*I J A B E R*, Vol. 13, No. 5, (2015): 2793-2815

# FACTORS RELATED TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF FACULTY MEMBERS: INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

**K. G. Senthilkumar[1], S. Chandrakumaramangalam[2] and M. Umasankar[3]**

***Abstract:*** *This is an empirical study conducted with 364 faculty members from 45 Anna University affiliated private engineering colleges situated in Coimbatore District of Tamilnadu state, India. This study investigated the factors that affect the overall perception of quality of work life (QWL) of the faculty members. A 64 item QWL questionnaire with socio-demographic data was performed. After checking the reliability of scale and the test of appropriateness of the data so collected, factor analysis was applied for data reduction. Then, correlation analysis was performed to know about the feature and extent of the inherent linear relationship existing between the factors and QWL. Results of factor analyses indicated that the QWL measure was found to be consisted of eight dimensions such as teaching learning process, learning opportunity, work life balance, compensation, leadership, professional relationship, employee support services and feedback on performance. The factor loadings in the eight factors range from .486 to .777. It is obvious that all eight dimensions contributed highly to the QWL of faculty members. The result of regression analysis indicates that excluding the employee support services 74.2% of the variance is explained by all other independent variables.*

***Key words:*** *Quality of Work Life, Work Life Balance, Compensation, Teaching Learning Process, Private Engineering College.*

## INTRODUCTION

India, one of the rapidly growing economies among the BRIC nation, has now become a key player in the global knowledge economy. Skill-based activities have made important contribution to this growth. Such activities depend on the large pool of qualified manpower that is fed by its large higher education system. India's higher education system is the third largest in the world after China and United States in terms of enrolment. India now possesses a highly developed higher education system that offers facility of education and training in almost all aspects of human creation and intellectual endeavors. Higher educational institutions play

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Kingston Engineering College, Vellore.

[2] Associate Professor and Head, Department of Management Studies, Anna University Regional Centre, Coimbatore.

[3] Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Kongu Engineering College, Perundurai, Erode.

vital role in nation's progress (Tsai, 2012). It is now widely accepted that higher education has been vital to India's emergence in the global knowledge economy. Today, the Indian higher educational institutions, particularly technical institutions are facing significant challenges in building both capacity and excellence. Only the Indian Institute of Technology and its related institutes acquire international recognition. The mainstream technical institutions are recognized as lacking in quality. It is because of the rapid expansion of tier-2 and tier-3 technical institutions without adequate quality control. And also the frequent turnover of qualified faculty members resulted in the poor quality. Faculty turnover has consequences for educational institutions. Being the core stakeholders in the higher educational institutions they are the definers, gatekeepers of academic quality and excellence (Tsai, 2012). They love what they do, would like to repeat it again, but are seldom satisfied with their institutions and working conditions (Boyer, Altbach, and Whitelaw, 1994). Colleges and universities have to pay the prices if they ignore the quality of work life experienced by their faculty members (Johnsurd L. K, 2002). Hence, it is imperative for the higher educational institutions to have thorough understanding of faculty members' Quality of Work Life.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study purports to explore and gain a better understanding of the QWL of faculty members of the private engineering colleges in Coimbatore District of Tamilnadu, India. The findings of this study will help both management and faculty members to understand QWL. Specifically, the objective is to investigate the factors that affect the overall perception of QWL of the faculty members.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Quality of Work Life

Many researches have been conducted on the subject of QWL since its inception into the Human Research Management to till date. The concept of quality of work in 1960s focused on psychology of individuals and their perception of the industrial environment (Reyan 1995). The QWL in 1980s was a general term to include a set of conditions in different fields such as organization, work environment, and partnership (Huzzard , 2003). This was parallel to concepts such as "humanization of work", "improvement of working conditions", or "protection of workers". These differences emphasized that the concept of quality of working life severed psychology and approached a social approach; which is related to the social-technical systems theory which ensures autonomy in work, interdependence, and self-involvement. It improves culture of the organization that will lead to the development and growth of employees. Initially the focal issue was on the people personal lives.

It is learned from the literature review that the faculty work life encompassed professional priorities, institutional support, and the quality of life (Johnsrud, L. K. and Heck, R. H. 1998). These three dimensions had been shown to be significant to faculty work life. These three dimensions were reconstructed as professional priorities and rewards, administrative relations and support, and benefits and services associated with the faculty member's appointment (Johnsrud and Rosser, 2002). Work Life of academic faculty can also be viewed with the work environment domains such as, role stress, job characteristics to directly and indirectly shape academic staff's experiences, attitudes and bahaviour (Winter, Taylor and Sarros, 2000). Apart from work environment, the organizational characteristic such as institutional type, resources and unit size were also be viewed as dimensions of perceived quality of work life among faculty members and administrative staff (Johnsurd L. K, 2002).

The review of literature also revealed that in Malaysia the work life of faculty members were studied with the help of ten dimensions such as support from organization, work-family conflict, relationship with peers, self competence, impact on job, meaningfulness of job, optimism on organizational change, autonomy, access to resources and time control. It is observed that all the dimensions on its own were a salient predictor of Job Satisfaction but only three dimensions namely meaningfulness of job, optimism on organizational change and autonomy were significantly related to Job Satisfaction (Saad, H.S, Samah, A.J.A, and Juhdi, N, 2008). The seven dimensions, viz. growth and development, participation, physical environment, supervision, pay and benefits, social relevance and workplace integration were shown to be significant to academic faculty work life in Malaysia (Daud N, 2010).

The eight dimensions model that was advocated by Walton viz., adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, chance of growth, constitutionalism in the work organization, the social relevance of work life, total life space, social integration in the work organization and human progress capabilities have positive and significant relation with job satisfaction among faculty members of University of Teharan (Mirkamalia, S.M and Thani, F.M, 2011). Further, it is confirmed that the same eight dimensions were significantly related to teachers' efficiency among secondary school teachers in Kordestan province of Iran (Hamidi, F and Mohamadi, B, 2012).

Today QWL has become a dynamic multidimensional concept which includes concepts such as job security, rewarding systems, career opportunities, work- life balance and employee participation. Now, this concept is mostly related to job content and embodies the results of job content and working relations (Tamjidi, 2007). Although considerable researches have been done in USA, Europe and Japan, there has been very little research that examines the quality of work life in Asia, with the exception of Japan. From the literature it is learned that few studies have

examined the quality of work life dimensions among faculty members. However, there is a dearth of research that examines the quality of work life within educational institutions especially with regard to technical institutions in India and requires more inclusive research. These educational institutions, as key factors in social, economic and cultural development, play vital role in educating and developing human capital. Hence, the purpose of the present study is to fill this vacuum presently existing in the areas of quality of work life research.

### Dimensions of Faculty members' Quality of Work Life

The review of literature on quality of work life, specifically among faculty members, suggests that quality of work life is a multifaceted paradigm, built upon a number of interrelated factors that seek meticulous consideration to conceptualize and measure. Hence, a detailed review was made to identify the important dimensions of quality of work life. After a careful analysis of the responses of the pilot survey and also the views of academicians, to measure the quality of work life, eight dimensions were included in this study. These include compensation, employee support services, work life balance, teaching learning process, learning opportunity, leadership, feedback on performance, and professional relationship.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Development of the Measuring Instruments

The above mentioned dimensions were derived from the QWL survey Report (Curtin University of Technology, 2006) of Western Australia and the study from Malaysia (Saad, H.S, Samah, A.J.A, and Juhdi, N, 2008). These dimensions were believed to be appropriate and reliable in the context of Asia generally and India specifically since some of the dimensions were used separately by researchers in Singapore (Lau *et al.*, 2001) and Malaysia (Rethinam, Maimunah, Musa and Bahaman, 2004; Rethinam, G. S., I., Maimunah, 2008; Daud N 2010).

After developing a construct, the scale development process was undertaken. The questionnaire used in the survey consisted of two sections. The first section was designed to get demographic information about respondents, namely: gender, age, marital status, number of children, education level, income level, position and years of service. The last section, including 64 statements, was designed to measure the perception by faculty members on eight dimensions of QWL. These 64 items were selected from initial pool of one hundred and nine items generated at the beginning stage of the instrument. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on each statement from "1" as "strongly disagree" to "5" as "strongly agree". To increase reliability and to assure the appropriateness of the data collection instrument, the questionnaire was subject to a pilot test conducted with 20 faculty members working in private engineering colleges in Coimbatore

District of Tamilnadu, India. Some of the statements were subject to a refinement after pilot survey.

**Population and Sample**

The population for the study comprised the faculty members from 45 private engineering colleges of Coimbatore District of Tamilnadu, India where about 5187 fulltime faculty members are employed during the study period (Till May 2013). Thus, 5187 faculty members are the target population for this research study. From this target population the researchers drew a sample of 683 full time faculty members through simple random sampling method which represents roughly 13.2 percent of the overall samples. Data were collected by distributing the questionnaires and also through online survey. Finally 364 useable questionnaires were obtained from among the sample respondents.

**Statistical Tools of Data Analysis**

At first, factor analysis was applied for data reduction. Then, correlation analysis was performed to know about the feature and extent of the inherent linear relationship existing between the factors and quality of work life. Before performing factor analysis, testing of the reliability of the scale was done as it is very much important as its shows the extent to which a scale produces consistent result if measurements are made repeatedly.

**Reliability and Validity Analysis**

In this regard the Cronbach's alpha is most widely used method. It may be mentioned that its value varies from 0 to 1 but, satisfactory value is required to be more than 0.6 for the scale to be reliable (Malhotra, 2002). If compared reliability value with the standard value alpha of 0.6 advocated by Cronbach (Cronbach, 1951), it was found that the scales used were highly reliable for factor analysis.

After checking the reliability of scale, test of appropriateness of the data so collected was done. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy is useful method to show the appropriateness of data for factor analysis. The KMO statistics varies between 0 and 1. It is relevant that the values greater than 0.5 is acceptable. In this study, the value of KMO for overall matrix is 0.890, there by indicating that the sample taken to process the factor analysis is statistically significant.

**Profile of the Respondents**

The demographic profile of the respondents is depicted in Table 1. From the table, the age range of 36-45 (nearly 35.4%) was the dominant age of the faculty members in the study. Male and female respondents were distributed almost equally with

**Table 1**
**Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

| *Respondents profile* | *Total number of respondents* | *Percentage of Respondents* |
|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | | |
| Male | 188 | 51.64 |
| Female | 176 | 48.35 |
| **Age** | | |
| 26- 35 years | 94 | 25.6 |
| 36- 45 years | 128 | 35.4 |
| 46-55 years | 87 | 23.9 |
| Above 55 years | 55 | 15.1 |
| **Marital status** | | |
| Married | 213 | 58.5 |
| Unmarried | 151 | 41.5 |
| **Qualification** | | |
| Masters Degree | 286 | 78.6 |
| Masters Degree with Ph.D | 78 | 21.4 |
| **Designation** | | |
| Assistant Professor | 127 | 34.9 |
| Assistant Professor (SG) | 99 | 27.2 |
| Associate Professor | 82 | 22.5 |
| Professor | 56 | 15.4 |
| **Teaching hours/week** | | |
| Assistant Professor | 21 | Average hours/ |
| Assistant Professor (SG) | 18 | week 11-12 |
| Associate Professor | 12-16 | |
| Professor | 8-10 | |

males being 3.3 percent more than females. The table also shows that about 78.6 percent of the faculty members having master degree as their academic qualification and only 21.4 percent have completed doctorate.

## Factor Analysis

After examining the reliability of the scale and testing appropriateness of data as above, the 64 items QWL measure were subjected to principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine if there were any underlying dimensions within the data on the attitude to the Quality of Work Life statements. The results of the analysis were depicted in the tables from the table 2 to table 6. From the output, eight factor solutions emerged with Eigen values exceeding 1. Results of factor analyses indicated that the QWL measure was found to be

**Table 2**
**KMO and Bartlett's Test**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .890 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 18768.892 |
| | Df | 3655 |
| | **Sig.** | **.000** |

**Table 3**
**Total Variance Explained**

| *Component* | *Initial Eigenvalues* | | | *Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings* | | | *Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumula-tive %* | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumula-tive %* | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumula-tive %* |
| 1 | 20.989 | 32.795 | 32.795 | 20.989 | 32.795 | 32.795 | 8.291 | 12.954 | 12.954 |
| 2 | 4.481 | 7.002 | 39.797 | 4.481 | 7.002 | 39.797 | 6.341 | 9.907 | 22.861 |
| 3 | 3.326 | 5.196 | 44.993 | 3.326 | 5.196 | 44.993 | 6.118 | 9.559 | 32.421 |
| 4 | 2.352 | 3.675 | 48.669 | 2.352 | 3.675 | 48.669 | 4.871 | 7.611 | 40.032 |
| 5 | 2.086 | 3.259 | 51.928 | 2.086 | 3.259 | 51.928 | 4.801 | 7.502 | 47.533 |
| 6 | 1.657 | 2.588 | 54.516 | 1.657 | 2.588 | 54.516 | 3.424 | 5.351 | 52.884 |
| 7 | 1.446 | 2.260 | 56.776 | 1.446 | 2.260 | 56.776 | 2.193 | 3.427 | 56.311 |
| 8 | 1.172 | 1.831 | 58.607 | 1.172 | 1.831 | 58.607 | 1.470 | 2.296 | 58.607 |
| 9 | 1.064 | 1.663 | 60.270 | | | | | | |
| 10 | .896 | 1.400 | 61.670 | | | | | | |
| 11 | .843 | 1.318 | 62.987 | | | | | | |
| 12 | .819 | 1.279 | 64.267 | | | | | | |
| 13 | .804 | 1.255 | 65.522 | | | | | | |
| 14 | .767 | 1.198 | 66.720 | | | | | | |
| 15 | .756 | 1.182 | 67.902 | | | | | | |
| 16 | .740 | 1.156 | 69.058 | | | | | | |
| 17 | .711 | 1.111 | 70.169 | | | | | | |
| 18 | .692 | 1.081 | 71.249 | | | | | | |
| 19 | .680 | 1.063 | 72.312 | | | | | | |
| 20 | .644 | 1.006 | 73.318 | | | | | | |
| 21 | .627 | .980 | 74.298 | | | | | | |
| 22 | .624 | .976 | 75.274 | | | | | | |
| 23 | .604 | .944 | 76.218 | | | | | | |
| 24 | .598 | .934 | 77.152 | | | | | | |
| 25 | .590 | .922 | 78.074 | | | | | | |
| 26 | .579 | .905 | 78.979 | | | | | | |

*contd. table 3*

| *Component* | *Initial Eigenvalues* | | | *Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings* | | | *Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumulative %* | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumulative %* | *Total* | *% of Variance* | *Cumulative %* |
| 27 | .563 | .880 | 79.858 | | | | | | |
| 28 | .538 | .841 | 80.700 | | | | | | |
| 29 | .520 | .813 | 81.512 | | | | | | |
| 30 | .515 | .805 | 82.318 | | | | | | |
| 31 | .490 | .766 | 83.084 | | | | | | |
| 32 | .486 | .759 | 83.843 | | | | | | |
| 33 | .472 | .737 | 84.580 | | | | | | |
| 34 | .466 | .728 | 85.308 | | | | | | |
| 35 | .447 | .698 | 86.006 | | | | | | |
| 36 | .436 | .682 | 86.688 | | | | | | |
| 37 | .428 | .669 | 87.358 | | | | | | |
| 38 | .422 | .659 | 88.017 | | | | | | |
| 39 | .411 | .642 | 88.658 | | | | | | |
| 40 | .410 | .640 | 89.299 | | | | | | |
| 41 | .395 | .618 | 89.917 | | | | | | |
| 42 | .387 | .605 | 90.521 | | | | | | |
| 43 | .372 | .581 | 91.102 | | | | | | |
| 44 | .366 | .572 | 91.675 | | | | | | |
| 45 | .354 | .554 | 92.229 | | | | | | |
| 46 | .346 | .540 | 92.769 | | | | | | |
| 47 | .338 | .529 | 93.297 | | | | | | |
| 48 | .326 | .510 | 93.807 | | | | | | |
| 49 | .323 | .505 | 94.313 | | | | | | |
| 50 | .314 | .491 | 94.803 | | | | | | |
| 51 | .301 | .470 | 95.273 | | | | | | |
| 52 | .300 | .468 | 95.741 | | | | | | |
| 53 | .279 | .437 | 96.178 | | | | | | |
| 54 | .267 | .418 | 96.596 | | | | | | |
| 55 | .264 | .412 | 97.008 | | | | | | |
| 56 | .260 | .407 | 97.415 | | | | | | |
| 57 | .255 | .398 | 97.812 | | | | | | |
| 58 | .237 | .370 | 98.183 | | | | | | |
| 59 | .229 | .358 | 98.541 | | | | | | |
| 60 | .204 | .319 | 98.860 | | | | | | |
| 61 | .197 | .308 | 99.168 | | | | | | |
| 62 | .185 | .289 | 99.457 | | | | | | |
| 63 | .183 | .286 | 99.743 | | | | | | |
| 64 | .164 | .257 | 100.000 | | | | | | |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

**Table 4**
**Component Matrix[a]**

| | *Component* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* |
| Q2 | .771 | | | | | | | |
| Q6 | .770 | | | | | | | |
| Q3 | .766 | | | | | | | |
| Q4 | .762 | | | | | | | |
| Q1 | .754 | | | | | | | |
| Q7 | .752 | | | | | | | |
| Q14 | .749 | | | | | | | |
| Q8 | .738 | | | | | | | |
| Q5 | .735 | | | | | | | |
| Q13 | .733 | | | | | | | |
| Q15 | .732 | | | | | | | |
| Q12 | .725 | | | | | | | |
| Q18 | .724 | | | | | | | |
| Q28 | .720 | | | | | | | |
| Q9 | .717 | | | | | | | |
| Q24 | .714 | | | | | | | |
| Q25 | .702 | | | | | | | |
| Q10 | .679 | | | | | | | |
| Q16 | .679 | | | | | | | |
| Q22 | .675 | | | | | | | .415 |
| Q17 | .670 | | | | | | | |
| Q11 | .667 | | | | | | | |
| Q38 | .653 | | | | | | | |
| Q20 | .648 | | | | | | | |
| Q27 | .642 | | | | | | | |
| Q23 | .614 | | | | | | | |
| Q32 | .611 | | | | | | | |
| Q19 | .609 | | | | | | | |
| Q34 | .607 | | | | | | | |
| Q26 | .602 | | | | | | | |
| Q35 | .599 | | | | | | | |
| Q42 | .598 | | | | | | | |
| Q21 | .593 | | | | | | | |
| Q33 | .570 | | | | | | | |
| Q30 | .564 | | | | | | | |
| Q36 | .557 | | | | | | | |
| Q45 | .542 | | | | | | | |
| Q44 | .532 | | | | | | | |
| Q29 | .508 | | | | | | | |
| Q52 | .507 | | | | | | | |
| Q48 | .487 | | | | | .451 | | |
| Q37 | .483 | | | | | | | |
| Q43 | .466 | | | | | | | |
| Q47 | .461 | | | | | | | |

*contd. table 4*

| | *Component* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* |
| Q53 | .434 | | | | | | | |
| Q58 | .433 | | | | | | | |
| Q54 | .411 | | | | | | | |
| Q55 | | | | | | | | |
| Q62 | | .578 | .411 | | | | | |
| Q39 | | .536 | | | | | | |
| Q31 | | .532 | .424 | | | | | |
| Q61 | .455 | .520 | | | | | | |
| Q41 | | .469 | .426 | | | | | |
| Q64 | | -.468 | | | | | | |
| Q46 | .412 | .459 | | | | | | |
| Q60 | | -.449 | | | | | | |
| Q57 | | -.414 | | | | | | |
| Q63 | | .468 | .556 | | | | | |
| Q40 | | | | | | | | |
| Q51 | .445 | | | | | .488 | | |
| Q49 | | -.427 | | | | .442 | | |
| Q50 | | | | | | | .459 | |
| Q59 | | .423 | | | | | .423 | |
| Q56 | | | | | | | | .572 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 8 components extracted.

**Table 5**
**Rotated Component Matrix[a]**

| | *Component* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* |
| Q2 | .763 | | | | | | | |
| Q6 | .729 | | | | | | | |
| Q3 | .713 | | | | | | | |
| Q4 | .688 | | | | | | | |
| Q1 | .675 | | | | | | | |
| Q7 | .669 | | | | | | | |
| Q14 | .659 | | | | | | | |
| Q8 | .658 | | | | | | | |
| Q5 | .593 | | | | | | | |
| Q13 | | | .592 | | | | | |
| Q15 | | | .590 | | | | | |
| Q12 | | | .552 | | | | | |
| Q18 | | | .497 | | | | | |
| Q28 | | | .732 | | | | | |
| Q9 | | | .711 | | | | | |
| Q24 | | | .707 | | | | | |
| Q25 | | .701 | | | | | | |
| Q10 | | .694 | | | | | | |

*contd. table 5*

| | *Component* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *1* | *2* | *3* | *4* | *5* | *6* | *7* | *8* |
| Q16 | | .672 | | | | | | |
| Q22 | | .635 | | | | | | |
| Q17 | | .626 | | | | | | |
| Q11 | .467 | .512 | | | | | | |
| Q38 | | .666 | | | | | | |
| Q20 | | .632 | | | | | | |
| Q27 | | .617 | | | | | | |
| Q23 | | | | | .613 | | | |
| Q32 | | | | | .607 | | | |
| Q19 | | | | | .595 | | | |
| Q34 | | | | | .564 | | | |
| Q26 | | | | | .555 | | | |
| Q35 | | | | | .546 | | | |
| Q42 | | | | | .544 | | | |
| Q21 | | | | .530 | | | | |
| Q33 | | | | .500 | | | | |
| Q30 | | | | .661 | | | | |
| Q36 | | | | .642 | | | | |
| Q45 | | | | .623 | | | | |
| Q44 | | | | .622 | | | | |
| Q29 | | | | .601 | | | | |
| Q52 | | | | .583 | | | | |
| Q48 | | | | .534 | | | | |
| Q37 | | | | .531 | | | | |
| Q43 | | | | | | .503 | | |
| Q47 | | | | | | .777 | | |
| Q53 | | | | | | .772 | | |
| Q58 | | | | | | .767 | | |
| Q54 | | | | | | .729 | | |
| Q55 | | | | | | .728 | | |
| Q62 | | | | | | .684 | | |
| Q39 | | | | | | | .662 | |
| Q31 | | | | | | | .636 | |
| Q61 | | | | | | | .762 | |
| Q41 | | | | | | | .665 | |
| Q64 | | | | | | | .661 | |
| Q46 | | | | | | | .613 | |
| Q60 | | | | | | | .609 | |
| Q57 | | | | | | | .533 | |
| Q63 | | | | | | | -.707 | |
| Q40 | | | | | | | -.666 | |
| Q51 | | | .493 | | | | | .506 |
| Q49 | | | .472 | | | | | .486 |
| Q50 | | | | | | | | .708 |
| Q59 | | | | | | | | .509 |
| Q56 | | | | | | | | .405 |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.

**Table 6**

| *Variable Name* | *Factor Loadings* | *Component Number* | *Cronbach Alpha* | *Factor Name* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q2 | .763 | 1 | | Teaching and Learning Process |
| Q6 | .729 | | | |
| Q3 | .713 | | | |
| Q4 | .688 | | | |
| Q1 | .675 | | 0.89 | |
| Q7 | .669 | | | |
| Q14 | .659 | | | |
| Q8 | .658 | | | |
| Q5 | .593 | | | |
| Q13 | .592 | 2 | | |
| Q15 | .590 | | | |
| Q12 | .552 | | | |
| Q18 | .497 | | 0.91 | Learning Opportunities |
| Q28 | .732 | | | |
| Q9 | .711 | | | |
| Q24 | .707 | | | |
| Q25 | .701 | 3 | | |
| Q10 | .694 | | | |
| Q16 | .672 | | 0.86 | Work life Balance |
| Q22 | .635 | | | |
| Q17 | .626 | | | |
| Q11 | .512 | | | |
| Q38 | .666 | | | |
| Q20 | .632 | | | |
| Q27 | .617 | | | |
| Q23 | .613 | 5 | | |
| Q32 | .607 | | | |
| Q19 | .595 | | | |
| Q34 | .564 | | 0.81 | Employee Support Service |
| Q26 | .555 | | | |
| Q35 | .546 | | | |
| Q42 | .544 | | | |
| Q21 | .530 | 4 | | |
| Q33 | .500 | | | |
| Q30 | .661 | | | |
| Q36 | .642 | | | |
| Q45 | .623 | | | Compensation |
| Q44 | .622 | | 0.87 | |
| Q29 | .601 | | | |

*contd. table 6*

| *Variable Name* | *Factor Loadings* | *Component Number* | *Cronbach Alpha* | *Factor Name* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q52 | .583 | | | |
| Q48 | .534 | | | |
| Q37 | .531 | | | |
| Q43 | .503 | 6 | | |
| Q47 | .777 | | | |
| Q53 | .772 | | | Feedback on Performance |
| Q58 | .767 | | 0.92 | |
| Q54 | .729 | | | |
| Q55 | .728 | | | |
| Q62 | .684 | | | |
| Q39 | .662 | 7 | | |
| Q31 | .636 | | | |
| Q61 | .762 | | | Leadership |
| Q41 | .665 | | | |
| Q64 | .661 | | 0.83 | |
| Q46 | .613 | | | |
| Q60 | .609 | | | |
| Q57 | .533 | | | |
| Q63 | -.707 | | | |
| Q40 | -.666 | | | |
| Q51 | .506 | 8 | | |
| Q49 | .486 | | | |
| Q50 | .708 | | 0.77 | Professional Relationship |
| Q59 | .509 | | | |
| Q56 | .405 | | | |

consisted of eight dimensions. The factor loadings in the eight factors range from .486 to .777. It might be worth mentioning out here that factor loading greater than 0.30 are considered significant. 0.40 are considered more important and 0.50 or greater are considered very significant (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 2003). For parsimony, only those factors with loadings above 0.50 were considered significant (Pal & Bagi, 1987; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, &Black, 2003).

From the results it is concluded that the teaching learning process, learning opportunity, work life balance, compensation, leadership, professional relationship, employee support services and feedback on performance contributed highly to the QWL of faculty members in higher learning institutions.

Each of eight QWL factor listed in table 6 is labelled according to the name of the value that loaded most highly for those QWL. The higher a factor loading, the

more would its test reflect or measure as QWL (Pallant, 2005).The QWL's variable getting highest loading becomes the title of each factor of QWL.

**Factor-1: Teaching Learning Process -** This factor is represented by nine variables of QWL with factor loadings ranging from 0.763 to 0.593. The highest factor loading for a variable 'good classroom environment and lecture hall facilities' (0.763) and the lowest factor loading for 'adequate time for thorough Preparation' (0.593).

**Factor-2: Learning Opportunities** – Seven variables of QWL factor loadings ranging from 0.732 to 0.552. The variable 'Opportunities for Training and Development are available' has highest factor loading (0.732) and the variable 'Physical facilities for research is available' has the lowest factor loading (0.552).

**Factor-3: Work life Balance -** This factor comprises nine variables like 'It is very difficult to balance work and family' which has highest factor loading (0.702) and 'institution provides support in managing work and family commitments' which has the lowest factor loading (0.512).

**Factor-4: Compensation** – Ten variables of QWL factor loadings ranging from 0.661 to 0.500. The variable 'gives fair salary in comparison with cost of living' has highest factor loading (0.661) and the variable 'Yearly increment of salary is fairly given' has the lowest factor loading (0.500).

**Factor-5: Employee Support Service -** This factor is represented by seven variables of QWL with factor loadings ranging from 0.613 to 0.544. The highest factor loading for a variable 'Transportation facility is provided in the institution' (0.613) and the lowest factor loading for 'institution provides childcare facilities' (0.544).

**Factor-6: Feedback on Performance** – Seven variables of QWL ranging from 0.777 to 0.503. Among the seven 'performance feedback occurs in a timely fashion' is the highest factor loading variable and 'management invites feedback from the students' is the lowest factor loading variable.

**Factor-7: Leadership -** This factor is represented by ten variables of QWL with factor loadings ranging from 0.762 to 0.533. The highest factor loading for a variable 'HOD/Director treats people equitably' and the lowest factor loading for 'HOD/ Director promotes a positive team environment'.

**Factor-8: Professional Relationship** - This factor is represented by five variables of QWL with factor loadings ranging from 0.708 to 0.489. The highest factor loading for a variable 'have good relationship with the other faculty members in the department' (0.708) and the lowest factor loading for 'have a good relationship with superior' (0.489).

**Regression Analysis**

In order to explain more on the relationship among teaching learning process, work life balance, learning opportunities, employee support service, compensation,

feedback on performance, leadership and professional relationship with QWL, a regression analysis was run on the data. The results of the analysis were depicted in the tables from table 7 to table 10. The standardized coefficients for teaching learning process is.074, work life balance is .312, learning opportunities is .126, employee support service is .048, compensation is.326, feedback on performance is .135, leadership is .127 and professional relationship is .178. The beta coefficients indicates the relative importance of each individual variables, thus it shows that except employee support services all other variables explain more of quality of work life. Table 10 shows the details.

**Table 7**
**Model Summary**

| *Model* | *R* | *R Square* | *Adjusted R Square* | *Std. Error of the Estimate* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .863[a] | .744 | .742 | 3.98000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Teaching and Learning Process, Worklife Balance, Learning Opportunities, Employee Support Service, Compensation, Feedback on Performance, Leadership, Professional Relationship

**Table 8**
**ANOVA[a]**

| *Model* | *Sum of Squares* | *Df* | *Mean Square* | *F* | *Sig.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 49586.345 | 10 | 4958.634 | 173.413 | .000[b] |
| Residual | 28394.189 | 993 | 28.594 | | |
| Total | 77980.534 | 1003 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: QWL
b. Predictors: (Constant), Teaching and Learning Process, Worklife Balance, Learning Opportunities, Employee Support Service, Compensation, Feedback on Performance, Leadership, Professional Relationship.

**Table 9**

| *Model* | *Unstandardized Coefficients* | | *Standardized Coefficients* | *t* | *Sig.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *B* | *Std. Error* | *Beta* | | |
| (Constant) | 4.449 | 1.467 | | 3.032 | .002 |
| Teaching and Learning Process | .794 | .293 | .074 | 2.713 | .007 |
| Worklife Balance | 2.524 | .282 | .312 | 8.954 | .000 |
| Learning Opportunities | 1.014 | .168 | .126 | 6.050 | .000 |
| Employee Support Service | .411 | .221 | .048 | 1.857 | .064 |
| Compensation | 3.619 | .348 | .326 | 10.390 | .000 |
| Feedback on Performance | 1.258 | .252 | .135 | 4.994 | .000 |
| Leadership | 1.067 | .300 | .127 | 3.561 | .000 |
| Professional Relationship | 1.570 | .312 | .178 | 5.037 | .000 |

**Table 10**
**Correlation Analysis**

| *Independent Variables* | *QWL* |
|---|---|
| Teaching and Learning Process | .390** |
| Work life Balance | .697** |
| Learning Opportunities | .407** |
| Employee Support Service | .343 |
| Compensation | .623** |
| Feedback on Performance | .543** |
| Leadership | .635** |
| Professional Relationship | .683** |

Model summary (Table 7) shows how much these variables explain quality of work life. The result indicates that 74.2% of the variance is explained by all the independent variables. Hence it is possible to say that 74.2% of the combination of teaching learning process, work life balance, learning opportunities, employee support service, compensation, feedback on performance, leadership and professional relationship is able to explain quality of work life in the sample. From the correlation analysis it is confirmed that the employee support service is not significant at 0.01 level. Hence, it is concluded that except employee support services all other factors explain quality of work life of academicians.

## DISCUSSION

### Teaching Learning Process

The present study divulged that the work environment especially, the teaching learning process became an important dimension of quality of work life. Teaching Learning Process of faculty members refers to the aspects such as class room timetabling, class room environment, lecture hall facilities, contact time with students, time availability for preparation, support available for implementing new teaching methods etc. in the working environment. The work environment plays a major role in determining quality of work life of employees. It is capable of fulfilling employees' personal needs according to their expectations and generally leads to an excellent QWL (Shoeb Ahmad, 2013). It is revealed that the elements that are significant in determining an individual's quality of work life include the task, and the physical work environment along with other factors (Che Rose, Beh, Uli and Idris, 2006). In teaching, the adequate condition of work is one of the important factors that can affect a positive or negative influence on language teacher education[25]. Accordingly, the work environment especially, the teaching learning process became an important dimension of quality of work life.

**Learning Opportunities**

From the analysis it is revealed that learning opportunities is one of the important factors that determine the QWL of faculty members. The Growth in skills and knowledge is an important aspect of competency development that enhances QWL. Among several critical dimensions of QWL in institutions of higher learning the growth and development of the academic staff is also important dimension (Daud N 2010). The growth and development of the academic staff in institutions of higher learning is based on the learning opportunities available to them. Learning opportunities and skill discretion have also proven to have a positive effect on job satisfaction and reduced job stress that will lead to better QWL(Lokanadha Reddy. M and Mohan Reddy. P 2010). QWL can be explained by several factors in that the possibility of learning and using new skills is very important (Mirsepasi, 2006). The opportunity to develop and the use of skills are associated with learning mechanisms. Consequently, the learning opportunities became one of the important facets of QWL.

**Work Life Balance**

The results of the analysis disclosed that the work life balance of faculty members plays a vital role in determining QWL. Work Life Balance can be defined as the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in – and equally satisfied with – his or her work role and family role (Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw, 2003). Thus, employees who experience high work-life balance are those who exhibit similar investment of time and commitment, to work and non-work domains (Virick, Lily & Casper, 2007). The integration of work and the rest of life have emerged as a major social concern (Jacobs and Gerson, 2004). This is true in India also as the typical Indian family structure defined by the male breadwinner has now been largely superseded by dual-earner couples. Review of literature has indicated that academic workplaces seldom acknowledge the multidimensional lives of faculty members constitute an obstructive and hostile environment especially for women faculty who undertake several roles and even they have forgo or delay childbirth to avoid negative career consequences (Mason and Goulden, 2004). The inability of staff members to balance the equally challenging demands of their work and personal life has contributed to the escalating stress and conflict in today's workforce (Edward, J.R.,& Rothband, N.P 2000). This in turn escorts to momentous increase in stress related to health problem, which is going to have a consequence financially on both the employer as well as the government (Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, 1997; Johnson, K., Duxbury, L., & Higgins 1997). Work-life imbalance decreases job satisfaction and also QOL (Makabe, S., Takagai, J., Asanuma, Y., Ohtomo K, and Kimura . Y, 2015). Hence, the balance between personal life and work life is a major component of quality of work life.

**Compensation**

The present study emphasized that the adequate and fair compensation is a vital factor in determining QWL. The basic driving force behind work is to earn a living. It is therefore apparent that QWL is affected by the extent to which this goal is achieved. Both the factors of adequate and fair compensation are therefore considered important determinants of QWL (Walton, 1973). Study on QWL of clothing workers confirmed that compensation does indeed play a critical role in determining QWL (Reid, 1992). It is divulged that one of the most important factors that made hospital employees work a positive experience is monetary compensation (Saraji Nasl and H.Dargahi., 2006). It is also revealed that the economic factor is being one of four important factors of QWL (Zare, Hamid, Haghgooyan, Zolfa and Asl, Zahra Karimi, 2012). It is explored that one of the predictor variables of QWL of the faculty members is adequate and fair compensation (Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K., 2012). As the nature of the influence is positive an increase in each of these variables can lead to an increase in QWL. The lower compensation is the one of the important reasons for leaving the jobs among faculty members (Akhter, I., Muniruddin, G., & Sogra, K. J., 2008). In today's globalised business scenario equal pay for equal work is mandated and pay that is linked to responsibility, skill, performance and individual accomplishment are viewed with great importance. Thus it can be said that the adequate and fair compensation can significantly influence a faculty members QWL.

**Employee Support Services**

The level of support provided by the organization is an important indication of the work-life quality. Organizational Support is defined as the extent to which employees perceive that the organization values their contributions and cares about their wellbeing. It is an important factor in influencing employee commitment and job satisfaction (Dixon, M. and Sagas, M. 2007). It is also having positive impact on organizational commitment, employee performance as well as job satisfaction (Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R., 2002). But, the findings of this study were divergent with their views. The result of regression analysis revealed that the employee support services were not significant in explaining QWL among faculty members.

**Feedback on Performance**

It is learned from the analysis that the feedback on performance is an important facet of faculty members' QWL. Feedback refers to the necessity of organizations to speedily provide employees with information and accurate knowledge regarding their performance and its wider organizational impact (Orpen, C., 1981). The Constructive feedback helps employees perform their work more effectively and also improves communication between supervisors and employees. In general

employees want to improve their performance on the job, for which they want to receive constructive suggestions regarding areas they need to work on and to be commended on their job well done. Communicating with employees in a positive manner when they need to improve their performance will help prevent work problems. Feedback is one of the important elements in the work environment that is able to fulfill employees' personal needs and also a critical factor in reducing absenteeism, and employee turnover (Hackman, J.R., and Oldham, G. R., 1980).

**Leadership**

It is highlighted from the analysis that the strong and effective leadership is a predictor of quality of work life of faculty members. In a quality work place the leadership ensures and facilitates trust and commitment, cooperation and teamwork, problem solving and effective dispute resolution. Leadership, especially the treatment of subordinates by supervisors, is a significant predictor of QWL (Davis, L.E., Levine, M.F. and Taylor, J.C., 1984). It is one of the dimensions which explain the work life of academic staff in higher learning institutions (Daud, N. 2010). Supervision also directly and indirectly shapes academicians' experiences, attitudes and behaviour (Winter, R., Taylor, T. and J. Sarros., 2000). By using appropriate leadership styles, managers can affect employee job satisfaction, commitment and productivity. It is the ability of a leader to influence subordinates to perform at their highest capability. Leaders who effectively communicate are able to make individuals feel like they belong and are accepted and abandon any fears of rejection. Thus, it is apparent that supporting, developing, recognizing, rewarding and conflict managing supervisor behaviour is conducive to good quality working relationships.

**Professional Relationship**

It is divulged from the analysis that the Professional Relationship in the work environment plays a crucial role in determining QWL of faculty members. Professional Relationship refers to all aspects involving common work dynamics, both formal and informal relationship with colleagues or with superiors. An important factor that contributes to improvement in QWL is to maintain the group relationships. The interactions that take place among the members of a group are referred to as group dynamics. To improve QWL, the management should concentrate on the dynamics of intra- and inter-group relationships to minimize the unfavourable effects (Shoeb Ahmad, 2013). The relationship aspects in health care have a remarkable prominence of the perceived quality of work life, especially, relationship with colleagues as one of the five most important areas (Argentero, P., Miglioretti, M. and Angilletta, C., 2007). It is also asserted that job characteristics, role states, group and organization characteristics and leader relations are generally considered to be antecedents of high quality of work life (Murrells, T., Clinton M.

and Robinson, S., 2005). It is affirmed that the most important determinants of QWL are interesting job, good relationships with managers and colleagues, high income, work independence and clearly defined career advancement opportunities (Brock-Utne, 2000). It is also proved that quality of relationships is a critical component of quality of work life (Saad, H.S, Samah, A.J.A, and Juhdi, N 2008). Thus, professional relationship plays an important role in determining quality of work life.

## CONCLUSION

The main aim of this research is to investigate the factors that affect the overall perception of QWL of the faculty members. Results of factor analysis showed that all the eight factors of QWL contributed highly to the QWL of faculty members. Results of regression analysis divulged that excluding employee support services all other factors explain more of QWL. Accordingly, it can be concluded that except employee support services all other dimensions elucidate QWL of faculty members. Considering the importance of every QWL dimensions it is recommended that the relation and effect of each dimensions with other organizational aspects be evaluated and analyzed.

### *References*

Tsai, M.C.H. (2012), An empirical study of the Conceptualization of Overall Organizational Justices and its Relationship with Psychological Empowerment and Turnover intention in Higher Education (Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington).

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., and Whitelaw, M. (1994), *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Johnsrud, L.K. (2002), Measuring the quality of faculty and administrative work life: Implications for College and University Campuses. *Research in Higher Education* 43(3): 379–395.

Reyan GM (1995), Theoretical basic for the QWL concept. University of Siena: quality (esprit project 8162) 9 working paper).

Huzzard J. (2003), The Convergence of the Quality of Working Life and Competitiveness: A Current Swedish Literature Review, National Institute for Working Life, Stockholm.Bloom, (1956). "Bloom Taxonomy". *http://www.officeport.com/edu/blooms.htm*

Johnsrud, L. K., and Heck, R. H. (1998), Faculty worklife: Establishing benchmarks across groups. *Research in Higher Education* 39(5): 539–555.

Johnsrud, L.K., and Rosser, V.J. (2002), "Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A Multilevel explanation". *Journal of Higher Education,* 73(4).

Winter, R., Taylor, T. and J. Sarros. (2000), "Trouble at mill: quality of academic work life issues within a comprehensive Australian university," *Studies in Higher Education*, 25, 3, pp.279-294.

Saad, H.S, Samah, A.J.A, and Juhdi, N (2008), "Employees' Perception on Quality Work Life and Job Satisfaction in a Private Higher Learning Institution", *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 4, No. 3 Pp.23-34.

Daud, N. (2010), "Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment Amongst Academic Staff: Empirical Evidence from Malaysia". *International Conference on Education and Management Technology (ICEMT 2010)*.

Seyed Mohammad Mirkamalia, Fatemeh Narenji Thani (2011), "A Study on the Quality of Work Life (QWL) among faculty members of University of Tehran(UT) and Sharif university of Technology (SUT)". *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences,* 29, 179 – 187.

Hamidi, F and Mohamadi, B (2012), "Teachers' quality of work life in secondary schools". *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, Vol. 4(1), pp. 1-5, January 2012 Available online at *http://www.academicjournals.org/IJVTE DOI: 10.5897/IJVTE11.018*

Tamjidi A. (2007), "Evaluate the Quality of Working Life and Relationship Managers Performance Roodsar City State Schools". MA thesis, Tehran: Allameh TABAEI Tba. School of Psychology and Educational Sciences, p. 28.

Curtin University of Technology, "*Quality of Working Life (QWL) Survey Report 2006."* Curtin, Perth.

Lau, T., Wong, Y.H., Chan, K.F., & Law, M. (2001), "Information technology and the work environment- does it change the way people interact at work". *Human Systems Management,* 20(3), 267-280.

Rethinam, G. S., I., Maimunah, A.H., Musa, and A.S., Bahaman, (2004), "Working Conditions and Predictors of Quality of Work Life: A Psychosocial Perspective of Malaysian Information System Personnel", In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Asian Conference of the Academy of HRD*, Nov. 20-23, Seoul, Korea, pp. 98-105.

Rethinam, G. S., I., Maimunah, (2008), "Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals". *European Journal of Social Sciences,* 7(1), 58-70.

Malhotra, N.K. (2002), *Marketing research: an applied orientation* (3rd ed.). New Delhi : Pearson Education Asia.

Cronbach, L.J., (1951), Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 6, (3), 297-334.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (2003), *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Delhi: Pearson Education.

Pal,Y. and Bagai, O.P. (1987), A *Common Factor Better Reliability Approach to Determine the Number of Interpretable Factor. P*aper presented at the IX Annual Conference of the Indian Society for Probability and Statistics held at Delhi, University of Delhi, India.

Pallant, J. (2005), *SPSS survival manual*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Shoeb Ahmad (2013), "Paradigms of Quality of Work Life". *Journal of Human Values,* 19: 73.

Che Rose, R; Beh L.S, Uli, J, Idris K. (2006), "An Analysis of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Career- Related Variables". *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 3 (12): 2151-2159.

Johnstone, R. (2004), Language teacher education. In A. Davies & C. Elder, (Ed), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp.649-671). Oxford:Blackwell.

Lokanadha Reddy. M and Mohan Reddy. P (2010), "Quality of work life of employees: emerging dimensions". *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 827-839.

Mirsepasi, Naser (2006), "The mutual impact of productivity and QWL". *Economics and Management Journal*. 17.

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003), "The relation between work-family balance and quality of life". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 510-531.

Virick, M, Lily, JD & Casper, WJ (2007), "Doing more with less: An analysis of work life balance among layoff survivors", *Career Development International*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 463-80.

Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2004), *The time divide: Work, gender, and inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004), "Marriage and baby blues: Redefining gender equity in the academy". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 596*(1), 86-103. doi: 10.1177/0002716204268744.

Edward, J.R., & Rothband, N.P (2000), "Mechanism linking work and family: clarifying the relationship between work and family construct". *Academy of Management Journal*. 25, pp. 178-199.

Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, (1997), "Relation of work-family conflict to health outcomes: a four year longitudinal study of employed parents". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 670, pp. 325-335.

Johnson, K., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (1997), "Making work and lifestyle initiatives work: Beyond best practices". Ottawa: Industry Canada.

Makabe, S., Takagai, J., Asanuma, Y., Ohtomo K, and Kimura . Y, (2015), "Impact of work-life imbalance on job satisfaction and quality of life among hospital nurses in Japan". *Industrial Health*, 53, 152–159.

Walton, R.E. (1973), "Quality of working life: what is it"? *Sloan Management Review, 11*-21.

Reid, C.A. (1992), "An evaluation of the quality of work life of clothing workers in the Durban area". *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. University of Natal, Durban.

Saraji Nasl and H. Dargahi. (2006), "Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL)". *Iranian J Public Health*, vol. 35. No. 4, pp. 8-14.

Zare, Hamid, Haghgooyan, Zolfa and Asl, Zahra Karimi (2012), "Determining and Prioritizing the Criteria and Scales of Quality of Work Life (QWF) by AHP Method". *European Journal of Social Sciences, 27(3),* 346-359.

Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K. (2012), "An Evaluation of the Quality of Work Life: A Study of the Faculty Members of Private Universities in Bangladesh". *ABAC Journal,* Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 36-57.

Akhter, I., Muniruddin, G., & Sogra, K. J. (2008), "A Trend Analysis of Faculty Turnover at the private universities in Bangladesh: A Business School Perspective". *Journal of Business Studies*, 4(1).

Dixon, M. and Sagas, M. (2007), "The relationship between organizational support, work family conflict, and the job-life satisfaction of university coaches". *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 78, 236-247.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002), "Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698–714.

Orpen, C. (1981), The conceptualization of quality of working life. Perspectives in *Industrial Psychology*, 7, 36- 69.

Hackman, J.R., and Oldham, G.R. (1980), *Work Redesign. Reading*, M.A: Addison-Wesley.

Davis, L.E., Levine, M.F. and Taylor, J.C. (1984), "Defining quality of working life". *Human Relations*. 37(1), 81-104.

Argentero P., Miglioretti M., Angilletta C. (2007), "Quality of work life in a cohort of italian health workers", Giornale Italiano di Medicina del Lavoro ed Ergonomia Supplemento A, *Psicologia* Vol. 29, N. 1: A50-A54.

Murrells, T., Clinton M. and Robinson, S. (2005), "Job satisfaction in nursing: Validation of a new instrument for the UK". *J. Nurs. Manag.*, 13(4): 296-311.

Brock-Utne, B., (2000), "Quality of work life for manual workers, Nurses. Job satisfaction: A proposed measure". *Nurs. Res.*, 39(2): 113-117.