaction, commitment, performance, and even the reputation of the universities. Considering the nature of the objectives, the present study is descriptive and explanatory. The data was collected from full-time academicians working in selected campuses in Gandaki province. A structured Google form questionnaire was used to gather the data. 470 questionnaires were distributed, out of which only 244 questionnaires were found to be complete and usable for the analysis. Data were analyzed using SPSS, in which descriptive statistics were conducted Mean and Standard deviation. They were carried out is to underscore the perception of the university teachers regarding the state of Quality of Work Life .Multiple regression is employed for analyzing the impact of autonomy of the work and work environment. The findings of the study pointed out that the work environment aspect of QWL amongst faculties positively and significantly impact QWL but the impact of autonomy of the work has insignificant results on QWL. The findings of this study will serve as valuable inputs for the universities in identifying the key workplace issues to develop strategies to address and improve the quality of working conditions and to increase the quality of work-life of the faculty members towards their campuses.

Keywords: *Autonomy of the work, dimensions, Faculty members, QWL, Work environment.*

**Lecturer, Department of Management, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara*

ISSN: 2392-4519 (Print)

INTRODUCTION

The phrase quality of work-life was first used in the late 1960s, starting from General Motors and the United Auto Workers, to explain workers' level of job satisfaction. Irving Bluestone indicated the term quality of work-life, which began as a variable expressing the level of worker satisfaction and empowerment into an approach and series of programs designed ultimately to enrich worker productivity. Labor-management cooperation directed the development and application of these early QWL efforts, resulting in workplaces where employees participated in problem-solving and decision-making efforts to better their work lives. Besides, management attitudes become more concerned with the individual's welfare, stressing positive inter-personal co-operation and overall improved working environment and conditions (Goode, 1989).

Universities, as key elements in social, economic, cultural, and political development, play a pivotal role in educating human capital. Analyzing the affected factors of growth and development in all developed or developing societies presents that the efficiency and efficacy of educational systems in any country promotes its inclusive development and growth. Faculty members as one of the greatest resources of any society and one of the most key elements of educational systems play a vital role in training specialized forces. The result of their roles is social development and growth in human societies. In our organizations improve QWL resourcefulness supports to fulfill technical and social needs of the workplace (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010). A paradigm shift in higher education sectors came with additional challenges to employees which included increased workload, inadequate resources, high stress levels, and increased job-related pressures. University is no exception; employees may have to cope with changes in organizational restructuring, staffing, and resources. These activities could lead to increased medical boarding applications, higher cases of unofficial leave, a high number of resignations, and an unsatisfactory working situation those impacts QWL.

QWL factors play an important role in teaching and knowledge sharing activities so that University tries to meet faculties' QWL factors. One of the studies is needed for exploring the condition of QWL dimensions on University campuses among faculty members. Tribhuvan University is an autonomous higher academic organization in Nepal. It is the first and the oldest university in the country. It is the umbrella organization of different constituent and affiliated campuses. However, the same university's teaching faculties present different attitudes towards the same phenomenon.

In autonomous workgroups, employees are given the freedom of decision-making; workers themselves plan, coordinate and control work-related activities. It also includes different opportunities for personnel such as independence at work and having the authority to access the related information for their task. A working environment is a place in which one works. It is a social and professional environment in which employees are supposed to interact with some people, and have to work with co-ordination in one or the other way. Thus, this research work contributes to examine the impact of QWL dimensions on the total quality of work-life of faculty members in the university. It contributes to the University for evaluating the quality of work-life conditions of faculties.

Much empirical research work on QWL is done in developed and developing economies in various disciplines (Gayathiri & Ramakrishnan, 2013) but very negligible in less developed economies like ours. Pugalendi, Umaselvi, and Nakkeeran (2010) conducted a study on faculties' Quality of Work-life and concluded that faculties QWL depending upon the situational requirement so that there is no change according to job designation. There are different types of campuses and programs running under T.U. so that the impact of QWL factors and thinking and perception about QWL of faculties should be different. Considering the above facts the impact of QWL factors among faculty members of constituent and affiliated campuses in T.U. towards QWL, is a researchable phenomenon for this study, and has tried to answer the following research questions:

- Does there any impact exist between autonomy of the work and work environment on the quality of work-life of a faculty member of T.U.?
- The main objective of this study is to examine the comparative impact of autonomy of the work and work environment on QWL of constituent and affiliated campus.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Quality of work life has its generic in the theories of Maslow, Herzberg, and McGregor. The needs for fulfillment as that of Abraham Maslow's motivational theory of needs hierarchy are interrelated with those of the dimensions of QWL. Basic needs like monetary benefits come first, as well as by good working conditions. Later it came planning, career growth, and development of human capabilities to satisfy. Maslow's esteem needs are comparable with the opportunity to apply and develop human capabilities. Lastly,

challenging work is associated with Walton to satisfy self-actualization needs in the need hierarchy. QWL focuses itself on satisfying both hygiene dimensions and motivators as identified by Herzberg to improve the work-life of employees. The assumptions of McGregor can be partition into two sets i.e., those under, Theory X and those under Theory Y' the realization of changing attitudes, values, and work culture of employees. QWL assumes that all employees belong to Theory Y'. Thus, it is proved that the QWL has had its root in these theories of motivation.

According to Akdere (2006), the issue of work-life quality has become important in the last two decades due to the increasing possibilities of today's business environment and family structure. The reality is that in an organization the priority to social understanding and the participation of all parties (i.e., executives, non-executives, and employees) concerned would constitute a positive attitude for better QWL and higher productivity. In this busy life, workmen reach the house after completion of their job with the highest stress. It has been a further change that faculty members play the key role in manipulating their services through providing better education and building the nation, as Hasan, Chowdhury, and Alam (2008) indicated that faculty turnover has a direct effect on the ultimate education system. It is accepted that the organization with good human resources practices can lead to a high QWL for the employees, which ultimately lowers the intention of shifting the jobs.

Most organizations today view QWL as important but do not link it to any of their strategic or business plans which affect employee job satisfaction and retention (Havlovic 1991, Newaz, Ali & Akhter, 2007). Many organizations propose to increase members satisfaction at all levels. However, this is a critical problem, because the separation and determination that factors relate to QWL are difficult in an organization (Seraji & Dargahi, 2006). This sign has created a request to the private university policymakers to identify the underlying conditions and reasons and brought them into consideration the QWL issue. Due to the importance of this sector, it is a necessity to evaluate the QWL of the faculty members of private universities. Because if employees feel that QWL is not adequate, they may leave the job and seek a better QWL. While ensuring QWL, can ensure employee job satisfaction and retention in the organization. QWL is a comprehensive and enlarge program that increases member satisfaction, enriches their learning with the environment, and helps them to address change. Member dissatisfaction of QWL is a problem that harms all workforces without

considering job position and situation.

The autonomy of work and quality of work-life

Quality of work life is operationally defined based on the quality of work-life situations and feelings concept further proposed by Saehkin and Lengermann (1984), according to this concept quality of work life is assumed both as collections of objective favorable or unfavorable job conditions and as collections of subjective feelings of separation from a person's works self. Autonomy i.e. the freedom of an employee to involve independent action on work-related issues, work speed and routine i.e. the degree of structured and routine nature of work with less personal contact, task-related interaction i.e. the degree to which the job provides interpersonal contacts as a part of the work activity, personal growth and opportunity i.e. the scope of learning and growing in the career ladder, and work complexity i.e. the extent to which the job is justifiable and interesting are the sub-areas of quality of work-life conditions. The collection of feelings of acceptance and participation in a positive direction and alienation and separation in a negative direction consist of quality of work-life feeling factor in the study.

Autonomy is the ability of the employees to control the overloading situation. In the autonomy of work, the right is decentralized among the employees where employees can take part in the decision-making process. Moreover, workers plan, coordinate, control, organize and make a decision on work-related activities. QWL exists providing employees with greater responsibility and autonomy. A job that lacks autonomy will result in low QWL.

In autonomous employees are given the freedom of decision making, workers themselves plan, coordinate and control work-related activities it also includes different opportunities for personnel such as independence at work and having the authority to access the related information for their task. Robins (1989) suggests that QWL is a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing an environment to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives.

Warr (1994) challenges the hypothesis that job autonomy is always beneficial. He concludes that the correlation between job autonomy and happiness is inverted U-shaped. When the job autonomy is excessive, the happiness of employees will be degraded. Because high job autonomy may no longer mean "beauty", but become a "necessity" of a job. Employees must adjust their work properly, which instead becomes passive pressure.

According to Scully, Kirkpatrick, and Locke (1995), higher autonomy on the job enhances the acquisition and utilization of knowledge whilst greater participation is held to develop cognitive growth via increased knowledge transfer among employees. Buffardi, Baughman, and Morse (2004) conducted research work on the task force in George Mason University's employees to correctly measure the quality of work life. Using Wiesenberger's construct of perceived organizational support (POS) survey was done to know which key factor affecting employee commitment to the organization, job satisfaction, and general quality of work life. According to this survey, the researcher said that employees are looking for various factors which come under the quality of work-life constructs these are-: health care benefits, salary, retirement benefits, job security, workspace, special recognition for achievements, availability of on-campus child care, adequate input in the decision process and fair and equitable performance appraisal equitable resources distribution.

Rethinam (2008) argued, if the organization provides the appropriate autonomy to design work activities to the individual employees, then it is highly possible that the work activities can adjust their employees' needs that provide the organizational performance. Ganguly (2010) analyzes the QWL of university employees and the relationship between quality of work-life and job satisfaction. The researcher was very careful in data collection. She considered literate and experienced persons who understand the significance of the questionnaire and fill up the data correctly, designed the questionnaire in Bengali, a regional language of the employee for better knowledge and thought flow. The results showed that the employees are not happy with the degree of autonomy, personal growth, and superior support. The staff was not satisfied with their job and unhappy with the QWL of the university.

Bishowkarma (2015) argued that the variable working conditions (WCS) and employee engagement (EEN) are two variables that have the strongest relationship to QWL. Thus, it can be concluded that the working conditions and employee engagement is important in the non-financial sector than that of the financial sector in Nepal. It may also indicate that stress at the work level is lower in the non-financial sector than that of the financial sector in Nepal.

Srivastava (2016) argued organization structure is the arrangement of the task, correlation of various departments and levels of authority to achieve a delegation of authority, cooperation of efforts, and effective communication along the scalar chain of

command. A safe school provides opportunities for students to learn to the best of their abilities, for teachers to operate under the conditions that encourage transformation and new ideas, and for increasing and strengthening the administrative capacities and strength of institutional leaders. This is because knowledgeable, proficient, and conscientious employees are desirous of providing services under that condition. **H_1:** There is a positive significant impact of autonomy of the work on QWL of faculty members.

Work environment and quality of work-life

It has gained importance since industrial revaluation as a result of the contributions of certain eminent management thinkers like Robert Owen, Charles Babbage, F. W. Taylor, Elton Mayo, and so on. It has claimed a huge role in the period of globalization where every organization is facing problems to survive and prosper in a rapidly changing situation where only the knowledgeable, talented and contented employees can only be the ultimate source of survival. So every organization across the globe is working hard to sustain their employees contented by introducing and bringing required change in the current Quality of Work-Life programs. Different factors are taken into consideration while planning the QWL programs. As per the definition given by the International Labor Relation Conference (1919), QWL is about exposing the conditions for a humane working life. Employees are human beings and therefore they need to be considered with thoughtfulness, kindness, and sympathy. Human beings should be implied for organizational works to meet organizational goals in a way that causes them as little pain or suffering as possible. Quality of work-life can be defined as the conditions of objective conditions/status of living of workers at the workplace. It is a function between objective situations of life and subjective attitude. Improved QWL will result in productivity improvement and benefits from productivity improvements. Orpen (1981) strongly focused that employees should not be exposed to working conditions that can adversely affect their physical and mental health. Many of the researchers in the domain of quality of work-life believe that safe and healthy work conditions have a significant effect on QWL. May, Lau, and Johnson (1999) pointed out that companies offering better QWL and supportive work environments would likely gain leverage in hiring and retaining valuable people, and companies with high QWL enjoy exceptional growth and profitability.

Ellis and Pompli (2002) forward a study on the QWL of nurses in Canberra. The

study explored that poor working environment, resident aggression, workload, inability to deliver the quality of care preferred, imbalance of work and family, shift work, lack of involvement in decision making, professional isolation, Quality of work-life is a set of supportive conditions and environments of a workplace that enhance and promote satisfaction and work motivation (Dhar, Dhar & Roy, 2006). Saraji and Dargahi (2006) explored QWL as a comprehensive, department-wide program designated to improve employee satisfaction, strengthening workplace learning, and helping employees had better manage, change, and transition by conducting descriptive and analytical studies. QWL programs will need both faculty and management, to mutually solving work-related problems, building cooperation, improving work environments, restructuring tasks carefully, and fairly managing human resource outcomes and payoff.

Dahie, Mohamed, and Khalif (2017) utilized convenient sampling to collect 95 questionnaires from the University of Somalia in Mogadishu, Somalia. These respondents were provided a questionnaire with three main constructs which measuring general well-being, career and job satisfaction, and working conditions. However, the study found that general well-being, career and job satisfaction as well as good working conditions workplace has a significant influence on the quality of work life.

Akter and Banik (2018) conducted a study of employees' status of QWL in RMG units in Bangladesh. The dimensions taken into account were career and growth opportunities, fair Payment, Job Security and safety, leave and holiday benefits, social and psychological support Work Environment, with the outcome that suggested saying, Work Environment should be enhanced which is affecting the Quality of working life of employees. Aharon, Madjar, and Kagan (2019) this study focuses on the relationships between job satisfaction, work environment, organizational commitment, and quality of work life. It was concluded that OC and QWL are factors that influence and managers should create an environment for this.

H_2: There is a positive significant influence of work environment on QWL of teaching faculties.

METHODOLOGY

Philosophical aspects and research design

The ontological stance is reality exists out there on University Campuses. Moreover, epistemology is "objective" because the body of knowledge is extracted directly from the

subjects in an objective manner. Moreover, the deductive approach is used to commence quantitative research in collecting and sorting data thus methodology includes the adoption of quantitative methods so that findings are supported through numerical significance. After exploration of ontological, epistemological stance, and methodology explored the axiological view by considering the criterion of inclusion of constituent and affiliated campuses teaching faculties of T.U. The study applied descriptive and explanatory research design.

Population and Sampling procedure

The population of the study assumed total permanent faculty members of Gandaki Pradesh two constituent and seven affiliated campuses of T.U. Total faculty members are 455. Among them 333 members from constituent campuses and 122 members from affiliated campuses. As a probability sampling, stratified sampling method the strata formulated based on the current job position of faculty members (Professors, Associate Professors, and Lecturers). Sample size determined by applying Yamane (1967) formula

The minimum sample size is 213. Among them 157 members from constituent campuses and 56 members from affiliated campuses. This study covers 244 faculty members as a sample size among professors, associated professors, and lecturers.

Measuring instrument and data collection procedure

5 point Likert scales (1) strongly disagree and (5) strongly agree. Data are collected through a Structural administrated questionnaire in form of Google form. Total distributed questionnaires are 467, filled up 256, and valid for using analysis for research work are 244.

Ratability test

Cronbach alpha is used for testing the reliability of data. Reliability reflects the consistency of a set of items (variables) in measuring the study concept. . It may be mentioned that its value varies from 0 to 1, but the satisfactory value is required to be more than 0.6 for the scale to be reliable (Malhotra, 2002; Cronbach, 1951). In the present study, we, therefore, were used Cronbach's alpha as a measure of the reliability of the scale.

Table 1
Reliability Value of the Variables

Variables	Cronbach Alpha of constituent campuses	Cronbach Alpha of affiliated campuses	Cronbach Alpha of both constituent and affiliated campuses
Work environment	0.714	0.780	0.730
The autonomy of the work	0.700	0.750	0.725
Quality of work-life (QWL)	0.740	0.750	0.740

Source: Field survey, 2021

The Alpha value of all independent variables is more than 0.71 so the data are highly reliable and consistent.

Data analysis tools

Descriptive analysis (mean and standard deviation) for exploring the position of two dimensions of QWL and linear multiple regression analysis examined the impact of two dimensions on the total quality of work-life of teaching faculties in University.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The present study emphasizes on impact of two dimensions of quality of QWL on the total quality of work-life of faculty members. So that the study applied different tools and instruments for analyzing the result these tools are descriptive analysis and multiple regressions.

Demographic description of the sample respondents

In this study, the demographic nature is characterized based on the respondent's age, gender, campus engagement, educational qualification, job position, and faculty or department. The demographic characteristics of constituent and affiliated campuses are

divided into multiple categories. For analyzing the different raw data, the demographic variables are applied as basic components

Table 2

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variables	Affiliated Campuses		Constituent Campuses	
	No. of respondents	Percentage of respondents	No of respondents	Percentage of respondents
Age(years)				
Below 40	38.00	49.40	27.00	16.20
40-50	33.00	42.90	68.00	40.70
Above 50	6.00	7.80	72.00	43.10
Gender				
female	15.00	19.50	11.00	6.60
Male	62.00	80.50	156.00	93.40
Campus engagement				
GMMC	12.00	15.60	-	-
JMC	19.00	24.70	-	-
KAC	10.00	13.00		
WRC	-	-	25.00	15.00
PNC	-	-	142.00	85.00
BMC	7.00	9.10	-	-
DMC	8.00	10.40	-	-
MMC	9.00	11.70	-	-
WMC	12.00	15.60	-	-
Educational qualification				
Master degree	72.00	93.50	134.00	80.20
M.Phil.	5.00	6.50	13.00	7.80
PhD	-	-	20.00	12.00
Job Position				
Lecturer	77.00	100	119.00	71.30
Associate professor	-	-	37.00	22.00

Professor	-	-	11.00	6.60
Faculty/ department				
Education	21.00	27.30	30.00	18.00
Engineering	-	-	20.00	12.00
Humanities and social science	17.00	22.10	47.00	28.10
Management	35.00	45.50	25.00	15.00
Science and technology	4.00	5.20	45.00	26.90

Source: Field survey, 2021

Of the respondents of affiliated campuses, 80.50 percent were male and 19.50 percent were female likewise among constituent campuses 93.40 percent male and 6.60 percent female respondents. Both types of campuses male-dominant gender conditions but female representation in affiliated campuses are better than constituent campuses. The majority of the respondents were aged less than 40 years in affiliated campuses i.e. 49.40 percent whereas in constituent campuses majority of respondents are more than 50 years i.e. represent 43.10 percent, In affiliated campuses above 50 aged respondents is very nominal i.e. 7.8 percent and in constituent campuses, less than 40 years respondents are the least number i.e. represent 16.20 percent. Most of the respondents in affiliated campuses are younger and in constituent campuses are old age more than 50 years.

Of the representation of respondents of two constituent campuses 85.00 percent of the respondents were from PNC and 15.00 percent from WRC most of the respondents are from PNC because the total population is from PNC larger. Likewise out of affiliated campuses 24.70 percent from JMC, 15.60 percent from GMMC, 13.00 percent were from KAC, 9.10 percent respondents from BMC, 10.40 percent from DMC, 11.70 percent from MMC, and 15.6 percent from WMC. In constituent campuses, most of the respondents are from PNC and in affiliated campuses, JMC represents a higher percentage. The majority of respondents have master's degrees in affiliated campuses i.e. 93.50 percent, M.Phil. 6.50 percent and none of the respondents is a doctorate. In constituent campuses most of the respondents are master degree i, e, 80.20 percent, 7.80 percent respondents are M.Phil. and 12.00 percent respondents are PhD. From the qualification point of view, the constituent campus respondents earn higher degrees of qualification M.Phil. and PhD than affiliated campuses.

In terms of job position of service in affiliated campuses, 100 percent of the respondents had a lecturer of which no one had on position on the associate professors and professor. In constituent campuses 71.30 percent of respondents are Lecturers, 22.20 percent respondents are Associate professors, and 6.60 percent respondents are Professors. The majority of both types of campuses' respondents are Lecturers but in affiliated campuses, none of the respondents holds the position of Associate professors and professors. Respondents represent by teaching faculty or department in affiliated campuses 45.50 percent from management, same as from humanities and social science 22.10 percent, 5.20 percent from science and technology, and 27.30 percent from education, none of the representation from engineering. In constituent campuses, 18.00 percent from education, 12.00 percent from engineering, 28.10 percent from management, and 26.90 percent from science and technology among a total population of departments.

Descriptive analysis

To describe the responses for the major variables, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations on all the independent and dependent variables were obtained. Table-3 shows the overall results of mean, standard deviations of the QWL, and its dimensions.

Table 3

Descriptive Analysis of Position of Two Dimensions and Total QWL

Variables	Constituent Campuses			Affiliated Campuses		
	No.of respondent	Mean	Standard Deviation	No.of respondent	Mean	Standard Deviation
Work Environment	167	9.74	4.79	77	10.45	5.66
Autonomy of the work	167	9.77	4.74	77	11.03	5.46
Quality of work-life	167	10.10	4.94	77	10.88	5.55

Source: Field survey, 2021

From the results in Table-3, all the dependent and independent variables' total mean score is maximum of 25 and the minimum score is 5. The dependent variable QWL of constituent campuses has a mean score of 10.10 with an S.D of 4.94. Likewise, the independent variable of these campuses' work environment and autonomy of the work represent 9.74 and 9.77 with S.D of these dimensions is 4.79 and 4.74 respectively.

Between these, two independents variables autonomy of the work bearing a higher mean score of 9.77 with an S.D of 4.74. It can be seen that the mean score of QWL variables lies between 11.64 to 8.88 with a standard deviation of 5.01 to 4.74. This indicates that the highest mean score is bearing by the autonomy of the work between two independent variables.

Likewise, in affiliated campuses, the mean score of the dependent variable quality of work-life is 10.88 with an S.D. of 5.55 and mean score and S.D of two independent variables are 10.45, and 11.03 with S.D of 5.66, and 5.55 for the work environment and autonomy of the work respectively. In affiliated campuses, the work environment bearing higher means score with S. D of 5.46 so the respondents give more attention to autonomy of the work in constituent campuses, and work environment is a more focused dimension in affiliated campuses.

Impact of four dimensions of QWL on the total quality of work-life

The relationship of two dimensions on quality of work-life

Correlation analysis was performed to test the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Pearson correlation matrix was developed to determine the correlation between the dimensions used for assessing the overall quality of the work-life level of faculty members. The relationship and significance level presents a different dimension on QWL.

Table 4

Relationship and Significance Level of Four Dimensions and Total QWL

Variables	Constituent Campuses		Affiliated Campuses	
	Correlation value(r)	P-value	Correlation value(r)	P-value
Quality of work-life	1.000	-	1.000	-
work environment	0.432	0.000	0.433	0.000
Autonomy of the work	0.248	0.000	0.333	0.002

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table no. 4 indicates that the correlation value (r) of constituent campuses on two dimensions work environment and autonomy of the work are 0.432 and 0.248 respectively and P-value is < 0.01 for all dimensions so that both dimensions have a positive and significant relationship on quality of work-life. Likewise, the correlation

value (r) of two dimensions of affiliated campuses is 0.433 and 0.333 for the work environment and autonomy of the work respectively. The P-value of all dimensions is <0.01 so that the relationship and correlation on QWL are the same as constituent campuses. All the relationships are positive and significant so that all variables are highly significant and correlated to the total QWL.

Test of multicollinearity and impact of independent variables

For testing the impact of independent variables on dependent variables R^2 is calculated the R^2value of two dimensions of QWL and total QWL of constituent campuses is 0.33 and affiliated campuses is 0.32 which is consistent in both types of campuses. Chin (1998, 2010) pointed out that R^2 values of 25 percent were considered as large, 9 percent as a medium, and 1 percent as small. Therefore, the R^2 showed that the study model fits the data and is a valid model that covers a considerable amount of the variation. Calculating R^2 is not so higher so that there do not exist multicollinearity problems. Another factor of testing multicollinearity is VIF (variance inflation factors), the VIF of variables are:

Table 5

Test of Multicollinearity among Independent Variables

Variables	VIF of constituent campuses	VIF of affiliated campuses
Work environment	1.067	1.394
Autonomy of the work	1.198	1.521

Source: SPSS output

Table no. 5 presents that the calculating value of variance inflation factor of independent variables is not so high all the values are within 1 to 1.521 which are very smaller than standard general setting value 5 so that there are no multicollinearity problems.

Impact on the total quality of work-life

Multiple regression techniques present the comparative impact of two dimensions on the QWL of faculty members of constituent and affiliated campuses. The regression result of these dimensions is presented in table no.6 and 7.

Table 6

Impact of Four Dimensions of QWL on Total Quality of Work-life of Constituent Campuses

Variables	Coefficient value (∅)	T-value	Significance value(p-value)
Constant	1.518	1.454	0.148
Work environment	0.345	5.047	0.000
Autonomy of the work	0.077	1.037	0.292

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 7

Impact of Four Dimensions of QWL on Total Quality of Work-life of Affiliated Campuses

Variables	Coefficient value (∅)	T-value	Significance value(p-value)
Constant	2.144	1.280	0.205
Work environment	0.271	2.406	0.019
Autonomy of the work	0.033	0.272	0.787

Source: Field survey, 2021

From Table 6 and 7, for the autonomy of the work dimension, β is 0.077, T value is 1.057, P>0.05; β is 0.033, T value is 0.272, P>0.05 in constituent and affiliated campuses, respectively. The result implies that autonomy of the work has no significant effect on the quality of work-life in constituent and affiliated campuses. Therefore, there is no strong evidence to support H_1 in both constituent and affiliated campuses. It can be argued that for academic staff of constituent and affiliated campuses, the autonomy of the work is an insignificant dimension of QWL that affects their quality of work-life. From Table 6 and 7, for the work environment dimension, β is 0.345, t value is 5.047, P<0.05; β is 0.271; T value is 2.406, P<0.05 in constituent and affiliated campuses, respectively. The result implies that the work environment has a significant effect on the quality of work-life in constituent and affiliated campuses. Therefore, there is strong evidence to support H_2 in both constituent and affiliated campuses.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, AND IMPLICATION

Discussion

Impact of autonomy of the work on quality of work-life

The impact of autonomy of the work on quality of work-life is insignificant and not

fully supported in both constituent and affiliated campuses. The result of Tables 6 and 7, present that the impact is the same in both types of campuses. It means that the autonomy of the work could not play a pivotal role in their quality of work-life. An earlier study by Saraji and Dargahi (2006) examined the Nursing college's Work-life Satisfaction survey results presented that Pay and Autonomy were the two most important components of nurses' quality of work-life they play a significant role in employees' QWL. However, Warr (1994) challenges the hypothesis that job autonomy is usually beneficial. He argues that the relationship between job autonomy and happiness is inverted U-shaped. When job autonomy is excessive, the happiness of employees will be reduced. Because high job autonomy may no longer mean beauty, but become a necessity of work. Employees must manage their work properly, which instead becomes passive.

It is cleared that the result of the study between autonomy of the work and QWL depends upon the situation and nature of the job so that the results of the impact of autonomy of work have not significant in this study. Past studies have presented mixed results some of the studies presented significant results and some of the same relational studies presented insignificant results, the present research work presented the insignificant impact of autonomy of the work on quality of work-life on both types of campuses.

Work environment and quality of work-life

The impact of the work environment on the quality of work-life is significant and fully supported in both constituent and affiliated campuses. The result of Tables 6 and 7, present that the impact is the same in both types of campuses. It means that the work environment of University campuses plays a pivotal role in their quality of work-life. Both types of campuses presented the same directional relationship on the quality of work-life. If the work environment was improved then the QWL of faculty members also be improved. In the past, the result of the relationship was explored by Dahie, Mohamed, and Khalif (2017) utilized convenient sampling to collect 95 questionnaires from the University of Somalia in Mogadishu, Somalia. These respondents were provided a questionnaire with three main constructs which measuring general well-being, career and job satisfaction, and working conditions. However, the study found that general well-being, career and job satisfaction as well as good working conditions workplace has a significant influence on the quality of work life.

Saraji and Dargahi (2006) explored QWL as a comprehensive, department-wide program designated to improve strengthening workplace learning, employee satisfaction, and helping employees had better manage, change, and transition by conducting the descriptive and analytical study. QWL factors will benefit both faculty and management, by aggregately solving work-related problems, building cooperation, improving work environments, restructuring tasks carefully, and fairly managing human resource outcomes and payoff. The working environment of a university is the important quality factor for teaching-learning activities thus both types of campuses have the same conception on quality of work-life. So the result of the study also explores the same result of the past study.

CONCLUSION

From the findings of this study, autonomy does not play a pivotal role in determining the QWL of faculty members. The study also indicates that the other factors of QWL more important than the autonomy of the work in teaching-learning activities. The feeling on the autonomy of the work in University campuses is situational and depends upon the faculties' phenomena so that it cannot play a significant role in determining the QWL of faculties in T.U. in all the situations. Both types of campuses mostly emphasize improving the work environment, arrange proper and adequate compensation, and established good relations among colleagues. Therefore it could be useful if the university provides space and flexibility to ensure that academic staff was able to maintain good co-worker relationships. This would enhance the total QWL of academic staff on campuses. Based on the findings of this study, improving the QWL of academic staff does not only affect their total quality of work-life but would also improve the performance of the university.

IMPLICATION

The policy implications may be useful for the overall improvement of QWL of work-life among faculty members of Tribhuvan University should develop a good working condition. This facilitates academic professionals to do their work effectively. University can adjust QWL factors by evaluating the organization nature and perceptual conception due to that QWL factors play an important role to enrich the inner capacity of faculty members. This study will also serve as valuable contributions to future research of

other main dimensions of QWL of faculties. These main dimensions will be training and development, job security, factors of work-life balance, and constitutionalism. It will also provide direction to comparative causal study about quality of work-life of faculties in constituent and affiliated campuses of T.U by adjusting the mediating role of organizational commitment to job performance.

REFERENCES

Adhikar, D. R. & Gautam, D. K. (2010). Labour legislation for improving the quality of work-life in Nepal. *International Journal of Law and Management,* 52(1), 40-53.

Aharon, A. A., Madjar, B., & Kagan, I. (2019). Organizational Commitment and quality of life at work among public health nurses in Israel. *Public Health Nursing.*

Akdere, M. (2006). Improving the quality of work-life: Implications for human resources. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 6 (1), 173-177.

Akter, K. M., & Banik, S. (2018). Factors Affecting the Quality of Working Life: An Enquiry into the RMG Industry of Bangladesh. *Journal of Human Resource Management,* 6(1), 26-36.

Biswakarma, G. R. (2015). Quality of work life in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences*, 19-26.

Buffardi, L., Baughman, K., & Morse, K. (2004). *Findings from the 2003 Quality of Work Life Survey of George Mason University Employees*, Draft Report.

Chin, W. W. (1998). The Partial Least Squares Approach to Structural Equation Modelling. *Modern Methods for Business Research,* 295 (2), 295–336.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 6, (3), 297-334.

Dahie, A. M., Mohamed A. A. & Khalif, H. B. (2017). Examining factors affecting the Quality of Work Life of Lecturers: A case study from the University of Somalia in Mogadishu, Somalia. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering and Research Development (IJAERD),* 4(4), 117-124.

Dhar, U., Dhar, S., & Roy, R. (2006). *Quality of work-life scale*. Agra: National psychological corporation.

Ellis, N., & Pompli, A. (2002). *Quality of working life for nurses*. Commonwealth Dept of Health and Ageing. Canberra.

Ganguly, R. (2010). Quality of Worklife and Job Satisfaction of A Group of University Employees. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 209-216.

Gayathiri, R. & Ramakrishnan, L. (2013). Quality of work life: Linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(1), 1–8.

Goode, D. A. (1989). *Quality of life, quality of work life.In W. E. Kiernan and R.L. Schalock*. Economics, Industry and Disability, 337-349.

Hasan, K .M. S., Chowdhury, M. & Alam, M. A. (2008). Faculty Turnover in Private Universities of Bangladesh-A Critical Evaluation. *The Business and Economics Review*, 1(2), 99-113.

Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes. *Industrial Relations*, 30(3), 469-479.

Malhotra, N. K. (2002). *Marketing research: an applied orientation* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Pearson Education Asia.

May, B. E., Lau, R. S. M., & Johnson, S. K. (1999). A longitudinal study of quality of work-life and business performance. *South Dakota Business Review, 58(*2),3-7.

Orpen, C (1981). The Conceptualization of quality of working life perspectives. *Industrial Psychology,* (7), 36-69.

Pugalendi, S. B., Umaselvi, M & Nakkeeran, S. K. (2010). Quality of Work-life: Perception of College Teachers. *MPRA, Munich Personal RePEearchive*, 2(1), 47-65.

Rethinam, G. S. (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 7(1), 58-70.

Robbins, S. P. (1989). *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications* (Fourth Edition Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall

Saehkin, M., & Lengermann, J. J. (1984*). Quality of work-life conditions/feelings*. San Diego: University Association 8517 Production Ave.

Saraji, G. N., Dargahi, H. (2006). Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL*). Iranian Journal of Public Health,* 35(4), 8-14.

Scully, J., Kirkpatrick, A., & Locke, E. (1995). Locus of Knowledge as a Determination of the Effects of Participation on Performance, Affect, and Perceptions. *Organizational Behaviour Human Decision Making Process*, 61, 276-288.

Srivastava, P. (2016). Leadership styles in western & eastern societies and their relation with organizational performance. *The Journal of Management Awareness,* 19(1).

Warr, P. B. (1994). A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Work and Mental Health. Work & Stress: *An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 8, 84-97.

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics, an Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row.