

FACTORS AFFECTING WORKING ENVIRONMENT OF FEMALE GOVT DEGREE COLLEGES OF DISTRICT RAWALPINDI (A CASE STUDY)

Saba Waseem and Almas Kiani

PMAS-University of Arid and Agriculture, Rawalpindi

E-Mail: swas1999@yahoo.com , almaskiani@uaar.edu.pk

ABSTRACT: *The key objective of this research paper was to delineate the factors affecting a working environment. The study design was of survey type. Survey study was conducted in Government Degree Colleges of District Rawalpindi. The questionnaire was designed to find out the influence of the factors in working surroundings. The population of present research consisted of 324 Lecturers and 160 were selected as a sample. Data was collected through questionnaires and was organized, tabulated and analyzed carefully with the help of statistical package SPSS version 16. Their results were inferred in the light of objectives of the study. Means and chi-square test was applied to test the study hypotheses. The results of the study indicated that there was no significant difference between the working environment and its factors.*

Keywords: working environment, factors affecting te working environment and female lecturers.

INTRODUCTION

The working environment of workplaces is one of the main facets that overtly or covertly encourage the self-actualization of teachers which, consequently, to have a ripple effect on their performance [1]. The working environment of a teacher has excessive influence on the students learning [2]. Conducive environment, according to King and Peart, [3] is where teachers feel contented due to their good relationship with their colleagues. To study teacher working environment, teachers themselves asked questions in a survey of 2002 IIEP and 2004 IIEP about facilities, resources, time, empowerment, headship and training. Survey was held to study the importance of teacher's retention in colleges. The correct fit between the person and the work task is accomplished when people are working in circumstances that suit their physical and mental abilities. People are then in the ideal situation for working, learning and achieving [4]. The principal is considered at the highest official position in the college thus, the liability of college administration is that of the principal [5].

Many researches have attempted with regards to working environment, yet, no significant research has been carried out that helped in investigating the factors of a working environment and its effects on the performance of lecturers. The present research survey was a serious attempt to explore the prevailing working environment of Government Degree Colleges in District Rawalpindi. The core purpose of the study was to investigate a Conducive working environment.

Objectives of the study:

- To ascertain the factors in a working Environment.
- To point out gaps between the working environment and its factors.
- To recommend strategies to bridge identified gaps.

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

1. Physical factors do not affect working environment.
2. Social factors do not affect working environment.
3. Psychological factors do not affect working environment.
4. Administrative factors do not affect working environment.
5. External factors do not affect working environment.
6. Organizational framework does not affect working environment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review focused on recent studies indicates that the working environment for teachers matter more than any other thing when it comes to decide where, and under which existing circumstances they will teach and can perform in a better way .

Working environment

Workplace factors play a pivotal role in a working environment [6,7] elucidated that the performance of employees effect due to working environment factors. The factors include comfortable and suitable work space, lighting and freshening environment. For college teachers peculiarity occurs in terms of salary, working conditions, spurs, acknowledgment and fringe benefits. [8]. A study indicated and focused on organizational environment, job fulfillment and classroom performance of college teachers [9]. The work task is attained when people are working in an environment that suits their physical and mental abilities, the exact fit between the people. People are then in the finest condition for learning, working and achieving [4]. Even outstanding teachers will struggle when encountered with poor facilities, a lack of resources, interventions on instructional time, and inadequate preparation time [10]. The analysis of his research on lecturers showed that the problems of working environment like clash and conflicts, jeopardy and reward, non-collaborative work and peer support, affect their performance[11] There are many aspects related to contractual lecturers' turnover. These aspects include Salary and benefits. Other than these factors, there are many workplace conditions such as college policy, teacher autonomy, the role of head of institution, and behaviours of colleagues [12]. In contrast, something that a person leaves behind is the performance and that occurs distant from the purpose [13]. Teacher's performance is the way in which a teacher behaves in the process of teaching. Teacher's performance is known to be related to teacher's usefulness [14]. Performance and output are defined in many ways in the literature. [15] The productivity is, when people make less effort to produce anything. Productivity defines as, the increase in performance of an organization along with effectiveness [16].

Working environment factors:

Researchers, such as Mark Smylie and Susan Moore Johnson, [17] have conducted extensive literature reviews on this topic.

- (1) **Physical factors** such as the suitability of buildings, classroom size, equipment and resources.
- (2) **Organizational factors** that influence workload, time pressure, autonomy, evaluation apprehension, teacher education and trainings.
- (3) **Sociological factors** that influence relationship with colleagues, respect and social needs (that influence teachers' roles and status).
- (4) **External climatic factors** that frame values, traditions, and norms.
- (5) **Psychological factors** that may support or diminish teachers personally (stress and strain).
- (6) **Administrative factors** such as those related to role of principal, and accountability that may enhance or constrain the performance of teachers.

Promotion counts very important in a teacher's career [18, 19]. Well-timed promotions support to get them committed to their work. Improves their attitude, enhance their performance and career growth. Promotion should not only be rewarded on the basis of seniority [20]. But it should also be bestowed to those who make efforts to improve their talents and skills. Promotion is the achievement of next level in your profession during the course of career [21]. Still, many employees do not get their due promotions as per promotion policy rules. At the workplace disapproving standpoint leads to demotivation and poor performance of lecturers at their workplace. There is an affirmative connection between promotion practices and apparent performance of teachers [22]. If the administration wants to increase the performance of employees in any organization, nondiscriminatory promotional chances ought to be given to employees. The aspects such as balanced promotion structure, job autonomy, headship behavior, social relations play leading role in shaping the level of job satisfaction [23]. promotional opportunities [24] in the organization leads to job satisfaction. [25] Progression and essential feature of educational work, added to lecturer's academic work. Teachers need constructive and helpful guidance by principals. More than one quarter of teachers in South Carolina identified that, "Teacher retention depends upon the working conditions faced by teachers in a working environment" [26]. If the people involved in the organization are satisfied with their work, quality education and human development can be possible. Teachers feel ignored and unsupportive when administrators do not involved teachers in the decision making process [27]. If the people work in collaboration with each other in their workplace, it may cause a positive effect on the satisfaction level of employees as it affects their performance [28]. To improve the satisfaction level in the workforce it is important to ascertain the importance of these factors. The factors like pay, promotion and comfort level with colleagues inspire the employee towards job satisfaction [29]. With the help of socialization and interaction among employees the performance can be enhanced and absenteeism can be declined [30]. Conducive environment, [3] is where teachers feel contended due to their

good relationship with their colleagues. It is very essential to make sure that teachers should have insistent chances to develop skills to meet the various necessities of learners, which can contribute to a constructive and helpful working environment. In a survey held by Arizona teachers on their working conditions, 55 percent of teachers evaluated that the most important factor influencing employment decisions was effectiveness with the students [10]. Teachers increasingly are expecting to collaborate with peers [31]. However a notch of self-sufficiency is appreciated by teachers, isolation from the support of colleagues can have unfavorable effect on teacher contentment, usefulness, and retention. Tournament Theory propounded, [32] further shapes the concept that when an institute inefficiently observes its employees' performances such that it have deficient data regarding employees abilities and talents, it is effective to manage a competition of career development based on the efficiency of their unveiled capabilities. When tournament participants ascertain that rewards are given to position holders, they will also work hard to get the position and the prize.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

It was a survey study in order to identified the factors that affect the working environment. The following procedure was adopted to collect the data:

Lists of all the Degree Colleges of District Rawalpindi were obtained from the Directorate of Education (colleges) Rawalpindi. According to collected data District Rawalpindi consisted of 7 tehsils, i.e. Taxila, Rawalpindi, Kalar Syedan, Gujar khan, Kotli Sattian, Kahota and Murree. Total number of Government Degree Colleges for women in these tehsils were 26 with total population of 324 Lecturers. Therefore; all the 26 Government Degree Colleges for women in District Rawalpindi, Sample size of 160 was selected randomly from the total population of 324 lecturers. Descriptive research survey Questionnaire was used as a tool to collect data.

Tools of Research:

Questionnaire was used to identify the factors in working environment. It consists of 35 items.

Validity & reliability of tool

Prior to the data collection, validity of the instrument was verified. By comparing the individual questions to the objectives of the study content validity of the tool was determined. A questionnaire comprising 35 statements was developed to find the effect of working environment. This questionnaire was validated through the experts. The instrument was validated according to the suggestions of the experts the observations made by the experts were removed and suggestions were encompassed accordingly and finally got ratified by the supervisor

Method of Data Analysis

Each statement of the factor affecting the working environment was verified by counting their responses in different options: strongly agree (SA), agree (A), neutral (N), disagree (DA) and strongly disagree (SDA). Each response for each statement was counted separately and then software program for statistical analysis (SPSS) was applied.

Analysis and interpretation of data

The collected data was organized, tabulated and analyzed using the statistical package (SPSS version 20) to find out

mean values and chi-square test. The data obtained from SPSS were subsequently applied to draw outcomes and conclusions of this research. The results were then presented in tables, and graph analysis.

RESULTS

After interpretation and analysis of data the results of the study are tabulated below:

Table: 1 Association of physical factors with working environment.

Pearson chi-square	value	df	P-value
Physical facilities	8.904	16	0.917

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 1, p-value is greater than level of significance at 0.05 levels so the null hypothesis “physical factors do not affect the working environment” is rejected and it is concluded that physical factors do affect working environment.

Table: 2 Association of Social factors with working environment.

Pearson chi-square	value	Df	P-value
Social behavior	22.467	16	0.230

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 2; p-value is greater than level of significance, so the null hypothesis” Social factors do not affect working environment” is rejected and it is concluded that Social factors effect working environment.

Table3: Association between Psychological factor and working environment.

Pearson chi-square	value	df	p-value
Psychological issues	14.105	16	0.59

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 3, as p-value is greater than the level of significance at 0.05 level of significance, hence the null hypothesis “Psychological factors do not affect the working environment” is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted, it is concluded that Psychological factors effect working environment.

Table4: Association between Administrative factor and working environment.

Pearson chi-square	value	df	P-value
Administrative role	8.848	12	0.716

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 4, p-value is greater than level of significance, so null hypothesis “Administrative factors do not affect working environment” is rejected and it is concluded that Administrative factors effect working environment

Table5: Association between external environment and performance

Pearson chi-square	value	df	P-value
External environment	25.512	16	0.562

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 5, calculated p-value is greater than level of significance at 0.05 level of significance, therefore, null hypothesis “External factors do not affect working

environment “is rejected and it is concluded that External factors do affect working environment.

Table6: Association between Organizational Framework and working environment.

Pearson chi-square	value	df	P-value
Organizational Framework	21.176	16	0.172

*Significant (0.05)

Refer to table 6, calculated p-value is greater than level of significance at 0.05 levels, therefore, null hypothesis “Organizational Framework factors do not affect working environment.” is rejected and it is concluded that Organizational Framework factors effect working environment.

DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to determine the factors affecting a working environment of female Degree colleges and how these factors affect the performance, retention and job satisfaction of female lecturers in numerous ways . From the findings of this research it was found that there are many factors which affect the working environment. This study was a significant endeavor in promoting A conducive working environment to get along in a better way. This survey would help the District Education Officers to identify and understand the attrition of employees and how to retain them in a favorable environment. It would help the head of institutions to determine the lack of missing physical facilities and try to improvise these provisions. It would be helpful for them to improve the organizational framework in a working environment in order to enhance the performance of lecturers. Keeping in view the effectiveness of working environment and expert support, the present study was conducted to explore the significance of working environment. The beneficiaries of this study will be lecturers, students, concerned Authorities, policy makers, and future researchers.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of result the following conclusions are drawn;

1. It was concluded that meager physical facilities and lack of infrastructure in a working environment for example, insufficient class rooms, deficient resources, inadequate equipment and unavailability of audio video teaching aids effect the working environment. Therefore, due to less provision of Physical facilities in a working environments resulted in poor performance.
2. Institutions which do not take interest in fulfilling social needs of its employees cannot produce a Conducive working environment for its employees.
3. From the finding of the psychological factors in this study it was found that stress, excessive workload, impolite behavior of colleagues and frustration leads to un-conducive working environment which needs to be addressed.
4. Rigid rules, formal interaction of the principal, non-flexible and discriminatory behavior of administrators were the administrative factors in a working environment which made the workplace punitive to work in.
5. It was revealed that the role of External Climate in a working environment like role of community services,

external influence, culture & heritage had a vital effect on the working environment.

6. Organizational framework in a working environment indicated that extra workload, lack of in-service training opportunities, criteria of fair evaluation, non-recognition and lack of acknowledgment were the most profound factors of a working environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Encompassing results show indication of several prospects for improvement. However, those areas that were placed below satisfaction level need urgent management, consideration and action. Hence, we recommend to the management to focus its efforts on the following areas:

1. Regarding lack of availability of the physical facilities the management may ensure to provide proper equipment, adequate number of class rooms, sufficient resources and provision of audio visual teaching aids to improve the working environment conditions.
2. It is strongly recommended that social behaviors in a working environment may be improved by introducing Peer learning and Collaborative learning programs by the College Administration. These programs would be helpful to evade grouping and lack of coordination among colleagues which may boost a healthy working environment.
3. It is strongly recommended that management may tackle the psychological issues of a working environment by introducing a biannual visit of psychologists in the educational institutions and may utilize the services of psychologists at its best. Psychological issues may be easily addressed by constituting a counseling team comprising of senior, vibrant and experienced teachers.
4. It is strongly recommended that the heads of the institutions may be democratic minded, they may adopt the principle of equality and may have proactive approach in a working environment.
5. Management may envisage weaknesses of organizational framework in a working environment. An evaluation committee at the district level should be introduced which may ensure that evaluation may be brisk, frequent, and unbiased. It may not be based on superficial judgments, but it should cater several dimensions of professional growth. It may provide various training opportunities to its employees. Rationalization of workload distribution among the staff in an institution may be strictly observed by a team of experts.
6. In a nutshell it is recommended that a Conducive working environment may be promoted in educational institutions for its employees by accomplishing all the physical, social, psychological, administrative and organizational factors.

7.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The recommendations for future research are:

1. Further research should be conducted to male colleges as well.
2. This research was conducted in District Rawalpindi. However, its results cannot be generalized for the whole of Punjab province. Therefore, it is recommended that this research may be conducted in other Districts of Punjab.

3. Research can be expanded to private sector colleges as well.

REFERENCES

1. Raza, A.S. *Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Performance of Teachers in Public and Private Colleges of Pakistan*. Rawalpindi: (Unpublished PhD thesis), University of Arid Agriculture. (2010).
2. Graham, J. Up close with Fred Douglas: The Worker's Voice. 1 (8), 29-33(2003)
3. King, A. & Peart, M.J. *Teachers in Canada: Their work and quality of life*. Ottawa: Canadian teacher's federation.(1992)
4. Pheasant, S. *Ergonomics, work and health*. London: MacMillan, 1991. 358pp.(1991)
5. Freiberg, H. J., & Stein, T.A. *School Climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments*. London: Palmer Press, pp. 3(4), 11-29.(1999)
6. Guest, D.E. Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: An analysis and review of the evidence. *Int. J. Manage. Rev.*, 5/6 (1): 1-19.(2004)
7. Silla, I. et al. *Job Insecurity and health-related outcomes among different types of temporary workers*. Economic and Industrial Democracy 26, 89-117.(2005)
8. Lavy, V. Using performance based pay to improve the quality of teachers. *Future Children*. 17(1): 87-109. (2007)
9. Hayat, S.A. *Study of Organizational Climate, job Satisfaction and class room performance*. Lahore: (Ph.D. Thesis), University of the Punjab.(1998)
10. Hirsch, E., & Emerick, S. (with Church, K., & Fuller, E.). *Teacher working conditions are student learning conditions*. A report on the 2006 North Carolina teacher working conditions survey. Hillsborough, NC.(2007)
11. Gunbayi, I. School Climate and Teacher Perceptions on Climate Factors: Research into Nine Urban High Schools. *The Turkish online Journal of Educational Technology*. 6(3) School (2007).
12. Ingersoll, R.M. and Alsalam, N. A. *The Effects of Professionalization on Teachers: A Multilevel Analysis*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES 96-XX. (1996).
13. Edis, M. *Performance Management and Appraisal in Health Service*. London: Kogan Page, 24 pp. (1995).
14. Medley, D. M., and Shannon, D. M. *Teacher Evaluation*. New York: In T. Husen and T. N. Postlethwaite, eds. *The International Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 10, 2nd ed., pp. 6015-20. Pergamon. (1994).
15. Roeloelofsen, P. The impact of office environments on employee Performance: The design of the workplace as a strategy for productivity enhancement. *Journal of Facilities Management; 1 (3), ABI/INFORM Global pp.247-264*. (2002).
16. Dorgan, C.E. *Productivity Link to the Indoor Environment Estimated Relative to ASHRAE 62-1989*.

- Proceedings of Health Buildings 94, Budapest, pp.461-472. (1994).
17. Smylie, M. & Allen, L. *Workplace conditions of the American public school teacher: A 40-year perspective*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. (1996).
 18. Jacoby, S.M. *Employing bureaucracy: Managers, unions and the transformation of work in American industry 1990-1945*. New York: Columbia University Press. (1984).
 19. Morishima, M. *Evolution of white collar human resource management in Japan in Lewin, D. Kauffman, B.E. & Soucell, D.(eds)*. Advances in industrial and labour relations. JAI Press Greenwich CT. Vol 7 (pp. 146-76). (1986).
 20. Pigors, C. & Meyers, C.A. *Personnel Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education. (1981).
 21. Decenzo, A.P. & Robbins, P.S. *Personnel: Human resource management (3rd ed.)*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India, Private Limited. (2002).
 22. Tessema, M. Soeters, J. Challenges and prospects of HRM in developing countries. *Testing the HRM-performance link in Eritrean civil service. Int. J. Hum. Res. Manage.*, 17(1): 86. (2006).
 23. Dawson, S. M. (Secondary stock market performance of initial public offers, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia: 1978-1984. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 14,65-76. (1987).
 24. Nguyen et al. *Relative Pay and Job Satisfaction*. Some New Evidence, MPRA Paper No 1382. (2003).
 25. Pool, M.B. & Summers, L. *Australian women & careers: Psychological, contextual influences over the life course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press. (1996).
 26. Hirsch, E. *Teacher working conditions are student learning conditions: A report of Governor Easley's 2004 working conditions initiative*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2005b).
 27. Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. *Transformational leadership effects: a replication, School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. 4(10), pp. 451-479. (1999).
 28. James, D. Forget Downsizing, Now Its Participative Redesign. *Business Rev.*, Weekly, 18(46): 70-72. (1996).
 29. Schermerhorn, J. Hunt, J. Osborn, R. *Organizational Behavior (9th ed.)*: New York: John Wiley. (2005).
 30. Padilla-Velez, D. (1993). Job satisfaction of vocational teachers in Puerto Rico. The Ohio State University
 31. Johnson, S.M. *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and effectiveness*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from <http://www.nea.org/research/bestpractices/images/wcreport.pdf>(2006).
 32. Lazear, M. & Rosen, S. (Rank order tournaments as optimal labour constraints. London: *Journal of Political Economy*. (1981).