Demography and Work Ambience: The Business Education Services Cape

V.P. Rameshkumaar[1] and B. Balaji[2]

[1] Assistant Professor (MBA), Sona College of Technology, Salem, Email: konguramesh81@gmail.com
[2] Professor, Shree Gurukripa Institute of Finance and Management, Chennai, Email: prof.bbalaji@gmail.com

Abstract: Workplace ambience, or work ambience has a tremendous impact on the morale of employees in an organisation and eventually dictates the level of a whole range of attributes like leadership, motivation, emotional intelligence, inter-relationships, development, and work engagement. Business education is a popular course that potential managers wish to pursue. This study aimed at assessing the work ambience and associated attributes in business education institutions. 467 Faculty at Bengaluru were surveyed and the study provides insights about various determinants.

Keywords: Work Ambience, Education, Demography.

BACKGROUND

Business education in India has been facing highs and lows down the ages. It is being considered as a critical tool to equip graduates with abilities and competencies to manage business globally and profitably. Infrastructure in many business education institutions resemble star hotels with state-of-the art features. Access to global resources and promise of placements with hefty pay packets stir the ambitions of young minds. Faculty profiles have changed too. Institutions no more have a traditional faculty profile where only degrees count. Faculty with ample exposure to the corporate world and business are now being inducted to foster reality and practicality in the classrooms. Several factors impact the work ambience in such institutions, namely, extraneous attributes, inherent attributes and purlieu attributes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Extraneous attributes concern aspects of a job that form the background or context to the task itself: Such attributes comprise relations with peers, superiors, resources, benefits, job security, and promotion prospects

Inherent attributes concern aspects inherent in the conduct of the job itself: Such attributes comprise development of human capacities, control, autonomy, job content, role clarity, progress and career development, social relevance, and recognition.

Work ambience concerns attributes of an organisation that describes the way in which the organisation operates (internal servicescape) and how it deals with other entities (external servicescape). Such attributes comprise motivation to achieve, fairness and equal treatment, communication, leadership and organisational structure, support and consideration, and participative management.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

(i) What is the inter-correlation between extraneous attributes, inherent attributes, purlieu attributes and work ambience?

(ii) What is the impact of demography factors like age, gender, income, tenure of service, prior corporate work experience, and designation on work ambience?

METHODOLOGY

The objectives were to analyse the inter-correlation between chosen variables and to assess the impact of socio-demography factors. Faculty serving in university-affiliated institutions offering full-time management programs at Bengaluru were surveyed using survey method and structured questionnaire. Proportionate Stratified Sampling was employed for the study wherein strata comprised two categories: colleges affiliated to Bangalore University (BU), and Viswesvaraya Technological University (VTU). The standard deviation value of 'work ambience' obtained from pilot study of 60 Faculty was $\sigma = 0.553$. The sample size was 467 Faculty.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Work Ambience

The mean ratings (4-point scale) for work ambience are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Mean Ratings for Work Ambience

Variables	Affiliated to VTU		Affiliated to BU		Overall	
	Mean Rating	Position	Mean Rating	Position	Mean Rating	Position
Communication	2.59	16	2.63	11	2.61	15
Participative Management	2.70	8	2.82	1	2.75	3*
Benefits	2.63	11	2.63	11	2.63	12
Autonomy and Control	2.44	17	2.46	17	2.45	18**
Recognition	2.84	2	2.60	13	2.75	4
Reward and Motivation to achieve	2.71	5	2.67	6	2.69	7
Relations with Peers	2.71	5	2.67	6	2.69	8
Job Content and Clarity	2.93	1	2.78	2	2.87	1*
Equity and fairness	2.61	15	2.65	8	2.63	13
Promotion prospects	2.71	5	2.72	5	2.71	6
Development of human capacities	2.67	9	2.65	8	2.66	10
Structure and Leadership	2.80	3	2.59	14	2.72	5
Job security	2.63	11	2.61	12	2.62	14

Discussion: It can be seen from Table 1 that the top three highest rated variables for institutions affiliated to VTU were Job Content and Clarity, Recognition and Structure & Leadership. The bottom three lowest rated variables for institutions affiliated to VTU were Autonomy and Control, Consideration, warmth and support, and Communication.

The top three highest rated variables for institutions affiliated to BU were Participative Management, Job Content and Clarity and Progress and development. The bottom three lowest rated variables for institutions affiliated to BU were Autonomy and Control, Consideration, warmth and support, and Superiors.

The top three highest rated variables overall were Job Content and Clarity, Progress and development and Participative Management. The bottom three lowest rated variables overall were Autonomy and Control, Consideration, warmth and support and Superiors.

Inter-Correlation

Null Hypothesis: There is no association between work ambience and other study variables, namely, extraneous attributes, inherent attributes, and purlieu attributes.

Table 2
Inter-Correlation Matrix

Attributes and Coefficients		*Extraneous*	*Inherent*	*Purlieu*	*Work Ambience*
Extraneous attributes	Pearson Correlation	1	0.212**	0.294**	0.496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000	0.000
Inherent attributes	Pearson Correlation	0.212**	1	0.309**	0.445**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.000	0.000
Purlieu attributes	Pearson Correlation	0.294**	0.309**	1	0.553**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000		0.000
Work Ambience	Pearson Correlation	0.496**	0.445**	0.553**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Analysis: It can be seen from Table 2 that p values are lesser than 0.01 and hence null hypothesis is rejected as p is significant at $p<1\%$. The coefficient of correlation (r) between extraneous attributes and work ambience is 0.496. The coefficient of correlation (r) between inherent attributes and work ambience is 0.445. The coefficient of correlation (r) between purlieu attributes and work ambience is 0.553.

Discussion: Extraneous attributes, inherent attributes, and purlieu attributes each have a positive association with work ambience.

Gender

Null Hypotheses: There is no significant difference between male and female with respect to perception about work ambience. There is no significant difference between institutional affiliation with respect to perception about work ambience. There is no significant difference between prior corporate experience with respect to perception about work ambience.

Table 3
Gender, Institution Affiliation,
Prior Work Experience and Work Ambience

Gender	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	t value	p value
Male	255	2.675	0.608	0.807	0.42
Female	212	2.717	0.511		
Visveswaraya Technological University	283	2.735	0.568	1.957	0.051
Bangalore University	184	2.63	0.557		
Possess Prior Corporate experience	230	2.717	0.555	0.888	0.375
Do not possess Prior Corporate experience	237	2.671	0.576		

Analysis: It can be seen from Table 3 that the p values are greater than 0.05 and hence not significant. The null hypotheses are accepted.

Discussion: There is no significant difference between male and female with respect to perception about work ambience. There is no significant difference between institutional affiliation with respect to perception about work ambience. There is no significant difference between prior corporate experience with respect to perception about work ambience.

Age

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between age groups with respect to perception about work ambience.

Table 4
Age Groups and Work Ambience

Age Group (years)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	p value
Below 25	108	2.63	0.504	1.045	0.352
26-35	270	2.72	0.598		
Above 35	89	2.69	0.535		
Total	467	2.69	0.566		

Result: It can be seen from Table 4 that the p value is greater than 0.05 and hence is not significant. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion: There is no significant difference between age groups with respect to perception about work ambience.

Tenure of service

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between tenure of service with respect to perception about work ambience

Table 5
Service Groups and Work Ambience

Tenure (years)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F value	p value
Below 3	107	2.729	0.608	0.565	0.638
3-6	193	2.668	0.589		
6-9	120	2.675	0.521		
Above 9	47	2.766	0.476		
Total	467	2.694	0.566		

Result: It can be seen from Table 5 that the p value is greater than 0.05 and hence is not significant. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion: There is no significant difference between length of service in current institution with respect to perception about work ambience.

Designation

Null Hypothesis: There is no association between designation and perception about work ambience.

Table 6
Designation Groups and Work Ambience

| | Level of Work Ambience | | | | | | |
Designation	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Total	Chi-Square value	p value
Lecturer	3	67	114	12	196	6.636	0.084
A	1.5	34.2	58.2	6.1	100		
B	42.9	45.6	38.6	66.7	42		
SeniorLecturer	4	80	181	6	271		
A	1.5	29.5	66.8	2.2	100		
B	57.1	54.4	61.4	33.3	58		

A: % within designation; B: % within Work Ambience.

Result: It can be seen from Table 6 that the p value is greater than 0.05 and hence is not significant. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion: There is no association between designation and perception about work ambience.

Monthly Compensation

Null Hypothesis: There is no association between monthly compensation and perception about work ambience

Result: It can be seen from Table 7 that the p value is greater than 0.05 and hence is not significant. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion: There is no association between monthly compensation and perception about work ambience.

Table 7
Monthly Compensation Groups and Work Ambience

Monthly Compensation (Rupees)	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Total	Chi-Square value	p value
		Level of Work Ambience					
Below 15000	1	15	35	2	53	4.508	0.608
A	1.9	28.3	66	3.8	100		
B	14.3	10.2	11.9	11.1	11.3		
15000-30000	5	86	182	14	287		
A	1.7	30	63.4	4.9	100		
B	71.4	58.5	61.7	77.8	61.5		
Above 30000	1	46	78	2	127		
A	0.8	36.2	61.4	1.6	100		
B	14.3	31.3	26.4	11.1	27.2		
Total	7	147	295	18	467		

A: % within monthly compensation by current institution; B: % within Work Ambience.

CONCLUSION

Extraneous attributes, inherent attributes, and purlieu attributes each have a positive association with work ambience. None of the demography factors in this research had any association with perception about work ambience.

REFERENCES

Brad Estes & Jia Wang (2008), "Workplace Incivility: Impacts on Individual and Organizational Performance", Human Resource Development Review, Vol. 7, pp. 218-240

Buhter, Patricia (1997), "Scanning the environment, environmental trends affecting the workplace", Supervision Publications, pp. 1-2

Chandrasekar, K. (2011), "Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations", International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems, 1(1).

Hameed, Amina & Amjad, Shela. (2009), "Impact of office design on employees' productivity: A case study of banking organisations of Abbotttabad, Pakistan", Journal of Public Affairs, Administration and Management, 3(1).

Higgs, Julia L. (2002), "Workplace Environment in a Professional Services Firm", Behavioural Research in Accounting.

Kaczmarczyk, S., & Murtough, J. (2002), "Measuring the performance of innovative workplaces", Journal of Facilities Management, Vol. 1, pp. 163-176.

Lee, S.Y. (2006), "Expectations of employees toward the workplace and environmental satisfaction", Journal of Facilities Management, Vol. 24, pp. 343-53.