

Identification the components of quality of work life and measuring them in faculty members of Tehran University**

*Hamid Zare^{*1}, Zolfa Haghgooyan², Zahra Karimi Asl³*

1. Assistant Professor, Farabi Campus, University of Tehran

2. PH.D Student in Management, Farabi Campus University of Tehran

3. M.A Student in Management, Farabi Campus University of Tehran

(Received: 29 October 2012; Revised: 1 August 2013; Accepted: 4 August 2013)

Abstract

The goal of this research is to measure the rate of quality of work life of faculty members in University of Tehran. The research type in regard to goal is applied investigative and in regard to data collecting method is descriptive investigative and of measurement branch. The statistical population is faculty members of University of Tehran's paradises and colleges. In this research, after identification quality of work life criteria and indexes, the rate of quality of work life of faculty members in University of Tehran based on this criteria and indexes, has been measured. For information collecting in fields of; theoretical bases, research literature compilation and scales and aspects identification the library studying method was used. The identified aspects are: factors related to job content, work economic factors, work social factors, balance between work and life. Also in order to measure the status of these aspects among faculty members of University of Tehran, a questionnaire was compiled that its admissibility and permanence was confirmed. Then a questionnaire in a considered sample was distributed. In data analysis for examination the scales and aspects status the statistical test (T-test) is used. The results of this test showed that balance between work and life has middle status, the status of work economic factors is undesirable and the factors related to job content and work social factors have desirable status.

Keywords:

balance between work and life, factors related to job content, faculty members of Tehran University, work economic factors, quality of work life, work social factors.

* Corresponding Author, Tel:+98-25-36166289

Email:hzarea@ut.ac.ir

** The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support of University of Tehran for this research under grant number 24981/1/02.

Introduction

The quality of work life is a subject of human sources managers and behavior sciences authorities. They consider the attention and right perception of quality of work life as a tool for improvement the management performance.

More than a decade has passed since the phrase “quality of work life” (QWL) was first introduced. During this period, QWL has been the subject of many academic papers, experiments in different settings and, recently, increased interest among managers and the popular press (Nadler & Lawler, 1983, p.20).

The quality of work life (QWL) has gained increasing currency since initial discussion supporting the concept began in the USA and Scandinavia in the 1960s and 1970s. During this time, researchers from various disciplinary backgrounds explored ways to improve employment conditions for workers as rapid advancements in technology and saw a greater de-skilling, dehumanization, alienation and objectification of labour under Taylorist influences (Hannif *et al.*, 2008, 272).

QWL passing employee involvement, quality cir- activities are designed to free workers to fulfill their productive function more effectively by opening up new ways for them to apply their energies to their work. Moreover, QWL activities encourage workers to direct their intelligence, expertise, skills, and abilities to such problems as job design, the relationships of workers among themselves and with management, the measurement of performance and the distribution of rewards, the distribution of authority and status symbols, and the definition of career paths. All QWL efforts have attempted, in some way, to increase employee participation in the management of the organization (Schlesinger, 1989, pp 5&6).

There is also evidence that while industrialized economies have

grown increasingly affluent in material wealth, the quality of work life has not significantly improved. Rather, workers have experienced greater work intensification, more significant stress, greater control, less autonomy and less job security than ever before (Hannif & et.al, 2008, p 272).

Considering the importance of employees' quality of work life in organizations productivity, nowadays identification the components of quality of work life is one of the main necessities to increase productivity in the organizations. So, in this research, the main affair is identification the scales and aspects of quality of work life, and measures their status among faculty members of Tehran University

Importance of QWF

In recent years, ethics, quality of work life (QWL) and job satisfaction are increasingly being identified as progressive indicators related to the function and sustainability of business organizations. The rising complexity of the competitive business world and the cumbersome process of implementing effective social laws make ethics an important strategic factor in protecting companies from unwanted disasters. Writings and research in management, HR, and OD often link QWL and job-related outcomes to ethics, productivity, corporate social responsibility and organizational performance (Koonmee *et al.*, 2010, p.20).

The benefits of QWL initiative go to both employees and employers. Employees trust that with the presence of QWL initiatives they feel safe, relatively well satisfied and able to grow and thus can develop as human beings. They believe that QWL enhances their dignity through job satisfaction and humanizing work by assigning meaningful jobs, ensuring job security, making provisions for adequate pay and benefits, providing safe and healthy working conditions, giving opportunities to develop human capacity, ensuring

growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism, getting freedom to self-expression and thus help to increase individual productivity that supports to achieve organizational effectiveness. QWL initiatives are equally beneficial for the employers. QWL positively nurtures a more flexible, loyal, and motivated workforce, which is essential in determining the company's competitiveness. There is statistically significant correlation between measures of QWL and business performance in terms of market performance, stakeholder value, and business sustainability as well as differentiating competitive capabilities in terms of service quality, delivery, employee knowledge, flexibility, and technological leadership. Positive results of QWL reduced absenteeism, lower turnover, and improved job satisfaction. Largely, it appears that the main concerns of an effective QWL program are improved working conditions mainly from an employee's perspective and greater organizational effectiveness mainly from an employer's perspective (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010, p.41).

Defining Quality of Work Life (QWL)

The term "quality of work life" (QWL) originated from the concept of open sociotechnical system designed in the 1970s that helps to ensure autonomy in work, interdependence, and self-involvement with the idea of "best fit" between technology and social organizations (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010, p.40). Different authors defined QWL differently. According to Efraty and Sirgy (1990) conceptualized QWL in terms of "need satisfaction." In their later research, Sirgy *et al.* (2001) define QWL as "employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace" (Koonmee *et al.*, 2010, p.22). Casio (1992) aptly defines QWL "in terms of employees' perceptions of their physical and mental well-being" (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010,

p.41). According to European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions Quality of work has been defined as “better jobs and more balanced ways of combining working life with personal life” (Connell & Hannif, 2009, p.365). Figure 1 summarizes the definitions of quality of working life presented so far:

| Definitions of Quality of Working Life |
|---|
| First Definition: QWL = Variable (1969-1972) |
| Second Definition: QWL = Approach (1969-1975) |
| Third Definition: QWL = Methods (1972-1975) |
| Fourth Definition: QWL = Movement (1975-1980) |
| Fifth Definition: QWL = Everything (1979-1982) |
| Sixth Definition: QWL = Nothing |

Figure 1 summarizes the definitions of quality of working life

The first definition that emerged during the period 1959 to 1972 was QWL as a variable. In this area saw quality of work life as an individual's reaction to work or the personal consequences of the work experience. During the period 1969 to 1974, QWL tended to be seen as meaning joint labor-management cooperative projects, particularly those aimed at improving outcomes for both the individual and the organization. The third definition, QWL as methods. People using, this definition talked of QWL as a set of methods, approaches, or technologies for enhancing the work environment and making it both more productive and more satisfying. The terms participative management and industrial democracy were frequently invoked as ideals of the QWL movement. The late 1970s and early 1980s brought renewed interest in QWL. It was during this

time that the fifth definition appeared. QWL is seen as a global concept and is frequently perceived as a panacea for coping with foreign competition, grievance problems, quality problems, low-productivity rates, and just about everything else (Nadler & Lawler, 1983, pp. 22-24).

Origins of the Qwl Movement

Over the past 10 to 15 years, two distinct phases of QWL activity stand out. The original one occurred during the period 1969 to 1974, when a broad, group of researchers, scholars, union leaders, and government figures became interested in how to influence the quality of an individual's on-the-job experiences.

There are several reasons why this concern emerged at that time. In the larger, generally affluent U.S. society, there were growing concerns about the effects of employment on the health and well-being of employees and about job satisfaction.

This initial excitement and activity continued through the mid-1970s and then experienced a lull during the late 1970s as other issues, primarily inflation and energy costs, diverted national attention. Starting in 1979 and continuing to this day, a second cycle of interest in QWL emerged. What created this interest? The most important factor was probably international competition. The United States faced increasing competition in international markets-and in domestic ones from foreign-made goods.

Previously, it had been easy to dismiss these foreign goods as the product of government subsidies or low-cost labor. But we began to recognize that perhaps other countries were doing something different managerially that might have something to do with their effectiveness. The Japanese stand out as the prime example of this phenomenon (Nadler & Lawler, 1983, p.21).

General criteria on Quality of Work Life (QWL)

By comparing used models and methods throughout the world, we extracted some common aspects and scales some of which are evaluated here. Achieved aspects and scales can be used in our final paradigm.

According to Nadler and Lawler (1983, p.27) the types of QWL activities can be listed as follows:

1. Participative problem solving,
2. Work restructuring,
3. Innovative rewards systems,
4. Improving the work environment.

Sirgy *et al.* (2001) categorize QWL into two major categories: lower- and higherorder needs. According to them, lower-order QWL is comprised of health/safety needs and economic/family needs and higher-order QWL is comprised of social needs, esteem needs, self actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetic needs. Both categories of QWL were investigated in the present study. They define QWL as “employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace.” They proposed that QWL is measured in terms of employees' needs. Specifically, seven dimensions of needs were suggested: a) health and safety needs (protection from ill health and injury at work and outside of work, and enhancement of good health); b) economic and family needs (pay, job security, and other family needs); c) social needs (collegiality at work and leisure time off work); d) esteem needs (recognition and appreciation of work within and outside the organization); e) actualization needs (realization of one's potential within the organization and as a professional); f) knowledge needs (learning to enhance job and professional skills); and g) aesthetic needs (creativity at work as well as personal creativity

and general aesthetics) (Koonmee *et al.*, 2010, pp.21-22).

Measures of Bhanugopan and Fish (2008, p.78) to QWL: lack of job stress, lack of job burnout, lack of turnover intentions and job satisfaction,.

Measures of Quality of Work Life according to Cordero *et al.* (1998, p.533) include: job satisfaction, earning money, membership in successful teams, job security & job growth.

Three QWL factors are reported by Connell and Hannif:

1. Job content;
2. Working hours and work-life balance; and
3. managerial/supervisory style and strategies.

They believe Key concepts tend to include job security, reward systems, pay and opportunity for growth among other factors (Connell & Hannif, 2009, pp. 364-365).

Measures of Quality of Work Life according to Adhikari and Gautam are: adequate pay and benefits, job security, safe and health working condition, meaningful job & autonomy in the job (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010).

Measures of Quality of Work Life according to Schlesinger & Oshry include (Schlesinger & Oshry, 1982, p.11):

1. Increased worker involvement, participation and power,
2. Increased emphasis on employee skill development,
3. Increased autonomy for action and decision making at worker level,
4. Reduced status distinctions among levels in hierarchy.

Walton in position of one of the outstanding researchers after many researches has brought up scales that by examination them, access to QWL in every organization becomes possible. He divides the essential components of quality of work life into four divisions. From his view point the effective factors on quality of work life are: meaningful and understandable work, social organizational fitting of

work, and the work being competitive rich and productive, also has brought up in minor form. These scales- in order- are as followings: fair paying, constitutionalism, continuous opportunity for growth, social dependence, ensuring (job) security, individual capabilities development, environment (work) security and social integration. (Kassaie, p.123) among cooperative scales that referenced to in most cases are: salary and benefits, therapeutic services , welfare services, insurance and retirement.

Briefly we can say high quality of work life is a thing that states some cases about individuals as followings:

1. Fair and suitable paying for good performing a job,
2. Safe and health working condition,
3. The possibility for learning and using new skills,
4. Establish social integration in organization,
5. Safe guarding individual rights,
6. Balance in work and unemployment (leisure) division,
7. Establish working and organizational commitment (Meer sepasei, 1385).

Research Background

In this section, we address to conducted researches on Quality of work Life as follow:

Cordero *et al.* (1998, p550) address this question (Does the use of cross-functional teams improve the quality of work life for technical professionals?) in study of 1,714 R&D professionals working on projects. Comparing the responses of participants who work on project teams with those who do not, the results of the study indicate that respondents who work on project teams face greater job demands than positive job outcomes. However, working on cross-functional teams

seems to increase positive job outcomes more than job demands. In other words, working on cross-functional teams appears to increase the quality of work life for the technical professionals in this study.

A research investigates the association between institutionalization of ethics, quality of work life (QWL), and employee job-related outcomes in the Thai work place. The survey results reveal a positive relationship between implicit form of ethics institutionalization and both lower-order and higher-order aspects of QWL. The results also indicate that the implicit form of ethics institutionalization and the two aspects of QWL have positive impacts on the three employee job-related outcomes: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and team spirit (Koonmee *et al.* 2010, p.20).

Layer *et al.* (2009) examined relationship between human performance in manufacturing environments and the cognitive demands of the operator and the perceived quality of work life attributes. Results showed that human performance was indicated to be a causal result of the combined, and uncorrelated, effect of cognitive demands and quality of work attributes experienced by workers. Also, an implication of this study is that human operator's perceived quality of work life attributes may be effectively paired with the cognitive demand associated with a particular manufacturing task in order to optimize the operator's human performance (John *et al.*, 2009, p 413).

Donaldson *et al.* (1999) examine the relationships between employee health behavior, quality of work life, and proximal organizationally valued outcomes. The results showed that quality-of-work-life factors significantly predicted organizational commitment, absenteeism, and tardiness frequency. Also, findings suggest the value of improving the system of work in which employees are embedded as part of comprehensive work-site health promotion efforts (Donaldson *et al.* 1999, p.579).

Adhikari & Gautam (2010) review how far Nepalese firms are complying quality of work life (QWL) provisions of the Labor laws and to assess expectations of union leaders on different dimensions of QWL. The findings showed In Nepalese workplaces, the QWL situation is deteriorating and thus commitment of the part of government, employers, and union leaders is required to work on QWL initiatives and to create a sound and harmonious industrial relations environment (Adhikari & Gautam, 2010, p.40).

Connell and Hannif (2009) seeks to determine whether and how the quality of working life (QWL) varies between call centres (CCs) in the in house/ outsourced, public and private sectors and the implications of these findings on human resource management (HRM). Findings showed the in-house, public-sector CC Govtcall emerges as being inferior in terms of job content, working hours and managerial/ supervisory style and strategies. Conversely, Salesplus features a management model that is more akin to what would be expected in a CC operating under a professional service model (Connell & Hannif, 2009, p.363).

A search aimed to examine quality of work life and job satisfaction of Tehran universities and sharif industrials scientific mission members has been performed. The obtained results indicated that:

1. University of Tehran and Sharif industrial professors in regard to quality of work life are in a rather undesirable level , and in regard to job satisfaction are in a rather high level.
2. There is a positive relation between quality of work life and job satisfaction components.
3. There is no meaningful deference between the rate of quality of work life and job satisfaction of the professors of said universities and only of social integration aspect that is from the quality of work life aspects. There is a little difference, in other words, Sharif industrial university scientific mission members

have a higher social integration compared with University of Tehran professors. 4. Regression results step by step indicates that in priority order: The constitutionalism in organization, ensuring growth opportunity and continuous security and human capabilities development as quality of work life aspects have correlation in several ways with job satisfaction (Meer kamali and Narenji thani, 1387).

The research results that by the title the relation between quality of work life and competency and effectiveness of employees performance in one of Islamic Azad University units has performed indicates that there is relation between quality of work life, and competency and effectiveness of employees performance (Fattah, 1383). A research with a goal of national compilation for evaluation quality of work life of the employees in organizations was done, that the results obtained from factor analysis, summarize the aspects of quality of work lies model, in the three structure factors: management, psychological and social. The obtained results showed that the models components are useful and suitable for evaluating the quality of work life status of the employees. The obtained results of variance analysis showed a meaningful deference between the quality of work life scale and modifier variables (age- sexuality- educations- job and job class- organization position- income- reward and the time of performing the work) in Alfa 5% level (Bazzaz Jazayerie & Pardakhtchie, 1386).

A research in the years 1384, 1385 by a goal of examining the relation between application rates of learning organization components based on Petersen's five principles (individual capability mental patterns cooperative ideal; team learning and systematic thinking) with improvement of the quality of work life of University of Isfahan scientific mission members was performed. The results of this research indicated that there is a meaningful relation between the application of learning organization components and improvement of

the quality of work life of University of Isfahan scientific mission members. The findings show that quality of work life is influenced more than every thing from mental pattern and the individual capability has the least influence (Yar Mohammad Zadeh &Cooperators, 1385).

In 1386 a study on the employees of Hamadan therapy management was performed. The goal of this study was to examine the influence of work life condition on job stresses. We understand from research findings that there is a meaningful and positive correlation between quality of work life and employees educations ($P=0.001$). Besides there is a meaningful and positive correlation between QWL and employees background by ($P=0.044$). Mean while in pirson correlation test that was taken for the relation between average grade of each QWL questionnaire and the average grade of stress of each person, it showed that what ever the person QWL has been more, he has less stress ($P=0.004$) consequently, he has a better psychological health in confronting by clients (Joybari, 1386).

In a research that was performed in 2000 among 500 s ∞ p companies, was showed that there is a direct relation between growth, performance and profitability with quality of work life (Lau, 2000).

A research was performed in 2001 that examined the relation between internal specifications (such autonomy, competitive work and...) and external specifications (apparent benefits such salary and...) with quality of work life among therapy- healthy organizations of the south area of Antarey in Canada. The results of this research showed that the external specifications such salary and benefits have had an important (p.7) role in life quality of the employees (Lewis *et al.*, 2001).

Research goal

- Identification the scales and aspects of quality of work life of the faculty members of University of Tehran Examination the status of the factors related to job content among faculty members of Tehran University,
- Examination the status of work economic factors among faculty members of Tehran University,
- Examination the status of work social factors among faculty members of Tehran University,
- Examination the status of the balance between work and life among faculty members of Tehran University.

Research questions

- What are the scales and aspects of quality of work life of faculty members of Tehran University?
- How is the status of the factors related to job content among faculty members of Tehran University?
- How is the status of work economic factors among faculty members of Tehran University?
- How is the status of work social factors among faculty members of Tehran University?
- How is the status of the balance between work and life among faculty members of Tehran University?

Research method sample statistical population and data collection method

The research method in regard to the goal is applied investigative and in regard to data collection method is descriptive investigative. The statistical population in this research is faculty members of University of Tehran colleges and paradises. The statistical population is limit and its size is 235 persons. For sampling we used the classification

chance sampling method. For determine the sample volume the following formula is used:

$$n = \frac{N Z^2 S^2}{(N-1) d^2 + Z^2 S^2}$$

That in it:

Sample volume= n

Success ratio in statistical population = p

Un success ratio in statistical population = q

Error rate= d

Normal population distribution = $Z^2 a/2$

$P=0/5$, $q=0/5$ is considered.

Sample total number regarded the above formula, by reliance level 95% and error 5% = 184 are obtained.

The statistical population size and sample size is presented in table number (1)

For information collection in theoretical bases field, research literature compilation, and identification the scales and aspects the library studying method was used. Also in order to collect data the field way was used that the tool for collection field information in this research is the questionnaire. The questionnaires was given to 30 experts and based on their opinions the necessary reformatations was preformed and the questionnaire admissibility was confirmed. Also to examine its permanence its koronbakh Alfa was measured and the questionnaire permanence was confirmed.

Data analysis

In this paper, the descriptive statistics and comprehension statistics include mean test of a statistical population for data analysis is used.

In descriptive statistics part the sexuality abundance, educations work background and organizational position, are used. About 7.3% of the respondents are women, about 88.1% of them are men, and 4.5% didn't answer to the question related to sexuality.

Table 1. Statistical population size and sample size

| Sample size | Society size | Paradises and colleges | range |
|-------------|--------------|---|-------|
| 6 | 50 | Abu-Reihan | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | Keesh | 2 |
| 32 | 277 | Technical colleges pardis | 3 |
| 14 | 118 | Sciences pardis | 4 |
| 6 | 47 | Qom pardis | 5 |
| 24 | 208 | Agriculture pardis | 6 |
| 12 | 102 | Fine arts pardis | 7 |
| 8 | 69 | The humanities and literature colleges | 8 |
| 4 | 29 | Economic | 9 |
| 7 | 57 | (Islamic) education | 10 |
| 4 | 30 | Physical education | 11 |
| 5 | 37 | Geography | 12 |
| 12 | 100 | Law | 13 |
| 11 | 91 | Veterinary | 14 |
| 5 | 42 | Psychology | 15 |
| 6 | 52 | Languages | 16 |
| 7 | 53 | Social sciences | 17 |
| 3 | 18 | Entrepreneurship | 18 |
| 3 | 24 | Environment | 19 |
| 6 | 50 | Management | 20 |
| 2 | 13 | Universe studies | 21 |
| 3 | 18 | Biochemistry- bio-physics search centre | 22 |
| 3 | 25 | Geophysics institute | 23 |
| 184 | 1512 | Grand total | |

The scales and aspects of the quality of work life of Tehran University scientific mission members

Table 2. Aspects and scales of Quality of work life

| Balance between work and life | Work social factors | Work economic factors | Factors related to job content |
|---|--|---|--|
| -fair and adequate work hours -having time for perform worship affairs -Argonomic environment -lack of psychological and physical harms -the distance between house and workplace | -work importance in society -social integration in organization -Social relationships in work environment -considering employees as respected persons -feeling self- respect in the organization | -salaries -therapeutic services -welfare services -insurance -retirement -job security | -team –work -autonomy -participation -meaningful work -competitive work -feeling ownership In work -need to creativity in work -growth opportunity |

In regard to employment status, 39.5% of the respondents are contractual, 20.9% are experimental official, 36.7% are definite official and 2.8% didn't answer to the question related to employment status. In regard to university degree, 5.6% is instructors 58.8% are assistant professors, 22% are associate professors, 13% are professors and also 0.6% didn't answer to the question related to university degree.

Also, in regard to work background 28.2% had less than 5 years, 32.2% had 5 to 15 years, 24.9% had 15 to 25 years, and 12.4% had more than 25 years work background. 2.3% also didn't answer to the question related to work background.

Also, in order to examine the status of quality of work life of faculty members of Tehran University (for answering to questions 2 to 5) the mean test of a statistical population was used. The results of this test for aspects of quality of work life is presented in tables (3) and (4).

Table 3. The statistics of mean test of a statistical population

| One- sample statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|-------|-----|--------------------------------|
| Mean Std Error | Std Deviation | Mean | N | variables |
| 0.038 | 0.502 | 3.227 | 177 | Factors related to job content |
| 0.051 | 0.674 | 2.783 | 177 | Work economic factors |
| 0.044 | 0.581 | 3.363 | 177 | Work social factors |
| 0.030 | 0.401 | 3.016 | 176 | Balance between work and life |

Table 4. Mean test of a statistical population

| one- Sample Test | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----------------|----------------|-----|--------|--------------------------------|
| Test Value=3 | | | | | | |
| Confidence 95% Interval of the Difference | | Mean Difference | (tailed-2) Sig | df | t | variables |
| Upper | Lower | | | | | |
| 0.301 | 0.152 | 0.227 | 0 | 176 | 6.014 | Factors related to job content |
| -0.117 | -0.317 | -0.217 | 0 | 176 | -4.276 | Work economic factors |
| 0.449 | 0.277 | 0.363 | 0 | 176 | 8.312 | Work social factors |
| 0.075 | 0.044 | 0.016 | 0.605 | 175 | 0.519 | Balance between work and life |

If meaningful number of the test has been bigger than considered meaningful level (0.05) The Zero assumption is confirmed and variable amount equals (3), that is the variable status in middle limit. If the test meaningful number has been less than considered meaningful level (0.05), zero assumption isn't confirmed. For decision about being bigger or smaller than the mean amount (3), we should look at the sign limit up or down. If both limits have negative signs, mean amount is smaller than (3) and variable status is unsuitable. If both limits have positive Signs, mean amount is bigger than (3) and the status of related variable is suitable.

As presented in table No.4 results of (T-test) examination show

that the balance between work and life has middle status, the status of work economic factors is undesirable and the factors related to job content and work social factors have desirable status. Then we examine the status of scales of every one of aspects among faculty members of University of Tehran. In order to examine the scales status of factors related to job content, the mean test of a statistical population was used. The results of this test for scales of factors related to job content are presented in tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. The statistics of mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|------|----------------------------|
| Mean | Std Error | Std Deviation | Mean | N |
| 2.684 | 0.071 | 0.942 | 177 | Team work |
| 3.582 | 0.050 | 0.660 | 177 | Autonomy |
| 2.594 | 0.049 | 0.652 | 177 | Participation |
| 3.777 | 0.059 | 0.776 | 175 | Meaningful work |
| 3.509 | 0.077 | 0.999 | 167 | Competitive work |
| 3.491 | 0.065 | 0.857 | 175 | Feeling owner ship in work |
| 3.273 | 0.062 | 0.824 | 176 | Need to creativity in work |
| 2.969 | 0.057 | 0.760 | 177 | Growth opportunity |

Table 6. Mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Test | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------|----------------|-----|--------|----------------------------|
| Test Value=3 | | | | | | |
| Confidence 95% Interval of the Difference | | Mean Difference | (tailed-2) sig | df | t | variables |
| upper | lower | | | | | |
| 0.177 | 0.456 | 0.316 | 0.000 | 176 | 4.467 | Team work |
| 0.680 | 0.484 | 0.582 | 0.000 | 176 | 11.738 | Autonomy |
| 0.309 | 0.503 | 0.406 | 0.000 | 176 | 8.278 | Participation |
| 0.893 | 0.661 | 0.777 | 0.000 | 174 | 13.246 | Meaningful work |
| 0.662 | 0.356 | 0.509 | 0.000 | 166 | 6.583 | Competitive work |
| 0.619 | 0.364 | 0.491 | 0.000 | 174 | 7.587 | Feeling owner ship in work |
| 0.395 | 0.150 | 0.273 | 0.000 | 175 | 4.389 | Need to creativity in work |
| 0.082 | 0.144 | 0.031 | 0.578 | 176 | 0.544 | Growth opportunity |

As presented in table No.6 (T- test) examination results show that. Growth opportunity has middle status the status of team work and participation scales is undesirable and the scales: autonomy meaningful job competitive work feeling ownership in work and creativity in work have a desirable status. In order to examine the status of work economic factors scales, the mean test of a statistical population is used, too. The results of this test for work economic factors scales are presented in tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. The statistics of mean test of a statistical population.

| One-Sample Statistics | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------|-----|----------------------|
| Mean Std Error | Std Deviation | Mean | N | variables |
| 0.054 | 0.719 | 2.999 | 177 | Salary |
| 0.077 | 1.011 | 2.865 | 171 | Therapeutic services |
| 0.072 | 0.946 | 2.433 | 171 | Welfare services |
| 0.075 | 0.997 | 3.011 | 176 | Insurance |
| 0.087 | 0.906 | 2.780 | 109 | Retirement |
| 0.075 | 0.984 | 2.576 | 170 | Job security |

Table 8. Mean test of a statistical population

| One-Sample Test | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------|----------------|-----|-------|----------------------|
| Test Value=3 | | | | | | |
| Confidence 95% Interval of the Difference | | Mean Difference | (tailed-2) sig | df | t | Variables |
| Upper | lower | | | | | |
| 0.106 | 0.108 | 0.001 | 0.986 | 176 | 0.017 | Salary |
| 0.018 | 0.287 | 0.135 | 0.084 | 170 | 1.739 | Therapeutic services |
| 0.425 | 0.710 | 0.567 | 0.000 | 170 | 7.845 | Welfare services |
| 0.160 | 0.137 | 0.011 | 0.880 | 175 | 0.151 | Insurance |
| 0.048 | 0.392 | 0.220 | 0.013 | 108 | 2.536 | Retirement |
| 0.275 | 0.572 | 0.424 | 0.000 | 169 | 5.614 | Job security |

As presented in table 8, the results of (T-test) examination show that the scales: salary, therapeutic services, insurance have a middle status because their meaningful coefficient is bigger than zero, the status of welfare, retirement and job security scales is undesirable, because their meaningful coefficient is smaller than (0.05) and their both limits (up and down) are negative. In order to examine the stats of work social factors scales, the mean test of a statistical population is used. The results of this test for work social scales are presented in tables 9 and 10.

Table 9. The statistics of mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|-------|-----|---|
| Mean Std Error | Std Deviation | Mean | N | Variables |
| 0.055 | 0.736 | 3.862 | 177 | Work importance in society |
| 0.071 | 0.927 | 2.798 | 173 | Social integration in organization |
| 0.056 | 0.738 | 2.928 | 175 | Social relation ships in work environment |
| 0.060 | 0.780 | 3.727 | 172 | Consider employees as respected persons |
| 0.052 | 0.682 | 3.494 | 174 | Feeling self- respect in organization |

Table 10. Mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Test | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------|------------------|-----|--------|---|
| Test Value=3 | | | | | | |
| Confidence 95% Interval of the Difference | | Mean Difference | (tailed - 2) Sig | df | t | variables |
| Upper | lower | | | | | |
| 0.971 | 0.752 | 0.862 | 0.000 | 176 | 15.573 | Work importance in society |
| 0.063 | 0.341 | 0.202 | 0.000 | 172 | 2.869 | Social integration in organization |
| 0.038 | 0.183 | 0.072 | 0.196 | 174 | 1.297 | Social relation ships in work environment |
| 0.844 | 0.609 | 0.727 | 0.000 | 171 | 12.212 | Consider employees as respected persons |
| 0.596 | 0.392 | 0.494 | 0.000 | 173 | 9.558 | Feeling self- respect in organization |

As presented in table 10 , the (T- test) examination results show that social relation ships in work environment scale has middle status because its meaningful coefficient is bigger than zero, the status of social integration in organization scales is undesirable, because their meaningful coefficient is smaller than 0.05 and their both limits (up and down) are negative and the scales: work importance in society, consider employees as respected persons and feeling self- respect in organization have desirable status because their meaningful coefficient is smaller than 0.05 and their both up and sown limits are positive.

In order to examine the status of balance between work and life scales. The mean test of a statistical population is used, the results of this test for balance between work and life scales is presented in tables 11 and 12.

Table 11. The statistics of mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|-------|-----|---|
| Mean Std Error | Std Deviation | Mean | N | Variables |
| 0.066 | 0.874 | 3.237 | 173 | Fair work hours |
| 0.067 | 0.882 | 3.488 | 172 | Having time to perform worship affairs |
| 0.063 | 0.830 | 3.378 | 176 | Argonomic environment |
| 0.081 | 1.063 | 2.848 | 171 | Lack of physical harms |
| 0.048 | 0.630 | 2.526 | 174 | Lack of psychological harms |
| 0.074 | 0.960 | 2.596 | 166 | The distance between house and work place |

As presented in table 12, the results of T- test examination indicated that: lack of physical harms scale has a middle status because its meaningful coefficient is bigger than zero, the status of the scales: lack of psychological harms and distance between house and work place is undesirable, because their meaningful coefficient is smaller than 0.05 and their both up and down limits are negative. And

the scales: fair and adequate work hours, having time to perform worship affairs, and argonomic environment have desirable status, because their meaningful coefficient is less than 0.05 and their up and down limits are positive.

Table 12. Mean test of a statistical population

| One- Sample Test | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------|---------------------|-----|-------|--|
| Test Value=3 | | | | | | |
| Confidence 95% Interval of the Difference | | Mean Difference | (tailed - 2) Sig | df | t | Variables |
| Upper | lower | | | | | |
| 0.368 | 0.106 | 0.237 | 0.000 | 172 | 3.568 | Fair work hours |
| 0.621 | 0.356 | 0.488 | 0.000 | 171 | 7.263 | Having time to perform worship affairs |
| 0.501 | 0.254 | 0.378 | 0.000 | 175 | 6.038 | Argonomic environment |
| 0.008 | 0.312 | 0.152 | 0.063 | 170 | 1.871 | Lack of physical harms |
| 0.380 | 0.568 | 0.474 | 0.000 | 173 | 9.930 | Lack of psychological harms |
| 0.257 | 0.551 | 0.404 | 0.000 | 165 | 5.419 | The distance between house and work place |

Descussion

This topic is descussed before in many books and articles and defferent aspectes are identified for Quality of work life in general, but the inovative of this research is that we look at topic with a local veiw.it means that we identified the aspects of Quality of work life that special to context of university in Iran.so some aspects of Quality of work life in general are deleted in this reserch and some aspects, according to veiw of experts, are added.

Conclusion and suggestion

According to the results of this paper, the identified aspects of quality of work life of faculty members of University of Tehran are: factors related to job content, work economic factors, work social factors, and balance between work and life, for measuring the quality of work life of faculty members of University of Tehran. We planed a questionnaire based on indentified aspects and by using of experts opinions, its admissibility was confirmed. For measuring the rate of quality of work life of faculty members of Tehran University, the statistical examination (T-test) has been used, the results of this test indicated that balance between work and life have middle status, the status of work economic factors is undesirable, and the factors related to job content, and work social factors have desirable status.

So, for improving the quality of work life of faculty members of University of Tehran, the managers should plan to establish the justic salary payment system. They should reform the apprasial system of faculty members of Tehran University. They should also prepare opportunity to leisure and happy time for them. upon the results of this research it can be suggested that the managers of university should prepare the ground for welbeing of faculty members of University of Tehran. Making them to go on journey, specially with familily, to be away from troubled situation, and breaking the weather and creating a variety in life, is the something that can improve the quality of work life. Also, we suggest to prepare facilities for faculty members of Tehran University to exercise, so that they can gain a healthy and pleasure life.

References

- Adhikari, D.R & Gautam, D.K,(2010), "Labor legislations for improving quality of work life in Nepal", *International Journal of Law and Management*, Vol. 52 No. 1, 2010, pp. 40-53.
- Bazaz Jazayeri, Seyed Ahmed & Pardakhtchi, Mohammad Hussein (2007), "devising a model to evaluate employees' QWL in organizations", *Iran Management Quarterly*, 123 – 151.
- Bhanugopan, Ramudu and Fish, Alan, (2008), "The impact of business crime on expatriate quality of work-life in Papua New Guinea", *Australian Human Resources Institute*, Volume 46(1), 68–84.
- Connell, Julia & Hannif, Zeenobiyah, (2009), " Call centers, quality of work life and HRM practices An in-house/outsourced comparison", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 31 No. 4, 2009, pp.363-381.
- Cordero, Rene & et.al, (1998), " Technical Professionals in Cross-functional Teams: Their Quality of Work Life", *J PROD INNOV MANAG* 1998;15:550 -563
- Donaldson, Stewart I. & et.al,(1999), " Health Behavior, Quality of Work Life, and Organizational Effectiveness in the Lumber Industry", *Health Education & Behavior*, Vol. 26 (4): 579-591
- Fatah, Nazem (2004), "the relationship between QWL and performance efficiency and effectiveness", the Fifth International Conference on Quality Management.
- Hannif, Zeenobiyah & et.al, (2008), " Call Centers and the Quality of Work Life: Towards a Research Agenda", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(2) 271–284
- Juibari, Leila (2007), "studying the impact of work life situation on job stress of Hamedan health management sector", the 9th Congress of Nursing and its role in improving life quality.
- Kasaei, Mitra, "employees' attitude on QWL and its relation to performance", *Official Transformation*, 7th volume.
- Koonmee, Kalayanee & et.al, (2010), " Ethics institutionalization, quality of work life, and employee job-related outcomes: A survey of human resource managers in Thailand", *Journal of Business Research* 63 (2010) 20-26
- Lau. R.S.M, (2000),"quality of work life and performance, *international Journal of survey industry management*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp422-437

- Layer, John K. & et.al, (2009), " The effect of cognitive demands and perceived quality of work life on human performance in manufacturing environments", *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics* 39 (2009) 413–421
- Lewis & et.al, (2001)"Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life", *Journal of leadership in health services*
- Mirkamali, Seyed Mohammad & Narenji, Sani Fatemeh (2008), "studying the relationship between QWL and job security among Faculties in University of Tehran and Sanati Sharif University", *Research and Planning in High Education*, 71 – 101
- Mirsepasi, Naser (2006), "the mutual impact of productivity and QWL", *Economics and Management Journal*, vol. 17.
- Nadler, D.A & Lawler, E. E, (1983), "Quality of Work Life: Perspectives and Directions", *Organizational Dynamics*, AMACOM Periodicals Division, American Management Associations. All rights reserved. 0090-2616/83/0016-0020/\$02.00/O, pp.20-30
- Schlesinger, L.A & Oshry, Barry, (1982), " Quality of Work Life and the Manager: Muddle in the Middle", Portions of this article have been excerpted from *Middles of the World*, Integrate by Barry Oshry (Power & Systems Training, Inc., 1982) and are reprinted here with the permission of the publisher. 5-25
- Yar Mohammadzadeh, Peyman et al (2006), "studying the rate of using learning organization constituents based on Peter Senge's five principles and QW improvement among the faculties of Isfahan University", *International Management Conference*.
- Zare, Hamid et al, 2012," Determining and Prioritizing the Criteria and Scales of Quality of Work Life (QWF) by AHP Method" , *European Journal of Social Sciences* , Vol.27 No.3 (2012), pp. 346-359