

QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND PRODUCTIVITY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS

SHAMIRA C. DAIS

Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography, Mindanao State University, Sanga-Sanga, Bongao, Tawi-Tawi, PHILIPPINES.

Email: shamira_dais@yahoo.com

How to cite this article: Dais, S.C. (March, 2018). Quality of work life and productivity of physical education instructors. Journal of Physical Education Research, Volume 5, Issue I, 76-88.

Received: December 22, 2017

Accepted: March 06, 2018

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in the campuses of the Mindanao State University System. The researcher employed the quantitative and qualitative method of research. The quantitative method was used to know the relationship between quality of work life and the productivity in terms of instruction, research and community service and the P.E. instructors profile. The qualitative method used the Key Informant Interview (KII) to look into the perceived factors that may influence the quality of work life and productivity of the P.E. instructors. The regular PE instructors of Mindanao State University served as the respondents of this study. This included the PE instructors of the following 11 campuses. The instrument used in gathering data in this study was composed of four parts. The 1st part includes the personal profile of the respondents, the 2nd part utilized a standardized instrument of Walton's Quality of Work Life Questionnaire, the 3rd part was a researcher made questionnaire on the productivity of the PE instructors in terms of instruction, research, and community service (extension), in addition, another 3-item questionnaire was also administered to the P.E. instructors and chairperson of the P.E. department for the secondary data. The findings showed that PE instructors had high satisfaction on their quality of work life in all indicators except in total life space. The findings showed that PE instructors performed well in instruction, research and extension.

Keywords: *Quality of work life, productivity, physical education instructors.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance is not a myth; it is a reality that has to be achieved for a person to find satisfaction in every effort he makes. Finding a suitable balance between work and daily living is a challenge not only to the workers but to the employers as well.

Quality of work life is a philosophy or a set of principles, which holds that people are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making a valuable contribution to the organization. It also involves treating people with respect (Rose, Beh, Uli, & Idris, 2006). In order to have quality of work life, it is not enough to have a job that generates labor satisfaction. A higher quality of life at work will undoubtedly be determined by elements relating to better or worse relationships, and trust and commitment with bosses and/or subordinates (Requena, 2003).

On the other hand, productivity is optimization of resources in order to produce the customers' or stakeholders' requirement at the needed time (Ledesma-Tan et al., 2001). It is ideally achieved through high performance and with a sense of personal satisfaction by the people doing the work (Schermerhorn as cited by Begas (2012). It suggests that people are valuable organizational resources and managers should provide avenues for the attainment of the workers' need to be productive.

Correspondence: Shamira C. Dais (Ph.D.), Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography, Mindanao State University, Sanga-Sanga, Bongao, Tawi-Tawi, PHILIPPINES, Email: shamira_dais@yahoo.com.

Presently the administration in this university is seeing a decrease in individual and organizational output and efficiency. Despite great investment placed, and reasonable work schedules as well as professional training, low motivation, low efficiency and low productivity are evident among the faculty due to absenteeism, movement, resignation, health issues and early retirement. The Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs as well as the Director of the Students' Affairs and Services disclosed that a number of faculty had been complaining about teaching overload, lack of classrooms, poorly ventilated classrooms, lack of sports facilities, and temporary or contractual status. Others also had complained about lack of financial support in pursuing their graduate and post graduate degrees. Such problems can be some of the factors why their performance as faculty is deteriorating. It has been noted that the smallest population in every institution of the MSU system are the physical education instructors. There is less financial support in physical education and sports which, in turn, may have affected productivity.

This prevailing situation has prompted the researcher who is a P.E. instructor in MSU - Tawi-Tawi to look into the influence of work life balance on the respondents' productivity. This study is also fastened on the "Theory of Performance" of Elger (2011) stating that "performance develops and relates concepts to form a framework that can be used to explain quality of work as well as productivity performance improvements". The theory stressed further that to perform is to produce valued results. It also pointed out that developing performance is a journey, and level of performance describes location in the journey. The proponent of the theory averred that a performer can be an individual or a group of people engaging in a collaborative effort. He further asserted that current level of performance relied holistically on six components, namely: context, level of knowledge, levels of skills, level of identity, personal factors, and fixed factors. Three axioms were proposed by Elger for effective performance improvements that lead to quality of work and productivity. These involved a performer's mindset, immersion in an enriching environment, and engagement in reflective practice. In this present investigation, quality of work and productivity are variables being measured in terms of determining the level of quality of work and the level of productivity among the PE instructors of Mindanao State University system.

It should also be noted that despite their high productivity, assistant professors were significantly less satisfied with their jobs than their colleagues at the full professor rank. The study of Rosser is related to the present investigation because the moderating and extraneous variables in the study include, gender, salary range, marital status, age, and length of service. In general, literature and studies helped the researcher in coming up with the total concept of this study especially in this investigation on the relationship of quality of work life and the productivity of the faculty. The cited literature and studies herein all dealt with the related subject matter with the present study. However, the locale, time and respondents all differ, since the present study was conducted in a province down in ARMM while the aforementioned studies were conducted in a foreign setting and other places in the Philippines.

2. METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1 Research Design

The researcher employed the quantitative and qualitative method of research. The quantitative method was used to know the relationship between quality of work life and the productivity in terms of instruction, research and community service and the P.E. instructors profile. The qualitative method used the Key Informant Interview (KII) to look into the perceived factors that may influence the quality of work life and productivity of the P.E. instructors. The information gathered served as reference point for analysis, classification, interpretation and evaluation of the present status of the prevailing conditions.

The following indicators were used as measuring factors: the quality of work life includes adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy environment, development of human capacities, growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism, total life space, and social relevance. These indicators were extracted from the study of Reza *et al.* (2013) which utilized Walton's Quality of Work Life Questionnaire and the indicators for the faculty productivity will be instruction, research and community service.

The data were gathered through a modified research instrument on quality of work life and productivity of the PE instructors. A correlation analysis was utilized in order to determine the significant relationship between the variables of the study.

2.2 Research Environment

This study was conducted in the campuses of the Mindanao State University System. The Mindanao State University, founded on September 1, 1961 through republic Act 1387 and Republic Act 1893 has evolved over the years in keeping with national and local developments. The brain-child of late Senator, Domocao Alonto, it has grown from its main campus in Marawi City to a university system that now comprises MSU Main Campus Marawi, MSU- Lanao National College of Arts and Trade (LNCAT), MSU Maguindanao, MSU-Sulu, MSU- Tawi-Tawi College of Technology and Oceanography (TCTO), MSU-Buug, MSU- Iligan Institute of Technology (IIT), MSU-Naawan, MSU- Lanao del Norte Agricultural College (LNAC), MSU Maigo School of Arts and Trade (MSAT) and MSU-General Santos. The MSU system is the only university with a special mandate of integrating the cultural communities, specially the Muslims into the mainstream of the nation's socio-cultural & political life by providing them with opportunities for quality and relevant public education for self-development, and providing trained manpower skills and technical know-how for the economic development of Mindanao, Sulu, Basilan, Tawi-Tawi and Palawan region. The university, with its dynamic and highly qualified faculty and staff continuously endeavor for professional development and advancement.

2.3 Research Respondents

The regular PE instructors of Mindanao State University system served as the respondents of this study. This included the PE instructors of the following 11 campuses.

MSU Campus	Number of P.E. Instructors
1. MSU Main Marawi	22
2. MSU – LNCAT	1
3. MSU – Maguindanao	3
4. MSU – Sulu	3
5. MSU – TCTO	5
6. MSU –Buug	2
7. MSU – IIT	12
8. MSU – Naawan	3
9. MSU – LNAC	2
10. MSU – MSAT	2
11. MSU – General Santos	4
Total	59

Total enumeration was used in determining the respondents of this study.

2.3 Research Instrument

The instrument used in gathering data in this study was composed of four parts. The first part includes the personal profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, academic rank, length of service and number of related trainings.

The second part utilized a standardized instrument of Walton's Quality of Work Life Questionnaire - a 34-item standardized test which measures 8 work characteristics, namely: adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy environment, development of human capacities, growth and security, social integration, constitutionalism, total life space and social relevance. Each item was described by four-point scale.

The third part was a researcher made questionnaire on the productivity of the PE instructors in terms of instruction, research, and community service (extension). Each indicator has 15 sub indicators that measure faculty productivity. Each indicator for faculty productivity was measured using a four-point Likert scale.

In addition, another 3-item questionnaire was also administered to the P.E. instructors and chairperson of the P.E. department for the secondary data. These questions were included in the questionnaire. Another set of questions were asked during the oral interview through phone calls. The recorded answers to these questions were used as evidence or proof to validate the perceived answers of the faculty about their quality of work life and productivity.

2.4 Research Procedure

A letter of request was sent to the office of the Dean, Graduate School, and sought for endorsement to be able to conduct the study to the 11 MSU campuses. Further, a letter request was sent by the researcher to the Deans and Heads of the P.E. department of each of the 11 MSU campuses of the MSU System and sought the permission to gather data in their respective institutions. Upon approval, the researcher sent the questionnaire thru LBC to the different campuses due to unstable peace and order situation, except MSU TCTO which is the researcher's home place. The gathered data and responses were consolidated and tallied in tabular form according to the various aspects of the problem for analysis and interpretation.

3. RESULTS

This section contains the data, analysis and interpretation of the level of quality of work life of the respondents which includes eight dimensions which directly influence the employee's performance, namely: adequate and fair compensation; safe and healthy environment; development of human capacities; growth and security; social integration; constitutionalism; total life space; and social relevance.

Table 1: Adequate and Fair Compensation

A. Adequate and Fair Compensation	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How satisfied are you with your salary (remuneration)?	3.19	0.66	High Satisfaction Level
2. How satisfied are you with your salary, if you compare it to your colleagues' salary?	2.98	0.73	High Satisfaction Level
3. How satisfied are you with the recompenses and the participation that you receive from the company.	3.03	0.59	High Satisfaction Level
4. How satisfied are you with the extra benefits (alimentation, transport, doctor, dentist, etc.) that your company offers to you?	2.56	0.90	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	2.94	0.60	High Satisfaction Level

Parameters limits for QWL

Range	Interpretation
3.26-4.0	Very high satisfaction level
2.51-3.25	High satisfaction level
1.76-2.50	Low satisfaction level
1.0-1.75	Very low satisfaction level

Table 1 shows the quality of work life in terms of adequate and fair compensation. The table shows item 1 has the highest mean of 3.19. This means that the PE instructors were satisfied with the salary that they were receiving. This is because almost all of the PE instructors had permanent work status and some had the rank of Associate Professor and Professor receiving higher salary than teachers in the Department of Education, followed by items 3, 2 and 4 with means of 3.03, 2.98 and 2.56, respectively. They obtained an interpretation of “High satisfaction level”.

The average weighted mean of 2.94 is interpreted as “High satisfaction level”. This finding means that most of the respondents were satisfied with their salary and compensation. They believed that their compensations were adequate and fair. By giving such ratings, it could be said that the respondents were just contented with their income from their job, equally compensatory to their qualifications, training, experience and professional development.

Promotion in schools and determination of salary involves a process that gives credit to every endeavor that the teacher undertakes. Along this line, the respondents had been promoted to higher rank since most of them had been in the university for 21 years and above. Begas (2012) averred that faculty members who have stayed long enough in their institutions enjoy a higher pay as result of expertise and advance qualification. Moreover, he stressed that young adult being less paid tend to be less satisfied with their work.

Although almost half of the respondents occupied the positions of Instructor I to III, the PE instructors fully understood that the entry salary grade for faculty in SUCs is salary grade 12 and that they are required to have at least a 3 years experience before they get the promotion. However, despite this situation, the teachers continued to strive for excellence; thus, they felt secure and they perceived fairness in compensation and the adequacy of pay as an indicator of the quality of work life that they experienced in the institutions where they were connected.

Table 2: Safety and Healthy Environment

B. Regarding your working conditions:	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How do you feel regarding your workload (quantity of work)?	3.24	0.63	High Satisfaction Level
2. How do you feel regarding the use of technology in your tasks?	2.75	0.71	High Satisfaction Level
3. How satisfied are you with the salubrity level (work conditions) in your workplace?	2.88	0.49	High Satisfaction Level
4. How satisfied are you with the security equipment, individual and collective protection provided by your company?	2.66	0.76	High Satisfaction Level
5. How do you feel regarding tiredness that your work cause to you?	2.98	0.57	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	2.90	0.46	High Satisfaction Level

Shown in Table 2 are the data on the level quality of work life of the respondents in terms of working conditions. The table shows that among the five statements, item one has the highest mean of 3.24. This means that the PE instructors had workable teaching load schedules in which they could manage their time with other functions. Having other designations such as department chair, sports coordinator entitled them to a 6- to 9-unit deloading. Their workloads allowed them to perform research and community service.

Followed by items 5, 3, 2 and 4 with mean of 2.98, 2.88, 2.75 and 2.66 respectively, the overall mean of the respondents was 2.90, with an interpretation of “High satisfaction level”. This means that the respondents simply believed that they have a safe and healthy working environment as they experienced in a clean and well maintained work area. The institution has provided safety and security measures that the faculty members need not worry about.

Walton, as cited by Markham (2010) stated that employees should not be exposed to working conditions that can adversely affect their physical and mental health. Consequently, the results of employer concern, union action, and legislation have promoted favorable working conditions through focus on noise, illumination, workspace, accident avoidance as well as the implementation of reasonable work hours and age limits for potential employees.

Harrison (2000) also agreed that safe and healthy work conditions have a significant impact on quality of work life. Newell (2002) highlights that quality of work life involves making improvements to the physical working conditions under which employees operate in order to make their work setting more favorable.

Table 3: Development of Human Capacities

C. Regarding the use of your capacities at the work:	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Are you satisfied with the autonomy (opportunity to make decisions) that you have at your work?	3.14	0.66	High Satisfaction Level
2. Are you satisfied with the importance of the task/work/activity that you do?	3.27	0.58	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How do you feel regarding the polyvalence (possibility to performance several tasks and works) at work?	3.08	0.53	High Satisfaction Level
4. How satisfied are you with your performance evaluation (awareness of how good or bad have been your performance at work)?	3.17	0.62	High Satisfaction Level
5. How do you feel regarding possibilities conferred (work responsibility given to you)?	3.20	0.52	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	3.17	0.46	High Satisfaction Level

Table 3 presents the data on the quality of work life in terms of development of human capacities. The table shows that item 2 has the highest mean of 3.27, interpreted as “Very High Satisfaction level”. This means that PE instructors agreed that their job allows them to make decisions on their own and that they are left to decide on how they should accomplish things. Further, they are given the span of action that allows them to unleash their potentials. Followed by items 5, 4, 1 and 3 with means of 3.20, 3.17, 3.14 and 3.08 respectively, interpreted as “high satisfaction level”. The average weighted 3.17 also has an interpretation of “high satisfaction level”. This means that the respondents agreed with the statements that indicate development of human capacities. They strongly agreed that their job requires them to be creative since it requires high level of skills. More than that, they are expected to learn new things since their jobs are generally challenging.

Walton as cited by Markham (2010) added that the feature of skill variety allows employees the opportunity to use and develop their human capacities through exercise of their competencies, skills and abilities rather than the reception of limited, narrow skills. Thus, the management and employees should mutually decide the job contents and assign the tasks that are challenging and interesting for the employees as challenging works can increase the employee performance (Fisher *et al.*, 2004).

Being free from close supervision would always allow every worker to be creative and be developed as a human resource. The trust given by the institution is one gesture that the employee is really worth the job and that the employee is really worth hiring. Thus, their capacities and potentialities should be unleashed so that the administration could discover the maximum work

and creativity that the employee is capable of doing. According to Hall (2008), the lack of role clarity is likely to make individuals believe they are helpless, and thus, reduce the impact they have in their work area. In contrast, individuals who understand their work roles are more likely to take actions and decisions in their work area.

Moreover, the central thrust to this perspective is that organizational productivity can be served by providing people with the opportunity to use their human capacities, pursue self-improvement, and identify with the work place. Quality of work life responds to both organizational needs and worker growth needs for improved work and working conditions. The above approach perceives Quality of Work Life to have, at its core, two goals: (a) to humanize the work place and improve the quality of employees' work experiences, and (b) simultaneously, to improve the overall productivity of the organization (Kotze, 2005).

To Walton as cited by Reza *et al.* (2013) organizational productivity can be served by providing people with the opportunity to use their human capacities, pursue self-improvement, and identify with the work place. Thus, to maintain an effective, productive and mentally healthy labor force, management should create an atmosphere that will enable people to actualize their full potential (Ivancevich, 2007).

Table 4: Growth and security

D. Regarding opportunities that you have at your work:	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How satisfied are you with your opportunity for professional growth?	2.95	0.73	High Satisfaction Level
2. How satisfied are you with the trainings you have participated in?	2.98	0.75	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How do you feel regarding the situation and the frequency of resigning at work occur?	2.86	0.57	High Satisfaction Level
4. How do you feel regarding the incentive to study given by your company?	2.64	0.85	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	2.86	0.59	High Satisfaction Level

Table 4 shows among the four statements, item 2 has the highest mean of 2.98, followed by items 1, 3, and 4 with means of 2.95, 2.86, and 2.64 respectively, interpreted as "High Satisfaction level". Along this line, it obtained an average weighted mean of 2.86, also interpreted as "High Satisfaction level". This points out that the respondents agreed on the indicators of growth and security. This would simply mean that the institutions were working for the development of their human resources.

These ratings could be achieved through attendance to graduate education, attendance in seminars and training in their own field. Aside from that, schools were offering scholarship programs for those faculty members who wanted to proceed with their graduate and post graduate education. The effective performance of an organization (according to Hyoon 2010) depends not just on the available resources, but its quality and competence as required by the organization from time to time. An organization, to be dynamic, should possess dynamic human resources. It can develop, change and excel, only if it possess developed human resources. Thus, HRD plays a significant role in making the human resources vital, useful and purposeful. Cartwright and Holmes (2006) stated that organizations need to address and understand the deeper needs of employees in order to retain them and keep them motivated, as "talented people demand meaningful work....deny it, they leave".

Rennekamp (2013) believed that supporting staff members in professional growth improve job performance as well as increase levels of personal satisfaction. Planning for professional growth is an important part of professional responsibility. Effective planning involves looking beyond the present and taking a long-term, holistic look at one's career. Further, they

simply believed that the administration did everything to provide security of tenure for them at any level which made them safe and secure about their job. One important aspect of working conditions is the security of the worker's position: uncertainty about the employment position causes stress. According to Mone as cited by Markham (2010), employees who are unsure of their future in the organization may opt to transfer to other school, hunt for jobs or go abroad. Consequently, employees who are more insecure in their jobs are likely to react more positively to positive treatment by the organization than employees who enjoy a more secure position (Lee & Peccei, 2007). Tenure makes one secure, thus, these instructors must have gotten their tenure that they already feel secure.

Table 5: Social Integration

E. Regarding social integration at work:	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How do you feel regarding the discrimination (social, racial, religious, sexual, etc.) in your work place?	2.85	0.71	High Satisfaction Level
2. How do you feel regarding your relationship with your colleagues and bosses at work?	3.29	0.59	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How do you feel regarding your team's and colleagues' commitment to work?	3.07	0.55	High Satisfaction Level
4. How satisfied are you with the valorization of your ideas and initiative at work?	3.05	0.57	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	3.06	0.46	High Satisfaction Level

Presented in Table 5 are the data on the quality of work life of the respondents along social integration. Among the four statements, item 2 got the highest mean of 3.29, interpreted as "very high satisfaction level". Items 3, 4, and 1, with means of 3.07, 3.05 and 2.85, respectively, got an interpretation of "High Satisfaction level". Along this line, the respondents simply believed that they belong to the institution where they were currently connected. They felt that they were treated justly and that their superior gave them support and assistance needed in getting their job done. They felt the sense of belongingness that they can always expect their colleagues to support them and help them when they are doing something or when they need help as reflected in the average mean of 3.29 interpreted as "High Satisfaction level".

Within belongingness theory, self-esteem has been proposed to play a special role as an indicator of one's satisfaction of the need to belong. That is, self-esteem levels rise and fall in accordance with one's acceptance and rejection from a group (Williams, 2007). Consistently low levels of acceptance result in low levels of self-esteem. In the workplace, self-esteem is assessed with measures of organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), defined as the extent to which individuals believe they are capable, significant, and worthy at work. The respondents felt that there were fewer instances of biases, discrimination and injustices. Though there were individual differences as expected in an institution, these were not a hindrance in order to have harmonious relationship with the co-faculty and subordinates. Further, their voices were also recognized. Their suggestions were solicited and they were part of the planning and activities in school. According to Jenkins and Elliot (2004) support can be emotional, such as the action of caring or listening sympathetically, or instrumental, involving tangible assistance such as help with a work task. Such a lack of support represents an identity threat or actions by others "that challenges, calls into question, or diminishes a person's sense of competence, dignity, or self-worth" (Aquino & Douglas, 2003).

Simple recognition of the employee's accomplishment paves the way towards a better work performance the next time. It creates inspiration among the employees. It improves their work morale thereby allowing them to show their maximum effort towards attaining objectives of the organization. It improves the employee's level of motivation (Martires, 2004). Bakker *et al.*,

(2005) affirmed this finding as they found that social support at work is also a potential buffer against job stress, hence providing protection from pathological consequences of stressful experiences. In a study of higher education employees, the study showed that the combination of high demands and low job resources in the workplace significantly added to the risk of burnout. Furthermore, work overload, emotional demands, physical demands, and work-home interference did not result in high levels of burnout if employees experienced autonomy, received feedback, had social support, or had a high quality relationship with their supervisor. These authors postulated that the aspects of the high-quality supervisor relationships provided important instrumental help and emotional support.

Hawkins and Shohet (2000) also supported the above-mentioned and stated that a good supervisor can also help one to use one's resources better, manage one's workload and challenge inappropriate patterned ways of coping. Scaife and Walsh (2001) also support the inclusion of this as a legitimate focus of supervision, describing how supervision can provide an opportunity for dealing with the effects of organizational climate and professional relationships.

Table 6: Constitutionalism

F. Regarding constitutionalism (respect to the laws) at your work	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How satisfied are you with the company for respecting the workers' rights?	2.93	0.72	High Satisfaction Level
2. How satisfied are you with your freedom of expression (opportunity to give opinions) at work?	3.00	0.69	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How satisfied are you with the norms and rules at your work?	2.97	0.59	High Satisfaction Level
4. How do you feel regarding the respect to your individuality (individual characteristics and particularities) at work?	3.19	0.54	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	3.02	0.50	High Satisfaction Level

Table 6 presents the data on the quality of work life of the respondents reflected along constitutionalism. As shown in the table, item 4 has the highest mean of 3.19, and items 2, 3 and 1 got means of 3.00, 2.97 and 2.93, respectively, with an interpretation of "High Satisfaction level"; the average weighted mean of 3.02 is also interpreted as "High Satisfaction level". This shows that the respondents have experienced being respected and that they have the right to air out their concerns as workers. Further they exercise their rights as workers and were being protected by the laws, rules and regulations concerning employment by the Civil Service Commission. Their workplace observed individuality and privacy and that there was equal treatment of all workers. This showed how respectful the organizations are, and that they are free from being used and abused. Orpen as cited by Markham (2010) propounded that besides the above dimensions or determinants that help to define what constitutes quality of work life, there is another set that is frequently overlooked by industrial psychologists, since this essentially of a legal nature, and is concerned not so much with how people behave but rather with what rights they should enjoy, whether they exercise them or not. The criteria to be proposed are essentially concerned with the extent to which work organizations, acting either in response to trade union pressure or on their own initiatives, have set up formal procedures to protect the individual worker from capricious actions by employers.

To Bell *et al.*, as cited by Markham (2010) only if the work organization ensures that the following so-called rights of individuals are officially respected can the quality of life be high.

Table 7: Total Life Space

G. Regarding the space that the work occupy in your life	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How satisfied are you with the work influence on your family life/routine?	3.25	0.51	High Satisfaction Level
2. How satisfied are you with the work influence on your possibilities of leisure?	3.31	0.50	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How satisfied are you with your schedule of work and rest?	3.32	0.54	Very High Satisfaction Level
4. How do you feel regarding the respect to your individuality (individual characteristics and particularities) at work?	3.19	0.54	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	3.29	0.46	Very High Satisfaction Level

Table 7 presents the quality of work life along areas of space that the work occupied in the respondents' lives. Along this line, it could be said that the quality of work life of the respondents is very high satisfactory as shown by the means in items 3 and 2, of 3.32 and 3.31 respectively indicating that they agreed with the items on the provisions for total life space. Item 1 has a mean of 3.25 interpreted as "high satisfaction level". The total weighted mean of 3.29 is interpreted as "very high satisfaction level". This means that they experienced a total life space despite the fact that they were working for the school. They were generally satisfied with the work influence to their family. This finding is affirmed by the study of Raduan *et al.*, (2006) which indicated that a happy family correlates with high levels of job satisfaction and objective career success. Family's moral support and the diversion it entails make it an important factor affecting quality of work life. Moreover, the table shows that the respondents were satisfied with their work, their schedule of work, the pace of their work and including leisure time from their work. This means that the workplace is relaxing and is worth keeping. Khan (2008) emphasized that flexibility in work schedule can enhance the employee motivation, which in turn can increase productivity.

In general, the workplace is conducive for working. Herriot as cited by Raduan *et al.*, (2006) hypothesized that a higher conflict in the work role will result in the lower quality of family life, meaning that a higher conflict will result in the lower level of quality of work life; in other words, having a balance between work and family will result in the higher level of quality of work life. The scenario could be imagined as a workplace that is worth staying for a long time. Most of the times, the people occupying the workplace experience tension, pressure and coercion by their superiors with which one cannot imagine based on the response of the respondents.

Maslow as cited by Campos *et al.*, (2006) noted that negative work environment may lower faculty productivity. However, it could be said as shown in the table that the Higher Education Institutions involved in this study really had a conducive working environment.

Table 8: Social relevance

H. Regarding the social relevance and importance of your work:	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. How do you feel regarding the proud of performing your work?	3.42	0.53	Very High Satisfaction Level
2. Are you satisfied with the image this company have to society?	3.32	0.54	Very High Satisfaction Level
3. How satisfied are you with the communitarian integration (contribution to the society) that the company have?	3.19	0.54	High Satisfaction Level
4. How satisfied are you with the services and the quality of products that the company makes?	3.19	0.51	High Satisfaction Level
5. How satisfied are you with the human resources politic (the way that the company treats the workers) that the company has?	2.88	0.70	High Satisfaction Level
Mean	3.20	0.41	High Satisfaction Level

Presented in Table 8 are the data on the quality of work life of the respondents in terms of social relevance. Data reveals that the respondents have very high satisfaction quality of work life. The

total weighted mean of 3.20 shows a high satisfaction level of quality of life. They felt very satisfied and felt very proud of their work. They felt satisfied with their job and the extension services relative to their job. Not just that these were mandated functions but the respondents were really committed to their work even if these were not required of them. They felt that their work was important and rewarding and that they had effected to some extent to the lives of others. The institution was just showing its social responsibility, which is very important as a tertiary institution.

Chalofsky (2003) advocates that meaning in work, also termed meaningful work, is the way one expresses the meaning and purpose of one's life through work activities, although work is just one area of an individual's life. In essence, meaningful work is that which gives real substance to what one does, which brings a sense of fulfillment to one's life and contributes significantly to one's purpose in life. Therefore, according to Grady and McCarthy (2008) meaningful work is influenced by an inclusiveness of all the aspects of one's life beyond that of paid employment which can lead to an integrated wholeness for the individual. However, to attain a state of meaningful work, it is critical that no one sphere is so dominant that it adversely impacts the value gained from the other spheres. To Wrezesniewski *et al.* (2003), the meaning people make of their work is tied to their attitudes about the work they do and their overall wellbeing.

4. DISCUSSION

The data revealed that more than half of the respondents are female, mostly married and in their 50s, half of whom are master's degree holder and had attended relevant trainings and seminars. The level of quality of work life of the respondents was perceived with "High Satisfaction level" in all indicators except on total life space which was perceived with "Very High Satisfaction level".

The level of productivity of the respondents in instruction was "Very High Productive", while the level of productivity in research and community service was "High Productive". There was no significant relationship between the quality of work life of the respondents and their profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, academic rank, length of service, and number of related training. Accordingly, there was no significant relationship between the respondents' level of productivity and their profile except in academic rank. However, there was a significant difference between the level of quality of work life and productivity when the respondents were grouped according to schools. It was also found out that there was no significant relationship between quality of work life and the respondents' productivity in instruction, research and community service.

The factors which influenced quality of work life as perceived by the respondents were recognition, salary/benefits, training/professional advancement, dedication, adequacy of facilities/equipment, promotion, and safe and conducive environment. The factors which influenced productivity as perceived by the respondents were compensation, professional growth, safe environment, administrative support, seminars/trainings, and relationship with co-faculty. As to what drove them to accomplish or achieve more at work, the respondents revealed that promotion was the common motivation.

The findings showed that PE instructors had high satisfaction on their quality of work life in all indicators except in total life space. Nevertheless, out of eight indicators, growth and security and safe and healthy environment were rated with the lowest satisfaction. These were the two indicators that need to be paid attention to. They viewed that there was an inappropriate use of technology in the task, the work conditions were not that conducive, and there was lack of security equipment, and individual and collective protection. On the other hand, they were not very much satisfied on the opportunities provided for professional growth like providing scholarships and

assistance in pursuing their graduate studies. Moreover, they were not very much satisfied with the incentives that they received from the institution.

The findings showed that PE instructors performed well in instruction, research and extension. Nevertheless, there were some indicators that need to be paid attention to. Only few served as editor, area or associate editor or as a member of editorial boards/professional journal; served as principal investigator in competitive and externally funded research grants and contracts; few became authors or co-authors non-refereed works (such as journal articles, chapters in books, etc.) that are published by commercial or non-commercial organizations, and few became authors or coauthors non - refereed works (such as newspaper and magazine articles, books reviews, etc.) that are published by commercial or noncommercial organizations.

5. CONCLUSION

Age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service, academic rank, and relevant training are not indicators of quality of work life. Age, sex, marital status, highest educational attainment, length of service, and relevant training are not indicators of productivity in instruction, research, and community service. Academic rank is a significant factor of productivity in instruction, research, and community service. The level of quality of work life and level of productivity of PE instructors differ by institution where they belong.

In the light of the findings in this study, the proponent hereby recommends to implement the Action Plan on Quality of Work Life and the Action Plan on Productivity to all campuses of the MSU System. State Universities may provide their PE instructors a comprehensive and responsive faculty Development program/Action Plan to support them in their quest for professional advancement.

6. REFERENCES

- Allis, R. (2011). *Improving employee productivity*. Available online at: <http://www.zeromillion.com/management/employee-productivity/> (Accessed on 12 February 2017).
- Andersson, R., Quigley, M.J., & Wilhelmsson, M. (2009). urbanization, productivity, and innovation: evidence from investment in higher education. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 66(1), 2-15.
- Barrick, R. K., Jess D. M., & Edward, V. T. (2000). *Designing, conducting and analyzing correlational research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bernas, J. G. (2002). *The 1987 Philippine constitution*. Manila Philippines: Rex Book Store.
- Bidad, C. D. (2009). *Community extension services of SUCs in region IX: Basis for sustainable community enhancement program*. JRMSU, Dapitan City.
- Campiseño, J. S. R. (2010). Status of Jose Rizal memorial state college: Basis for a university proposal. *E-International Scientific Research Journal*, 2(3), 192-199.
- Campos, L. C. A., & Souza, A., M. (2006). Study of the Walton's criteria of quality of working life using multivariate analysis in a military organization. Third International Conference on Production Research – Americas' Region. Available online at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.554.3383&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (Accessed on 12 February 2017).
- Carl, D. P. (2001). *Estimating the return of schooling: progress on some persistent econometric problems*. McMillan Book Co.
- Casper, G. (1989). Changing concepts of constitutionalism: 18th to 20th century. *The Supreme Court Review*, 1989, 311-332.

- Hussain, N., & Khalid, K. (2011). Impact of Karasek job demand control model on the job satisfaction of the employees of Nadra. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), 566-594
- Ivancevich, J. M. (2007). *Human resource management*. New York: McGrawHill.
- Jackson, L. A. (2005). *When the love is gone: how to reignite passion for the job*. Black Enterprise.
- Malate, R. F. (2009). *Corporatization of state universities and colleges: impact on quality higher education*. JRMSU, Dapitan City.
- Nante, S., & Gilberto, P. (2009). *Employability of Jose Rizal memorial state college graduates to industries: basis for a job placement program*. JRMSU, Dapitan City.
- Sillero, E. J. (2009). *Internal-external predictors of quality management among SUCs in region IX*. JRMSU, Dapitan City.

JOPER