
Quality of Work Life: Comparative Study of University Teachers

Dr. Satinder Kumar

Astt. Prof. School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, Email: kumarsatinder1981@gmail.com

Mr. Gagandeep

Astt. Prof. University School of Applied Management, Punjabi University. Patiala

Abstract

It is utmost important to retain competent employees for the success of every organization. Mere use of money, technology and infrastructure could not bring success to an organization unless and until its employees are satisfied. For employee satisfaction, employees must be self motivated. Thus objective of this study is to analyze what factors affect quality of work life of faculty members working in public and private sector universities in Punjab.

As far as comparative study is concerned; factors which motivate both sector's employees to work efficiently are salary & rewards, better leave plans, reasonable working hours and opportunities for promotion. There are few factors, which create aversion among employees of both the sectors are; too much workload, conduct of top management, long travelling hours and internal politics.

Keywords: *Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Quality of work life*

1.0 Introduction

Quality of work life refers to the level of pleasure or displeasure with one's own career. The employees who enjoy their career are said to have a high quality of work life, while who are not satisfied with their job have a low quality of work life. Various variables are taken which affect quality of work life of both Government and Private University Teachers. For the success of every organization it is utmost important to retain competent employees. Mere use of money, technology and infrastructure could not bring success to an organization unless and until its employees are satisfied. For employee satisfaction; employees must be self motivated. As mentioned in hygiene two factor theory, the presence of hygiene factors do not create satisfaction but absence of these definitely create dissatisfaction (Herzberg 1923). Due to changes in work environment i.e. technological, high competition, rise of employee unions etc.; employers are not only offering pay as compensation, but are considering other benefits both intrinsic & extrinsic to create a quality working environment will attract and retain the best brains in the industry. The quality of work life can be explained as the quality of association among the employees and the work surroundings such that the employees have an important pressure in structuring the organizational surroundings in techniques utilized to rise not only their personal inspiration and job satisfaction but also the profits and productivity of the organization. The quality of work life covers numerous areas like getting rid of the health hazards for the employees, sufficient fair compensations, security of job, benefits for employees, profit sharing, work schedules and the work place contribution. As far as

comparative study is concerned; factors which motivate both sector's employees to work efficiently are salary & rewards, better leave plans, reasonable working hours and opportunities for promotion. Employees often expect various quality requirement from work place, these can be classified into personal anticipatory, motivational insights, job freedom and working conditions.

2.0 Review of Literature

The most contented teachers are the ones who feel their jobs are secure and they are treated as experts by the community. This is one of the key factors as this ensures that they are capable of delivering the student requirement and they are capable of utilizing their overall skills (Walton et al., 2003). Teachers whose jobs are secure are more likely to have prospects for professional development, interact cohesively with peers and greater parental involvement in their schools and to their students (Gupta & Sharma, 2011). Rewards and Benefits serves as a motivating factor for teachers to perform well in the colleges. This also creates a healthy competition between teachers in using their overall skills in their performance and strives to increase the overall standard of the college (Kaur, 2012). Compensation plays a pivotal role in effectiveness of the university. Lesser compensation would not attract skilled and experienced people with great performance and would not help in achieving the quality in imparting education, while higher compensation might be an overhead with costs running more than the desired (Malarvizhi, 2012; Islam, 2012). University should strive to provide opportunity for every team member to showcase their talent,

proficiency, skills, capacity and abilities (Zakari, Khamis & Hamadi, 2010). Utilizing teacher's capacities in areas other than their present position will help them to understand that management appreciates and identifies that what the staff could provide to the university. This can also provide work variety and helps to break up the everyday grind of work and also helps to get free from the stress of the routine work (Gupta & Sharma, 2011). Teachers will be dissatisfied if rational climate doesn't exist for them to differentiate work from family (Carr et al. 2003). The universities demand shouldn't be interfering with teacher's family responsibilities and personal duties apart from their carrier (Aziz et al., 2010; Al-Enezi et al. eds., 2009). Teachers experience poor mental health and lower job satisfaction as compared to other groups (Miller and Travers 2005). There is an association between the quality of work life with the commitment to university among some 205 students who possess the student job and it is found that there is a considerable association among the willingness to work and the commitment to university (Turner 2005) whereas there is a significant and positive association between the organizational commitment and the quality of work life (Ashoob 2006). Disappointment with quality of work life may affect faculties irrespective of their positions. When the universities starts to identify that the faculties have their lives apart from work, trust and loyalty among faculties is created (Saraji and Dargahi, 2006). Workload pressure, role ambiguity and performance pressure were the predictors of job stress. But managerial role and relationship with others had no significant direct effect on job stress (Alam 2009). As far as association in the perception of employees towards quality of work life and job satisfaction across the gender and nature of job is concerned there is difference in the perception of males and females with regard to different dimensions like working conditions, work life balance, opportunities of growth and social relevance of job (Shalla et al.2014).

3.0 Research Gap

The review of the existing literature reveals that a numbers of studies have been carried out on various aspects of quality of work life but a very few comprehensive studies in this area could be found which provide detailed information regarding quality of work life in universities of Punjab region. In the light of the above discussion comprehensive and detailed study regarding universities is of dire need. Since these teachers are the only scapegoat of these universities, the comparison of the quality of their work life in universities will be an eye opener to private as well as public sector universities in Punjab in improving the work environment of these faculties.

4.0 Need and Significance of the Study

This study aims to analyze what factors affecting quality of work life of faculty members working in public and private sector universities in Punjab. To achieve organizational goals it is necessary that its employees must be ready to work with zeal and enthusiasm. For this purpose, efficient working conditions should be provided to them.

5.0 Research Method

The present study is based on both primary data and secondary data. In this research, primary data are collected from faculty members of government and private universities of Punjab, with the help of questionnaire. The secondary data have also been collected from journals, books and various committees such as Yash Pal Committee Report 2009, CSO (2008) Statistical Abstracts of Punjab. Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of random sampling. The survey was conducted via email and face to face interviews. The sample size is an important feature. A total of 550 survey questionnaires were sent, of which 510 questionnaires received back. Each of the responses received had been screened for errors or incomplete responses. However, responses that had more than 25% of the questions in the survey questionnaire left unanswered that had been discarded from data analysis. After the screening process carried out, only 500 (250 from each sector) responses have been considered complete and valid for data analysis. Taking into consideration the objectives of the study, a structured questionnaire was prepared to meet the objectives. The questionnaire was framed on the basis of previous literature, discussion with experts of the related field. The suggestions of experts led to many meaningful modifications. The preliminary draft was pre tested on 50 respondents, including 25 from public sector universities and 25 from private sector universities. Questionnaires were received back with suggestions; questionnaires were revised and sent for final survey. All the questions were close ended. Factor analysis was used to analyze the data.

6.0 Analysis

These were in general; reflecting perception of faculty members of Public and Private Universities. Faculty members were asked to express their level of agreement/disagreement with respect to various statements based on five-point Likert scale. Factor analysis is applied to summarize the data into less and meaningful factors relevant to the sample.

6.1 Perception of Public University's Teachers - A Factor Analysis Approach

Data were examined for their suitability for factor analysis. Reliability is measured by using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha ranges from 0 to 1. The Cronbach's Alpha of likert scaled items in the questionnaire was 0.732 which is deemed to be good. This was done by computing the correlation matrix which was depicted enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Correlation matrix was computed which depicted that there were enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Communality and factor loadings were high enough to prove the suitability of data as well as the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was 0.715 which indicated that the sample was good enough for sampling. Barlett's Test of Sphericity showed statistically significant correlations among the variables. Hence all the above mentioned parameters revealed that data were fit for factor analysis. The Eigen value are the total variance attributed to that factor. Any factor that has an Eigen values of less than 1

does not have enough total variance explained to represent a unique factor and is therefore disregarded. The Eigen value represent the total variance explained by each factor. Out of 34 statements listed for assessing quality of work life after applying factor analysis total variance that 12 factors extracted together for 62.357% of total variance so it is possible to economize on the number of variables from 34 to 12.

The 1st factor explains the largest portion of the total variance. The 2nd factor for the most of the residual variance, subject to being uncorrelated with the first factor. The second factor explains the second highest variance and so on. The Eigen values for the factors are in decreasing order of magnitude as we move from variable 1 to variable 12. Factor 1 accounts for a variance 4.885 which (4.885/34) or 14.367% of the total variance. Likewise the second factor accounts for (2.566/3.4) or 7.548% of total variance and so on. All factor loadings greater than 0.5 have been considered for factor analysis.

Table-1 : Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Public Sector University

Sl. No	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem	F ₃	Good Relationship with co-workers	0.639	4.88	7.96	7.96
		F ₁₂	Faculty members have friendly relations with each other	0.669			
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues are ready	0.708			
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after performing my work	0.584			
2	Recognition and Career Progression	F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.577	2.56	7.30	15.27
		F ₈	Support from the top management is helpful in accomplishing a task	0.628			
		F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.643			
		F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.515			
		F ₂₄	All the faculty member generally support all the members of the universities	0.695			
3	Employee loyalty and Growth	F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.584	1.87	6.03	21.30
		F ₁₅	On the basis of my own standards, I am satisfied with personal development	0.510			
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.787			
		F ₂₉	All the members are generally committed to their work	0.587			
4	Quality on Work Place	F ₂₀	I feel that my university provides maximum facilities for doing my work properly	0.688	1.70	4.92	26.22
		F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.515			
5	Conducive Environment	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at the university	0.725	1.52	4.89	31.12
		F ₂₂	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.579			
6	Lower Self Esteem	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this University Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.816	1.47	4.82	35.94
		F ₂₇		0.574			
7	Employee Development	F ₂₁	I am developing new skills and abilities at work	0.704	1.41	4.67	40.62
		F ₃₄	My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences	0.558			
8	Work load other than teaching	F ₃₂	I feel too much burdened for research work	0.582	1.30	4.48	45.10
		F ₃₃	My university organizes FD for the up gradation of faculty	0.815			
9	Rationality	F ₁₁	Favoritism does not play any part in the institution of work	0.754	1.18	4.46	49.57
		F ₂₅	Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work	0.511			
10	Organizational satisfaction	F ₂	Job security exists at my university.	0.741	1.15	4.30	53.88
		F ₁₄	I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work	0.566			
11	Organizational communication and economic benefit	F ₁	There is a reasonable periodical increase in salary	0.795	1.08	4.26	58.15
		F ₂₃	There is an active flow of ideas	0.501			
12	Critical factors	F ₁₉	Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization.	0.586	1.01	4.20	42.35
		F ₂₆	Employer overdrive the employees	0.701			

KMO 0.715

6.1.1 Job satisfaction and self esteem (Factor 1) : This suggests that factor 1 is the combinations of four variables. Faculty of Public Sector University perceives that there exists job satisfaction and self esteem. This factor explains (7.965%) variance with 4 statements. Highest coefficient is for the statement F_3 , "Good relationship with co-workers" (0.639), followed by F_{12} "Faculty members have friendly relations with each other" (0.669) whereas next variable F_{13} states that "Fellow colleagues are ready to help in distress" (0.708) and one more statement which is extracted in factor 1 is F_{16} "feeling of satisfaction after performing my work". Our results go hand in hand with the results of study conducted by Schulz and Pauline (2009), Johansson and Heikinaro(2004) who too found that teachers derived most of their job satisfaction from interpersonal relations.

6.1.2 Effort Recognition and Career Progression (Factor 2): This factor explains a combination of 5 statements with 7.309% of variance. The statement F_7 scored the highest score. It is sufficient motivational strategies" (0.577), followed by F_8 "support from top management is helpful in accomplishing a task" (0.628). The statement F_9 states that "university recognizes and acknowledge my work" with factor loadings 0.643 is also a combination of F_{10} "Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression" (0.515) and statement F_{24} All the faculty members generally support all the members of the universities with factor loadings 0.695. Effort recognition and career progression also fall in line with the findings of Jenkinsons and Chapman (1990), Sweeney (1981).

6.1.3 Employee loyalty and growth (Factor 3): This factor explains 6.032% of variance with 4 statements. These statements indicate that employees committed towards their duties and sufficient promotional opportunities are provided to deserving employees. The results contradict with studies conducted by Sonmezer and Eryaman (2008).

6.1.4 Quality on Work Place (Factor 4): Public university provides maximum facilities to conduct research work as well as to perform other activities. Factor 4th explaining 4.920% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F_{21} "University provides maximum facilities for doing to my work properly" (0.688) followed by F_{17} "Feeling good about the quality of work performed" (0.515). Bhanugopal et al. (2008) also found that there is correlation between quality of work life and work environment.

6.1.5 Conducive Environment (Factor 5): The 5th factor explains 4.897% of variance of 2 statements. The highest coefficient is 0.725 in case of the statement F_6 , "Good safety measures adopted at my university" followed by F_{22} , "I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties" (0.579) employees feels comfortable is this environment and work efficiently. It is also found in the study of Mirvis and Lawler (1984) that quality of work life is associated to working environment, working hours and safe working conditions.

6.1.6 Lower Self Esteem (Factor 6): Factor 6 enlists negative statements which lead to low the morale of employees. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 6 explains 4.820% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.816 in case of statement F_{18} , "There are many political problems in this university" and F_{27} , "Most of my activities are routine and boring" with factor loadings of 0.484.

6.1.7 Employee Development (Factor 7): Factor 7 enlists statements related to employee development. 7th factor explains 4.679% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F_{21} , "I am developing new skills and abilities at work" 0.704 followed by F_{34} , "My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences" with factor loading of 0.558.

6.1.8 Workload other than teaching (Factor 8): This factor is a combination of 2 statements with 4.487% of variance. These statements create extra burden other than teaching on university faculty.

6.1.9 Rationality (Factor 9): Factor 9 enlists favorable statements which lead to job satisfaction among public sector university faculty. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 9 explains 4.64% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.754, in case of statement F_{11} , "Favoritism does not play any part in the Institution" and F_{25} , "Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work" (0.511).

6.1.10 Organizational Satisfaction (Factor 10):

The 10th factor explains 4.309% of variance with 2 statements the statement F_2 scores highest score, "Job security exists at my university" (0.741), followed by F_{14} "I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work" (0.566).

6.1.11 Organization Communication and Economic Benefits (Factor 11): This factor explains 4.269% of the variance with 2 statements. This factor features that there is two way communications to make healthy environment and economic benefits are reasonably provided to the faculty. The highest varimax coefficient is secured by the statement F_1 , "There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary" (0.795), followed by F_{23} , "There is an active flow of ideas" with factor loadings 0.501.

6.1.12 Critical Factors (Factor 12): The factor 12th explains 4.205% of variance with 2 negative statements. The statement F_{19} , "Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization" (0.586) followed by F_{26} , "Employer overdrive the employees" with factor loadings of 0.70%.

6.2 PERCEPTION OF PRIVATE UNIVERSITY TEACHERS –A FACTOR ANALYSIS APPROACH

Out of 34 factors only 12 factors extracted together with variance for 71.133% of total variance, so it is possible to economize on the number of variables from 34 to 12. The 1st factor explains the largest position of the total variance. The second factor for the most of the residual variance, subject to being uncorrelated with the first factor. The Eigen values for the factors are in decreasing order of magnitude as we move from variable 1 to 12. Factor 1

accounts for variance 5.934 which (5.934/34) or 17.454% of total variance. Likewise 2nd factor accounts for (3.056/

34) or 8.989% of total variance and so on. Table 5 indicates that 12 factor have been extracted.

Table - 2 : Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Private Sector University

Sl. No.	Dimensions	Label	Statement	Factor loading	Eigen Values	% of variance	% of Cumulative variance
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem	F ₃	Good relationship with co-workers	0.561	5.93	8.94	8.94
		F ₁₂	Friendly relations with each other	0.742			
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues ready to help in distress	0.686			
		F ₁₅	Feeling of success	0.702			
		F ₁₄	Superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions	0.583			
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after reforming my work	0.526			
2	Effort Recognition and Organizational Communication	F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.512	3.05	7.90	16.84
		F ₂₁	I am developing my skills and abilities at work	0.572			
		F ₂₃	There is an active flow of ideas	0.580			
		F ₂₄	Co-workers support each other	0.626			
		F ₂₅	Faculty members are given recognition for their work	0.800			
3	Quality on Job Freedom	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at university	0.651	2.22	7.39	24.24
		F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.588			
		F ₈	Support from top level management	0.703			
4	Employee loyalty and Growth	F ₁	There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary	0.559	2.17	6.37	30.61
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.850			
		F ₂₉	All members generally committed to their work	0.769			
5	Work load other than Teaching	F ₃₂	I am too much burdened for research work	0.672	1.83	6.32	36.94
		F ₃₃	My university organizes FDP from up gradation of faculty	0.730			
		F ₃₄	Support to attend conferences and refresher courses	0.703			
6	Lower Self Esteem	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this university	0.766	1.68	5.83	42.78
		F ₂₇	Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.677			
7	Work Pressure	F ₁₉	I am ready to join if same type of job under same terms and conditions in a different organization.	0.837	1.52	5.42	48.20
		F ₃₀	I have no time to pursue my area of interest	0.511			
8	Opportunity of Growth	F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.585	1.38	5.00	53.20
		F ₂₂	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.835			
9	Critical Factors	F ₂₆	Employer overdrive the employees	0.538	1.28	4.78	57.98
		F ₃₁	I have to do too much clerical work	0.583			
10	Rationality	F ₄	There is rational performance and appraisal system.	0.528	1.05	4.77	62.77
		F ₁₁	Favoritism do not ply and part in the institutions	0.836			
11	Quality of Work	F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.785	1.02	4.20	66.97
12	Organizational satisfactions	F ₂	Job security exists at my university	0.713	1.01	4.15	71.13
		F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.671			

KMO=0.630

6.2.1 Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem (Factor 1):

The first factor explains 8.949% of the total variance with 6 statements. The results go hand in hand with the results of study conducted by Schulz and Pauline (2009), Johansson and Heikinaro (2004) who too found that teachers derived most of their job satisfaction from interpersonal relations.

6.2.2 Effect Recognition and Organizational Communication (Factor 2):

This factor explains 7.905% of the variance with 5 statements. The highest coefficient 0.800% is scored by the statement F_{25} , "Faculty members are given recognition for their work" followed by F_{24} , "Co-workers support each other" (0.626). The findings of the study also matched with Islam (2012). He conducted study regarding the factors affecting quality of work life among employees of private limited companies in Bangladesh.

6.2.3 Quality on Job Freedom (Factor 3):

The factor explains 7.392% of the total variance with 3 statements. The highest coefficient is scored by the statement F_8 , "Support from top management". (0.703), followed by F_6 , "Good safety measures" adopted at university (0.651). The statement which scored least is F_7 , "Sufficient motivational strategies" (0.588). As explained by Owens (2006), that commitment has a major and constructive influence on job performance and on retaining workforce.

6.2.4 Employee Loyalty and Growth (Factor 4):

The 4th factor explains 6.371% of variances with 3 statements. The statement F_{28} , "Faculty members communicate well with each other" has scored highest coefficient (0.850), followed by 2 statements F_{29} , "All members generally committed to their work" (0.769) and F_1 , "There is reasonable increase in my salary" (0.559).

6.2.5 Workload other than teaching (Factor 5):

This factor explains 6.371% of variance with 3 statements in which employees feel stressed with high commitment work system i.e. trainings, meetings and involvement in job.

6.2.6 Lower Self Esteem (Factor 6):

The 6th factor explains 5.839% of the total variance with 2 statements. The high coefficient is scored by the statement F_{18} , "There are many political problems in this university" (0.766) followed by F_{27} , "Most of my activities are routine and boring" (0.677).

6.2.7 Work Pressure (Factor 7):

This factor explains 5.420% of the total variances with 2 statements. Due to work pressure in private universities; employees are ready to join the same position in some other organization.

6.2.8 Opportunity of Growth (Factor 8):

The 8th factor explains 5.002% of variance with 2 statements. The findings of the study also fall in line with Sandrick (2003) found that intrinsic job satisfaction, job delight was a better predictor of self esteem and

opportunities of growth and career achievement are helpful to retain employees in an organization.

6.2.9 Critical Factors (Factor 9):

This factor explains 4.787% of variance with 2 statements. The highest coefficient is scored by F_{26} , "Employer over drive the employees" (0.583) followed by F_{31} , "I have to do too much clerical work" (0.583).

6.2.10 Rationality (Factor 10):

This factor explains 4.780% of the total variance with 2 statements. The rationality among performance appraisal of faculties also fall in line with the results of study Aldakhilallah and Parente (2002) who serves as revised version of outdated methods of performance evaluation in the effective evaluation of the performance of faculties that fits with the idea of Total Quality Management (Almalki, 2012; Almalki, Fitzgerald & Clark; 2011).

6.2.11 Quality of Work (Factor 11):

This factor explains 4.20% of the total variance with only one statement F_{17} , "I feel good about the quality of work performed" (0.785). This is an Independent factor. Itself it is an important factor which is essential to evaluate overall work environment.

6.2.12 Organizational Satisfaction (Factor 12):

The 12th factor explains 4.156% of the total variance with 2 statements the statement F_{21} , "Job security exists in my university" (0.713) followed by F_5 , "Effective promotional opportunities exist in my university" (0.671). The results also went along with findings of Moses (1999), Gupta and Sharma (2010) that they offer facility of self development and provides prospects to improve their job. There is correlation between quality of work life, job security and opportunities of career growth.

6.3 COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION OF FACTOR ANALYSIS' RESULTS FOR PUBLIC SECTOR AND PRIVATE SECTOR UNIVERSITY

Application of factor analysis to responses of public sector and private sector teachers reveals 12 dimensions. Total variance explained by 12 factors was 62.35% in case of public sector university teachers and 71.13% in case of private sector university teachers. These results reveals that factors discovered as important in quality of work life are greater preferred by private sector university teachers than public sector. There has been similarity in case of 3 factors i.e. job satisfaction and self esteem and effort recognition and career progression and lower self esteem as this has been expressed through 1st and 2nd and 6th factor by public sector and private sector university teachers. However, the importance of other factors differed considerably. The **work load other than teaching** appears as the F_8 explaining 4.48% variance in case of public sector university, while factor 5th explains 6.32% variance in case of private university teachers. There is a further **Rationality** features as the 9th factor with 4.64% of variance in case of public sector while it

features as F_{10} with 4.78% of variance in private sector teachers. The 'Employee loyalty and growth' is observed as the 3rd factor by public sector university teachers with 6.37% of variance while it is at 4th level in case private sector with 6.032% of variance and critical factors features as 12th factor with 4.205% variance while it features at 9th level with 4.787% for private sector teachers. The factor **organizational satisfaction** features at 10th level with 4.309% of variance in public sector where as at 12th level with 4.156% of variance. Hence, private university teachers more affected by work load, rationality, critical factors and organization satisfaction. A comparison of two samples illustrates that the factors emerging from both university teachers are similar in constitution but private university teachers feel more work load others than teaching and critical factors as well as they feel there are more growth opportunities in Private Sector University.

References

- ♦ Abel, M.H. and Sewell, J. (1999), "Stress and Burnout in Rural and Urban Secondary School Teachers", *Journal of Education Research*, Vol. 92(5), 287-293.
- ♦ Al-Doski NAS, Aziz KF (2010), "Job Satisfaction among Nurses in Iraq-Erbil City", *International Journal of Academic Research*, Vol.2 (5), 86–89.
- ♦ Al-Enezi N, Chowdhury RI, Shah MA, Al-Otobi M (2009), "Job Satisfaction of Nurses with Multicultural Backgrounds: A Questionnaire Survey in Kuwait", *Applied Nurses Research*, Vol.22 (2), 94–100.
- ♦ Almalk MJ, FitzGerald G, Clark M (2012), "The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Turnover Intention of Primary Health Care Nurses in Saudi Arabia *BMC Health Services Research*", Vol.12, 1-13.
- ♦ Ayesha Tabassum (2012), "Interrelations between Quality of Work Life Dimensions and Faculty Members Job satisfaction in the Private Universities of Bangladesh", *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.4 (2), 78-79.
- ♦ Barlow KM, Zangoro GA: "Meta-Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of the Anticipated Turnover Scale across Studies of Registered Nurses in the United States", *Journal of Nurse Management*, (2010), Vol.18 (7), 862–873.
- ♦ Berg D V (2002), *Teachers' Meaning Regarding Educational Practice*, Review of Educational Research.
- ♦ Blix, G.A. and Lee, J.W. (1994), "Occupational Stress among University Teachers", *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 36(2), 157-159.
- ♦ Bragard, L G. Dupuis D, Razavi C. Reynaert and A.M. Etienne (2012), "Quality of Work Life in Doctors Working with Cancer Patients *Occupational Medicine (London)*", Vol.62 (1), 34-40.
- ♦ Brown, F. (1972), "Need Satisfaction of Educational Administrators", American Educational Research Association, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED, 561-584.
- ♦ Chander, Subash and Singh, Parampal (1983), "Quality of Work Life in a University: An Empirical Investigation", *Management and Labour Studies*, Vol.18 (2), 97-101.
- ♦ Chandramohan, A (2008), *Human Resource Management*, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
- ♦ Clark P, Brooks B (2010), "Quality of Nursing Work Life: Conceptual Clarity for the Future", *Nurses Science Quarterly*, Vol.23 (4), 301–305.
- ♦ Cunningham, W.G. (1983), "Teacher Burnout-Solutions for the 1980s", *The Urban Review*, Vol. 15, 37-51.
- ♦ De Nitish R (1984), "Towards and Appreciation of Quality of Work life and Quality of Work", *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol.19 (20), 46-49.
- ♦ Dick, R.V. and Wagner, U. (2000), "Stress and Strain in Teaching: A Structural Equation Approach" *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 18(3), 146-165.
- ♦ Drago, R.,Caplan, R. and Lynn, R.(2005), "New Estimates of Working Time Elementary School Teachers", *Monthly Labour Review*, 24-32.
- ♦ Efraty, David and Sirgy, M. Joseph (1990), "The Effects of Quality of Working Life (QWL) on Employee Behavioral Responses", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol.22(1).
- ♦ Ellis and Pompili (2002), "Quality of Working Life for Nurses", Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing. Canberra.
- ♦ Evans, V., Ramsey, J., Johnson, D. and Renwick, D. (1986), "Analysis of the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Stress Factors of Physical Education Teachers", *Educational Research*, Vol. 36(6), 17-22.
- ♦ Farrah, S.M. (1981), "Teachers Performance Motivation Los Angeles", CA: American Educational Research Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206-096).
- ♦ Fattah, S. (2010), "Longitudinal Effects of Pay Increase on Teachers' Job Satisfaction-A Motivational Perspective" *Journal of International Social Research*, Vol. 3(10), 12-20.

- ♦ Gallie, Duncan, (2003), *"The Quality of Working Life: Is Scandinavia Different"*, Oxford Journal, Vol.19, 61–79.
- ♦ Gani, A. (1993), *"Quality of Work Life (QWL) in a State Setting: Findings of an Empirical Study"*, The Indian Journal of Labour Economics, Vol.36 (4), 817-823.
- ♦ Gilgeous, V., (1998), *"Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life"*, *Integrated Manufacturing System*, Vol. 9(3), 173-181.
- ♦ Grayson, C.J (1973), *Management Science and Business Practice*, Harvard Business Review, Vol.51 (4).
- ♦ Hannif and Zeenobiyah (2008), *"Call Centers and the Quality of Work Life: Towards a Research Agenda"*, Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.50 (2), 271–284.
- ♦ Havolovic, S.J. (1991), *"Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes"* Industrial Relations, Vol.30 (3), 469-479.
- ♦ Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.
- ♦ Hipps, E. and Smith, E. (1991), *"Job Stress, Stress Related to Performance Based Accredited, Locus of Control, Age and Gender as related to Job Stress and Satisfaction in Teachers and Principals"*, British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 16 (6), 25-28.
- ♦ Jenkinsons, R. and Chapman, W. (1990), *"Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers"* International Review of Education, Vol. 36(3), 299-313.
- ♦ Johansson, N. and Heikinaro, P. (2004), *"Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers in Finland"*, Paper Presented at Athens, Pre Olympic Conference.
- ♦ Kaur A (2012), *"Quality of work life, National foundation of Indian Engineers"*, Retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.nafenindia.com/nafdigjun12.pdf>
- ♦ Kaur, C. (1992), *Education in Punjab (A Historical Study)*, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi.
- ♦ Khan, A. A. (2008), *Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations* (2nd Edn.). Abir Publications: Dhaka.
- ♦ Knoop, R. (1980), *"Job Involvement of Teachers"*, Toledo, OH: Mid Western Educational Research Association, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 208-508.
- ♦ Kumar, H. and Shanubhogue A (1996), *"Quality of Work Life: An Empirical Approach"*, Manpower Journal, Vol.32 (3), 17-24.
- ♦ Ledford, G. E. and Lawler, E. E. (1982), *"Quality of Work Life Programs, Coordination, and Productivity"*, Journal of Contemporary Business, Vol. 11, 93-106.
- ♦ Lowe, G., & Schellenberg, G. & Shannon H. (2003), *"Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta- Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature"*, Leadership Quarterly, Vol.7 (3), 385-425.
- ♦ Lutz C. Kaiser (2014), *"A study on Job Satisfaction and Public Service Motivation: IZA"* Discussion Paper No. 7935, January, 2014.
- ♦ Malarvizhi (2012), *"A Study on Quality Of Work Life In Jeppiaar Cements Private Limited, Mela Mathur, Perambalur-District"*, retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.isrj.net/publishArticles/736.pdf>
- ♦ Memeon, J. (2008), *"Teacher Strees, Job Performance and Efficacy of Women School Teachers"* Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol.20 (2), 178-187.
- ♦ Miller, G.V. and Travers, C.J. (2005), *"Ethnicity and the Experience of work: Job stress and Satisfaction of Minority Ethnic Teachers in the U.K."*, International Review of Psychiatry, Vol. 17(5), 317-327.
- ♦ Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984), *"Accounting for the Quality of Work Life"*, Journal of Occupational Behavior, Vol.5, 197-212.
- ♦ Mishra, S.& Gupta, B. (2009), *"Work Place Motivators and Employee's Satisfaction: A Study on Retail Sector in India"*, The Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol 44(3), 509-517.
- ♦ Mount M, Ilies R and Johnson E (2006), *"Relationship of Personality Traits and Counter Productive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction"*, Personnel Psychology.
- ♦ Mourkani, G.S. and Avand, S.K. (2013), *"A Study of the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Entrepreneurship of the Faculty and Staff Members: A Case Study"*, Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research ISSN No. 2090-4304, Vol. 3(9), 119-125.
- ♦ Nadeem, Basu Mudasir (2012), *"Research on Leadership Behaviour of Educational Administrators - A Critical Review of Literature"* Scholarly Journal of Education Vol. 1(2), 20-30.
- ♦ Okpara, J.S. (2005), *"The Impact of Salary Differential on Managerial Job Satisfaction: A Study of the Gender Gap and its Implications for Management Education and Practice in a Developing"*

- Economy*", Journal of Business Development Nations, Vol 8, 66-92.
- ◆ Oshagbemi, T. (2000), "Gender differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers", Journal of Work Management Review, Vol. 15(7), 331-340.
 - ◆ Owens (2006), "One More Reason not to Cut Your Training Budget: The Relationship between Training and Organizational Outcomes". Public Personnel Management.
 - ◆ Payne R L (1987), *Organizations as Psychological Environments*, In Warr, P. Psychology at Work. London: Penguin Books.
 - ◆ Rao, D.B. & Sridhar, D. (2003), "Job Satisfaction of School Teachers", Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.
 - ◆ Rose, R. C., Beh, L. S., Uli, J., Idris, K. (2006), "Quality of Work Life: Implications of Career Dimensions", Journal of Social Sciences, Vol.2 (2), 61-67
 - ◆ Rudd, W.G.A. and Wiseman, S. (1962), "Sources of Disaster among a Group of Teachers", British Journal of Eco-Psychology, Vol. 32 (8), 275-291.
 - ◆ Sairam Subramaniam, Saravanan (2012), "Empirical Study on Factors Influencing on Quality of Work Life of Commercial Bank Employees", European Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 28(1), 119-127.
 - ◆ Saraji N. G. and Dargahi (2006), "Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL), Department of Health Care Management," School of Allied Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran, 1053-1056.
 - ◆ Sarmah, Bidula, Baruah and Manoshikha (2012), "Job Stress among Secondary School Teachers", Indian Stream Research Journal, Sep. 2012, Vol.2 (8), 34-36.
 - ◆ Savery, L.K. and Detiuk, M. (1985), "Principals' stress in Elementary and Secondary Schools", Education Quarterly Review, Vol. 16, 16-23.
 - ◆ Sheel, Shalini, Dr. Panday, D.K. (2012), "Quality of Work Life, Employee Performance and Career Growth Opportunities: A Literature Review", International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.
 - ◆ Sirgy, M. Joseph (2001). Handbook of Quality-of-Life Research: An Ethical Marketing Perspective. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers (translated in 2004 into Japanese by Interwork Publishers).
 - ◆ Sonmezer, M.G. and Eryaman, M.Y. (2008), "Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction levels of Public and Private School Teachers", Journal of Theory and Practice in education, Vol. 4(2), 189-212.
 - ◆ Stefan Hub and Markus Kleiner (2010), "Commitment on Work Related Expectations in Flexible Employment Forms: An Empirical Study of German IT Freelancers", European Journal of Management, Vol. 28 (1), 40-54.
 - ◆ Sweeney, P. (1981), "Human Needs and Job satisfaction", Professional Journal, Vol. 32(1), 42-55.
 - ◆ Thurman (1977), "Job satisfaction: An International Overview", International Labour Review, Vol. 117 (3), 249-250.
 - ◆ Trehan (2008), "Work Environment and Quality Life" Regal Publications, India, 20-28.
 - ◆ Turner, B.A. & P. Chelleadurai (2005), "Organization and Occupational Commitment, Intention to Leave and Perceived Performance of Intercollegiate Coaches", Journal of sport management, 682-686.
 - ◆ Van Hooft, A. J., Q De Jong, M. (2009), "Predicting Job Seeking for Temporary Employment using the Theory of Planned Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Individualism and Collectivism", Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 82(2), 295-316.
 - ◆ Walton (1982), "International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life", Productivity, Vol.22 (4), 79-83.