EMPIRICAL STUDY ON DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES INFLUENCING QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF PUNJAB GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Deepak Kochar*

**Associate Professor, GGN Khalsa College, Civil Lines, Ludhiana, Punjab, India.*
Email: kochhardipak@gmail.com

Abstract *The present study is designed to investigate the relationship of QWL and various job specific demographic variables of veterinary doctors working under Dept. of Animal Husbandry, Punjab. The purpose of this study is to provide the current profile of doctors toward worklife. Primary data from 322 respondents were collected with the help of a pre-tested questionnaire to have an insight of thoughts of opinions of respondents relating to the research problem. In order to identify the demographic variables which significantly affect QWL among the respondents, regression analysis for each of the variable (continuous, dichotomous and nominal) has been performed. The analysis reveals that age, job experience, sufficient income, sufficient time, and sufficient social support have been found to be significant explanatory variables of QWL of the respondents, whereas distance of residence from work place, monthly expenditure, working or not working spouse, average weekly hours, and social and economic background have not been found to be significant explanatory variables.*

Keywords: *Veterinary Doctors, QWL*

Introduction

For an organisation to be successful and achieve its organisational objectives it is imperative that its employees are satisfied with their work, since work occupies an important place in many people's lives, such conditions are likely to affect not only their physical but also a high level of social, psychological and spiritual well-being. It is well established in literature that employees with a high level of psychological well-being are more committed and more productive than employees with a low level of psychological well-being (Wright & Bonett, 2007; Wright & Cropanzano, 2004). Nonetheless, employees are likely to have higher well-being if they are satisfied with their work and organisation and they perceive their Quality of Work Life (QWL) positively, since an employee's experiences in the workplace and his/her QWL influence his/her health and psychological well-being (Chan & Wyatt, 2007; Srivastava, 2007).

The existing literature supports that many work life and non-work life attributes have considerable influence on the QWL of an individual. Many demographic variables may also affect the level of QWL being experienced by the individuals. There have been a number of individual characteristics explored in relation with quality of work life. Among those are gender, age, marital status, education, family income, race, hours worked, work experience, individual background, and number and age of children (Hossain, 1997; Mott *et al*. 2004; & Schommer, 2004; Saragi & Dargahi, 2006; Raduan et al. 2006; Argentero *et al*. 2007). Prior research by Mott *et al.* (2004) revealed that gender, race, education, years of experience, age, and marital status had significant influence on the quality of pharmacists' work life. On the contrary Argentero *et al*. (2007) revealed that work life score does not appear to be influenced by sex, role, age or number of working years in a specific department but what seems affecting quality of work life is the amount of weekly work.

The present study is designed to investigate the relationship of QWL and various job specific demographic variables of veterinary doctors working under Dept. of Animal Husbandry, Punjab. The purpose of this study is to provide the current profile of doctors toward worklife.

Research Methodology

Data Collection

As the research is exploratory in nature, primary data were collected with the help of a pre-tested questionnaire to have an insight of thoughts of opinions of respondents relating to the research problem. In order to collect the sample, initially

the questionnaire was e-mailed to all the veterinary officers, but observing the lukewarm response of the officers it was decided to approach them either personally or seek the help of senior veterinary officers and deputy directors of various districts. In order to ensure a higher response rate, concerted efforts were made to contact the doctors either personally or telephonically. Finally completed questionnaires were received from 322 respondents depicting 49.61 % of the universe.

Profile of the Respondents

As reported in Table 1, the age of the respondents of the present study varies from 23 years to 58 years with average age of 41.63 years and standard deviation of 8.748 years, total experience of respondents varies from 1 to 36 years with an average of 15.75 years and standard deviation of 9.463 years, the distance of residence from work place varies from 0 to 82 km with an average distance of 15.31km and standard deviation of 12.67 km, total monthly expenditure varies from Rs 8000 to Rs 90,000 with average expenditure of Rs 35,024.84 and standard deviation of Rs 15749.58, 83.5 percent of respondents felt that their income is sufficient to meet their family expenditure, 63 percent of respondents are having working spouse, 76.1 percent of respondents reported having sufficient time to meet the requirements of various roles they perform, 87.3 percent of respondents reported availability of sufficient social support in case of need, 41.3 percent of respondents worked for 41-50 hours per week whereas 17.7 percent respondents worked for more than 60 hours per week, 43.2 percent of respondents belonged to urban background, 20.2 percent of respondents belonged to semi-rural area whereas 36.6 percent of respondents belonged to rural background, 89.9 percent respondents belonged to middle class, 6.2 percent respondents belonged to elite class where as 4 percent respondents belonged to poor class.

Table 1: Profile of the Respondent Doctors

Serial no.	Demographic behaviour	Categories	Number	Percentage
1	Age	20-29	31	9.6
		30-39	100	31.1
		40-49	112	34.8
		50-59	79	24.5
2	Experience	0-9	92	28.6
		10-19	104	32.3
		20-29	103	32
		>30	23	7.1
4	Work place distance (reported by 318 respondents)	≤20	232	72.95
		21-40	77	24.21
		41-60	6	1.88
		61-80	2	0.62
		>80	1	0.31
5	Perception about income	Sufficient income	269	83.5
		Insufficient income	53	16.5
6	Monthly expenditure (Rs.)	8,000-20,000	75	23.3
		21,000-41,000	158	49.1
		42,000-60,000	74	23.0
		>60,000	15	4.7
7	Spouse	Working	119	37
		Non-working	203	63
8	Availability of time	Sufficient	245	23.9
		Insufficient	77	76.1
9	Availability of social support	Sufficient	281	87.3
		Insufficient	41	12.7
10	Average working hours per week	30-40	56	17.4
		41-50	133	41.3
		51-60	76	23.6
		>60	57	17.7
11	Social background	Urban	139	43.2
		Semi-rural	65	20.2
		Rural	118	36.6

Scales / Variables used

Quality of Work Life- Scale Development

To measure the QWL of veterinary doctors in Punjab, a scale measuring overall well-being was designed through an iterative process involving a creation of comprehensive list of factors which determine overall well-being of an individual. Finally, six different factors including; health, happiness, relationship with spouse and children, relationship with other important people, satisfaction with job and with family were refined and validated by using standard psychometric measures. For health and quality of relationship with spouse, children and with other important people, response were asked on a three point scale ranging from 'good' to 'poor', with weights 3 for 'good', 2 for 'average' and 1 for 'poor'. Similarly, happiness and satisfaction with job and with family were measured on a three point scale, ranging from high to low, with weights 3, 2 and 1 for 'high', 'moderate' and 'low'. The Cronbach alpha, a measure of internal consistency of the scale has been found to be 0.79.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables considered in the present study include: age, job experience, distance of residence from work place, monthly expenditure, whether respondents have sufficient income to meet their needs, whether the spouse of the respondents is working or not, whether respondents have sufficient time or not, whether respondents have sufficient social support or not, weekly work hours, social background, and economic background. The list of demographic variables includes some variables which have already been examined for their influence on quality of work life by different researchers. But some more variables which seem to be related to involvement of the respondents in their job and also affect the working of job have been added to the list. In order to examine the cause and effect relationship between demographic variables and quality of work life of the respondents, linear regression model for each demographic variable has been constructed.

Results and Discussion

A single score has been calculated for each respondent by adding the weights assigned to original responses of the respondents about the six dimensions considered for measuring quality of work life among the veterinary doctors. The score is expected to vary from 6 to 18, where 6 indicate poor quality of life and 18 indicates a high quality of work life. The actual range of scores in the present sample has been calculated to be 6 to 18 with a mean of 2.69 and S.D of 2.03, which indicate high quality of work life being enjoyed by the respondents of the present study.

As a preliminary requirement of regression model, a correlation matrix for continuous variables has been constructed. The results of correlation matrix are reported in Table 2 which reveals that quality of work life has been significantly and positively associated with age of the respondents ($r = 0.164$, $p \leq 0.01$), job experience ($r = 0.146$, $p \leq 0.01$) and monthly expenditure ($r = 0.122$, $p \leq 0.01$). It has been found negatively associated with distance of residence from work place ($r = -0.082$) but the relationship is found to be insignificant.

Table 2: Correlations between Demographic Variables and QWL

	Age	Job Experience	Distance of Work Place from Residence	Monthly Expenditure
QWL	0.164**	0.146**	-0.082	0.122**

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 levels (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at 0.05 levels (2-tailed).

In order to identify the demographic variables which significantly affect QWL among the respondents, regression analysis for each of the variable (continuous, dichotomous and nominal) has been performed. All nominally scaled and dichotomous variables were recoded into dummy variables and the results have been reported in the following text.

Age

Age of the respondents is being examined for its influence on QWL. Information about the age of the respondents was sought and it is reported in Table 1 that 9.6 percent of the respondents of the present study were from the age group 20-29, 31.1 percent were from the age group 30-39, 34.8 percent were from the age group of 40-49 and 24.5 percent were from the age group of 50-59. The results of the linear regression model are reported in Table 3 which reveals that age has been a significant explanatory variable which explains 2.7 percent of variance in the QWL of respondents. The regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.038$, $p \leq 0.01$) indicates that those who are older tend to have better QWL. The results are in agreement with study conducted by Hitt *et al*. (1983) and Bolhari *et al*. (2011). Similarly, in a study conducted by Hossain (1997) among industrial workers same results were reported stating that there is a significant positive relation between the age of the workers and their QWL

Table 3: Age and QWL ($R^2 = 0.027$, $p \leq 0.01$)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant	14.571	26.786	0.000
Age	0.038	2.982	0.003

Job Experience

Job experience is another variable which has been examined for its impact on the level of QWL of the respondents. As reported in Table 1 that 28.6 percent of the respondents of the present study were having total experience of 0-9 years, 32.3 percent of the respondents were having total experience of 10-19 years, 32 percent of the respondents were having total experience of 20-29 years and only 7.1 percent of the respondents have total experience above 30 years.

Table 4: Job Experience and QWL ($R^2 = 0.021$, $p \leq 0.01$)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant	15.666	71.963	0.000
Job Experience	0.031	2.638	0.009

As reported in Table 4, job experience has been found to be a significant explanatory variable which explains 2.1 percent variance in QWL of the respondents with regression coefficient ($\beta = 0.031$, $p \leq 0.01$). The study reveals that the respondents with more job experience are enjoying better QWL as compared to those having less job experience. The results are in consonant with the studies conducted by Hossain (1997) who investigated the relationship between QWL and work experience amongst industrial workers in Bangladesh and found a positive correlation between work experience and QWL. Similar results are reported by Bolhari *et al*. (2011) who examined the relationship between QWL and demographic characteristics of technical staffs in Iran.

Distance of Residence from Work Place

An attempt has also been made to study the impact of residence distance from work place on QWL of the respondents. Information about work place distance from residence reported that 72.95 percent of the respondents travel less than 20.00 km everyday, 24.21 percent of the respondents travel 21- 40 km, 1.88 percent of the respondents travel 41- 60 km, 0.62 percent of the respondents travel 61- 80 km and 0.31 percent of the respondents travel more than 80 km everyday. As reported in Table 5 the variable has been found to be negatively associated with QWL but does not emerge as a significant predictor of QWL. From the information given above, it is inferred that majority of the respondents travel less than 20 km everyday and which seems to be not affecting the QWL.

Table 5: Distance of Residence from Work Place and QWL ($R^2 = 0.007$, insignificant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant	16.280	116.519	0.000
Residence Distance from Work Place	-0.007	-1.470	0.142

Monthly Expenditure

Income level has been examined by various researches for its impact on the level of QWL experienced by respondents. In earlier research conducted by Saraji and Dargahi (2006) on hospital employees, it was reported that having a good income is an important issue for a high QWL. In a research by Raduan *et al*. (2006) among free trade zone managers, it was noticed that higher the income obtained by the respondents, higher the level of QWL among respondents. In the present study also the relationship between the monthly expenditure and QWL of the respondents has been examined. As reported in Table 1, 23.3 percent of the respondents have been spending monthly in the range of 8,000- 20,000, 49.1 percent of the respondents spending in the range of 21,000- 41,000, 23 percent spending 42,000- 60,000 and 4.7 percent have reported spending more than 60,000 per month to meet their needs. As reported in Table 6 monthly expenditure has not been found to be a significant predictor variable. It may be interpreted that the monthly expenditure of the respondents has not been found to be an indicator of quality of life as with change in income the perception of the people about quality of life might also be changing.

Table 6: Monthly Expenditure and QWL ($R^2 = 0.015$, insignificant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant	15.606	56.882	0.000
Monthly Expenditure	0.00001577	2.207	0.645

Sufficient Income

The present study has also attempted to investigate the relationship between sufficient income and QWL of the respondents. The information about the perception of the respondents regarding sufficiency of income has been sought. As reported in Table 1, 83.5 percent of the respondents have reported having sufficient income and 16.5 percent of the respondents have reported not having sufficient income to meet their needs. It has been used as a dichotomous variable, as having sufficient income and not having sufficient income and an independent variable and QWL as a dependent variable in the linear regression model and the results are reported in Table 7. The table discloses that sufficient income has been found to be a significant predictor variable, which explains 12.8 percent of variance of QWL of respondents. The group of respondents not having sufficient income has been used as a reference group. The intercept is 14.528 and this represents mean QWL score of those who have insufficient income. The regression coefficient for group having sufficient income (1.951) indicates that the mean QWL scores of group having sufficient income is 1.951 more than the mean QWL score of group having insufficient income and so is equal to 16.479 (14.528 + 1.951) which is significantly different at 1 percent level of significance. It is apparent that income plays a significant role in determining the QWL. Majority of the respondents reported that they have sufficient income to meet their needs which leads to peaceful family life and harmonious relations among the family members, thus leading to a better QWL.

Table 7: Sufficient Income and QWL ($R^2 = 0.128$, $p \leq 0.01$)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant: Insufficient Income	14.528	55.736	0.000
Sufficient Income	1.951	6.842	0.000

Working Spouse

An attempt has also been made to study the impact of whether the spouse is working or not on QWL of the respondents. In the present study, it is reported that 37 percent of respondents have working spouse and 63 percent of the respondents have non-working spouse. For these two categories, a dummy variable was introduced as independent variable and QWL as a dependent variable and the results are reported in Table 8.

Table 8: Spouse Working and QWL ($R^2 = 0.001$, in-significant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant: Non-Working Spouse	16.067	86.319	0.000
Working Spouse	0.145	0.617	0.538

As reported in Table 8, this variable has not shown significant explanatory value affecting QWL. The group of the respondents not having working spouse has been used as a reference group. The intercept is 16.067 and this represents the mean QWL score of group of respondents not having working spouse. It is evident from the results that QWL of the respondents is not affected by working or non-working spouse. It seems that majority of the respondents with non-working spouse feel contended with single income, as the veterinarians are placed in group-A (According to pay commission recommendations). Another reason which may be anticipated for the given results is the indifferent attitude of the respondents for both the options due to their respective positive and negative aspects.

Sufficient Time

The present study has also attempted to investigate the relationship between availability of sufficient time and QWL of the respondents. As reported in Table 1, 76.1 percent of the respondents reported having sufficient time to manage their job and family and 23.9 percent of the respondents reported not having sufficient time. A dummy variable has been used for group having sufficient time as an independent variable and QWL as a dependent variable in the linear regression model and the results are reported in Table 9.

Table 9: Sufficient Time and QWL ($R^2 = 0.143$, $p \leq 0.01$)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant: Insufficient Time	14.792	69.012	0.000
Sufficient Time	1.796	7.307	0.000

The table discloses that sufficient time has been found to be a significant predictor variable, which explains 14.3 percent of variance of QWL of respondents. The group of people not having sufficient time has been used as a reference group. The intercept is 14.792 and this represents mean QWL score of those who have insufficient time. The regression coefficient for group having sufficient time (1.796) indicates that the mean QWL scores of group having sufficient time is 1.796 more than the mean QWL score of group having insufficient time and so is equal to 16.588 (14.792 + 1.796) which is significantly different at one percent level of significance. From the above results it is evident that availability of sufficient time positively affects the QWL of the respondents. In today's mechanical life, availability of sufficient time to discharge various work and non-work responsibilities fulfils intrinsic needs of an individual. Moreover, nobody can ignore the value of spare time for leisure and recreation which acts as a stress buster and enhances QWL.

Sufficient Social Support

Sufficient social support is another variable which has been examined in the present study. It is reported that 87.3 percent of the respondents enjoy sufficient social support where as 12.7 percent of the respondents lack such support. A dummy variable has been used for group having sufficient social support as an independent variable and QWL as a dependent variable in the linear regression model and the results are reported in Table 10.

Table 10:Sufficient Social Support and QWL (R^2=0.117, $p \leq 0.01$)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficients (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Constant: Insufficient Social Support	14.341	48.111	0.000
Sufficient Social Support	2.082	6.525	0.000

The table discloses that sufficient social support has been found to be a significant predictor, which explains 11.7 percent of variance of QWL of respondents. The group of people not having sufficient social support has been used as a reference group. The intercept is 14.341 and this represents mean QWL score of those who have insufficient social support. The regression coefficient for group having sufficient social support (2.082) indicates that the mean QWL scores of group having sufficient social support is 2.082 more than the mean QWL score of group having insufficient social support and so is equal to 16.423 (14.341 + 2.082) which is significantly different at 1 percent level of significance. From the data above majority of the respondents have sufficient social support in life and it seems that they recognize the role of this variable in their life. Social support in life makes people feel socially and emotionally secured and thus lead to better QWL.

Average Weekly Hours

Working hours is another variable which could impact the QWL of the respondents. As per information reported, 17.4 percent of the respondents worked for 30-40 hours per week, 41.3 percent of the respondents worked for 41-50 hours per week, 23.6 percent of the respondents worked for 51-60 hours per week and 17.7 percent of the respondents more than 60 hours per week. For these four categories, three dummy variables were introduced as independent variable and QWL as a dependent variable and the results are reported in Table 11.

Table 11: Average Weekly Hours and QWL (R^2 = 0.010, insignificant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Intercept: 61+hrs	16.509	61.463	0.000
30-40 hrs	-0.616	-1.614	0.107
41-50 hrs	-0.298	-0.929	0.354
51-60 hrs	-0.509	-1.432	0.153

As reported in the table, this variable has not been found to be a significant explanatory variable affecting QWL of the respondents. The group of the respondents who have been working for 61 or more hours is used as a reference group. But no significant difference has been found in the level of quality of work life among the various groups considered. This seems to be due to the reason that, veterinarians do not have uniform work pressure and they have to treat the animals as per the needs of livestock owners, except at the time of emergency (outbreak of any disease, vaccination of animals, flood/draught) the nature of their job tends to be more demanding and time bound.

Social Background

The variable has three categories in which the social background of the respondents has been assessed, i.e. rural, semi-rural and urban. As per information reported, 43.2 percent of the respondents were having urban background, 20.2 percent of the respondents belong to semi-rural and 36.6 percent of the respondents were having rural background.

For these categories of social background, two dummy variables were used as independent variables and QWL as dependent variable in the regression model and the results of the same are reported in Table 12. As the table reveals that social background has not been found to be a significant explanatory variable of QWL among the respondents. The group of respondents who have urban background has been taken as a reference group. The intercept is equal to 16.173 and this represents the mean QWL score of urban respondents. As reported above the respondents belong to mixed social background and appear to be insensitive to this variable. The indifference of the respondents towards social background may be due to the fact that all the required facilities of life are easily accessible in all the areas on account of overall development of the state.

Table 12: Social Background and QWL (R^2 = 0.013, insignificant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Intercept: Urban	16.173	94.307	0.000
Rural	0.200	0.791	0.429
Semi-Rural	-0.434	-1.429	0.154

Economic Background

The variable has three categories which have been used to present the economic background of the respondents, i.e. poor, middle and elite. As reported earlier, 6.2 percent of the respondents belonged to elite economic class, 89.8 percent of the respondents belonged to middle economic class while 4 percent of the respondents were having poor economic background. For these categories of economic background, two dummy variables were used as independent variables and QWL as dependent variable in the regression model and the results of the same are reported in Table 13.

Table 13: Economic Background and QWL (R^2 = 0.004, insignificant)

Model	Unstandardised Coefficient (β)	t-values	Significance Level
Intercept: Poor	15.538	27.589	0.000
Middle	0.638	1.108	0.269
Elite	0.762	1.053	0.293

The table shows that economic background has not found to be a significant explanatory variable of QWL among the respondents. Poor economic background has been taken as a reference group. The intercept is equal to 15.538 and this represents the mean QWL score of respondents belonging to poor economic background. As per the results reported, majority of the respondents belong to middle economic background and revised pay scales as per sixth pay commission has contributed a lot in improving the economic conditions of government employees. Hence the economic background of the respondents as such has not affected their QWL.

The foregoing analysis reveals that age, job experience, sufficient income, sufficient time and sufficient social support have been found to be significant explanatory variables of QWL of the respondents.These results got adequate support from literature and explained in the foregoing text. Whereas distance of residence from work place, monthly expenditure, working or not working spouse, average weekly hours, social and economic background have not been found to be significant explanatory variables.

Further Research

In this study, the relation between age, job experience, sufficient income, sufficient time and sufficient social support, distance of residence from work place, monthly expenditure, working or not working spouse, average weekly hours, social and economic background with QWL were investigated. Future researches should include gender, other salient variables and also examine more complex interactions of quality of work life with demographic characteristics and other variables among veterinary doctors. It is recommended to present a comparison between QWL level of veterinary doctors and other professionals.

References

Argentero, P., Miglioretti, M., & Angilletta, C. (2007). Quality of work life in a cohort of Italian health workers. *Supplemento A, Pricologia*, 29(1), 50-54.

Bolhari, A., Rezaeean, A., Bolhari, J., Bairamzadeh, S., & Soltan, A. A. (2011). The relationship between quality of work life and demographic characteristics of information technology staff.*International Conference on Computer Communication and Management Proceedings of CSIT,* 5, 374-378.

Chan, K.W., & Wyatt, T. A. (2007). Quality of work life: A study of employees in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13(4), 501-517.

Hitt, A. M., Amos, M. O., & Warner, L. J. (1983).Social factors and company location decisions: Technology, quality of life concerns. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2(2), 89-98.

Hossian, J. A. (1997). Quality of working life of industrial workers in Bangladesh: A case in greeter Kushtia District,' Unpublished Researched Monograph.

Mott, D. A., Doucette, R., Gaither, C. A., Pedersen, C. A., & Schommer, J. C. (2004), Pharmacist's attitudes towards work life: Results from a national survey of pharmacists. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association*, 44(3), 326-36.

Raduan, C. R., LooSee, U., Jegak, U., & Khairuddin, I. (2006). Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 61-67.

Srivastava, A. K. (2007). Perceived work environment and employees. *Health, Psychological Studies*, 52(4), 345-347.

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

Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as non-additive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, 33(2), 141-160.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2004). The role of psychological well-being in job performance: A fresh look at an age-old quest. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 338-351.