

## IS DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS AFFECT QUALITY OF WORK LIFE (QWL) IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTE (HEI) TEACHERS

*K. C. Vashishtha<sup>1</sup> & Priyanka Mittal<sup>2</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>Dean & Head, Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Education, Dayalbagh Educational Institute  
(Deemed University), Dayalbagh, Agra, Uttar Pradesh, India*

*<sup>2</sup>Research Scholar, Dept of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Education, Dayalbagh Educational  
Institute (Deemed University), Dayalbagh, Agra, Uttar Pradesh, India*

---

**Received: 31 Jul 2018**

**Accepted: 04 Aug 2018**

**Published: 16 Aug 2018**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

*The objective of the present paper is to examine Quality of Work Life (QWL) as a determinant of demographic variables among HEI teachers. This research is a Descriptive survey in nature. The sample of 449 HEI teachers from Agra city was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. Teachers Quality of work life (QWL) was accessed through self-constructed Quality of work life scale. The main finding of the study that there is a low level of Quality of Work Life among the HEI teachers and the demographic variables viz., age and designation of HEI teachers have a significant influence on their Quality of work life. It is also evident from this study that QWL in HEI teachers can be improved by the Orientation/Refresher Courses, Faculty Development Programmes, Workshop, Seminar, and Symposium etc. Hence such opportunities should be given to the HEI teachers for their up gradation, methods, strategies, and pedagogy of higher education.*

**KEYWORDS:** *QWL-Quality of Work Life, HEI – Higher Educational Institution*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Quality of Work Life is an indicator of how free the society is from exploitation, injustice, inequality, oppression, and restrictions on the continuity of the growth of the man. The term Quality of Work Life is coined by Louis Davis (1972) and introduced at an International conference held at Arden. The concept of QWL has gone through multiple metamorphosis and grew as a simple construct to become a movement in the present world of vocation.

Walton (1973) has defined the quality of work life as a process by which an organization responds to employee need for developing a mechanism to allow them to share fully in making the divisions that design their lives at work. He emphasized the following elements of work environment to evaluate the quality of work life programme viz., (i) Adequate and Fair Compensation (ii) Safe and Healthy Environment (iii) Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities (iv) Future opportunity for Growth and Security (v) Social integration in the work organization (vi) Constitutionalism in the work organization (vii) Work and total life space (viii) Social relevance of work life. Rethinam and Ismail (2008) defined QWL as the effectiveness of the work environment that transmits to the meaningful organization and personal need in shaping the values of employee that support and promote better health and well-being, job security, job satisfaction, competency development and balance between work and non-work life.

Basically, the term quality of work life (QWL) can be conceptualized as a subset of the quality of life as both are closely knitted to each other. Work life is an integral part of total life space (Lawler, 1982). Quality of life may describe a person or group's standard of living, environment, public health and safety and/or general surrounding. It also includes the quality of a person's work life encompassing things those affect his well-being during a working day, such as salary and benefits, facilities, the potential for advancement and work-life balance (Ballou et al., 2007). The basic aim of education all round development of the individual, which can be achieved when teachers will give their highest contribution for imparting quality education, which ultimately helps in the progress of the nation. The government, as well as Higher Education Institutions as a part of society, should focus on the quality of work life of the teachers so they can give their best to an individual without any pressure or mental distraction. In the changing environment of modern technological advancement, the traditional concept of the teaching is subjected to rapid changes. A person who enjoys the work and derives satisfaction alone can perform in the perfect manner. The fulfillment of personal needs and goals lead to satisfaction, well-being and happiness of the person. But, how far and how long an individual could be satisfied in the profession if it is full of work-related stress and strain. Quality of education entails the design of work systems that enhance the working life experiences of teachers, thereby improving commitment and motivation for achieving their goals. In this regard, quality of work life is very important for the teachers in higher education institutions.

A wider exploration of QWL, depicting a dismissal scenario. Swamy et al. (2015) had filtered nine elements (factors) (Work environment, organization culture and climate, relation and co-operation, training and development, compensation and rewards, facilities, job satisfaction and job security, autonomy of work and adequacy of resources) responsible for the enhancement of QWL in an organization. Similarly, Sinha (2012) reported three basic factors of Quality of work life (QWL). On the other hand, Saravanan & Elamathi (2015) had proposed twenty factors responsible for better QWL in an organization. Hart (2011) developed structural Equation Model (SEM) and put forth three basic elements of QWL i.e. Integrating work experience, Psychological distress; and morale.

Some more productive studies on QWL have been carried out, giving the glimpse of its direct impact on professionals contribution and work culture of an organization. Afsar (2014) has shown the favorable impact of QWL on academicians work life in Turkey. Rao et al. (2013) investigated that teaching experience is directly proportional to QWL in HELs: Velayudhan & Yameni (2017) quoted that QWL can be enhanced through in-service training and refresher programme for the employees to a great extent.

A few more researches supported the above arguments about QWL as Kaur & Sharma (2016) reported that private university teachers are exhibiting poor QWL due to heavy workload, and organizational stress to perform. Shella et al. (2014) observed gender differences in QWL like working conditions; opportunities for growth and social relevance of job etc. Further Torre et al. (2018) has reported that Low level of job demand predicted high MCS (Mental Composite Summary) and has gender discrimination as MCS & PCS are at a higher level in male employees. Nia & Maleki (2013) found a positive relationship between QWL and organizational commitment.

In a nutshell, it is an old saying that round pegs fit into square holes are the symbolic ideal situation for the maximum welfare of an organization and a professional. It satisfy his/her cognitive and emotional domains as well as provides the work environment to suit his/her needs. Here QWL is the sole ingredient which makes or mars the

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The major objectives of this study are laid down as follows;

- To assess the level of Quality of Work Life (QWL) of Higher Education Institutions (HEI) teachers.
- To study the association between age groups and Quality of Work Life (QWL) among Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers.
- To study the association between Gender and Quality of Work Life (QWL) among Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers.
- To study the association between Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers designation and Quality of Work Life (QWL).
- To study the association between Working Experience and Quality of Work Life (QWL) of Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers.

## **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

The hypotheses in order to achieve the foremost objectives are formulated as following;

**Ho<sub>1</sub>:** There exists no significant difference among Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers. of different age groups regarding their perception towards levels of quality of work life.

**Ho<sub>2</sub>:** There exists no significant difference between male and female Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers. Regarding their level of quality of work life.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>:** There exists no significant difference among Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers designations regarding levels of quality of work life.

**Ho<sub>4</sub>:** There exists no significant difference between Working Experience of Higher Education Institution (HEIs) teachers regarding the level of quality of work life.

## **VARIABLES OF THE STUDY**

The important variables of the present study are;

Independent Variable - Quality of Work Life

Dependent Variables- Demographic Variables (Age, Gender, Designation and Working Experience).

## **METHOD OF THE STUDY**

Keeping in view the nature of the study, the descriptive survey method was employed. The study was conducted on a sample of 449 HEI teachers teaching in Dayalbagh Educational Institute (DEI) and Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar University (DBRAU), Agra. The selection of HEI teachers was done on the basis of the proportionate stratified random sampling method.

**Table 1: Exhibiting the Sample of the Study**

SN	Higher Education Institute (HEI)	Number of Respondents	
		Male	Female
1.	Dayalbagh Educational Institute (Deemed University), Dayalbagh, Agra	83	95
2.	Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar University Agra	139	132
<b>Total</b>		<b>222</b>	<b>227</b>

## TOOL CONSTRUCTION

The researcher has employed a self-constructed scale for the quantitative assessment of the quality of work life (QWL) of higher education institution teachers. It has following 10 dimensions: (i) Organizational commitment, (ii) Job satisfaction, (iii) Learning and improvement, (iv) Social relationship in the institution, (v) Physical state, (vi) Compensation & Rewards, (vii) Work Environment, (viii) Organization climate (ix) Motivation and (x) Facilities and resources. This scale has 50 items, based on the five-point Likert scale which ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This scale can be administered to all grades of teachers teaching in the higher education institutions. The Pilot study of the scale was carried out on 209 university teachers of Agra city. The reliability of the scale is found to be 0.87 using Chronbach's alpha method of determining the reliability and the content validity is found to be 0.83 by using scale content validity index (SCVI) method. Factorial validity was also established by using factor analysis. Hence the scale is significantly valid and reliable for the assessment of QWL of teachers teaching in higher education institutions.

## ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The analysis of data has been carried out objective-wise to test the null hypotheses in a sequential manner, the interpretation is also given along with it.

*Objective-1: To assess the level of quality of work life of Higher Education Institutions (HEI) teachers.*

In order to identify the level of QWL among the HEI teachers. Simple statistical criteria have been followed. The mean of the value of standard deviation gives the high level of QWL, and similarly  $M-1\sigma$  denotes the Low level of QWL, Meanwhile, middlemost group makes the Average QWL in HEI teachers.

**Table 2: Exhibiting levels of QWL among HEI Teachers (In percentage)**

S. No	Levels of Quality of Work Life	Criteria	Score Limit	Percentage of HEI Teachers	
				Frequency	Percentage
1.	Low	$M-1\sigma$	83-105	116	25.8
2.	Average	$M\pm 1\sigma$	106-188	205	45.7
3.	High	$M+ 1\sigma$	189-260	128	28.5
<b>Total</b>				<b>449</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The above table that majority of HEI teachers (45.7%) are fell down in the category of Average level of QWL. It can be inferred that these teachers are making the major group of HEI teachers which believe in average QWL position while a small group of HEI teachers in extreme group ( $M+1\sigma$ ) and ( $M-1\sigma$ ) represents a few numbers of HEI teachers. These groups were identified as having almost equal numbers of HEI teacher in them.

*Objective-2: To study the association between age of HEI teachers with respect to levels of Quality of Work Life.*

For testing the hypothesis Chi-Square test was applied in order to find out the significant association between the demographic variables like Age and QWL. The three group of HEI teachers under age considered for the present study were below 35 years, 36-50 years and above 50 years and the three levels of Quality of Work Life (QWL) were Low QWL, Average QWL, and High QWL. Here Row percentages are given in curved brackets and column percentages are given in square brackets. Chi-square value was also computed. The results are summarized in table 3

**Table 3: Exhibiting the Chi-Square Values between Different Age Groups and Levels of QWL**

S. No	Age (In Years)	QWL			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1.	Below 35 Years	49	45	61	155	65.188	0.00
		(31.6%)	(29.0%)	(39.4%)	100%		
		[23.9%]	[35.2%]	[52.6%]	34.5%		
2.	36-50 Years	154	82	41	277		
		(55.6%)	(29.6%)	(14.8%)	100.0%		
		[75.1%]	[64.1%]	[35.3%]	61.7%		
3.	Above 50 Years	2	1	14	17		
		(11.8%)	(5.9%)	(82.4%)	100.0%		
		[1.0%]	[0.8%]	[12.1%]	3.8%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>205</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>449</b>		

Source: SPSS 22.0 Version, Output

Note: 1.The value within curved brackets refers to row percentage

2. The value within square brackets refers to column percentage

Table no. 2 shows that the chi-square value for the age group is 65.18 with a p-value of 0.00, which means the p- value is less than 0.05 (Alpha Value). The null hypothesis is rejected. Hence it is concluded that respondent age groups have a significant association between age and levels of quality of work life among HEI teachers. The HEI teachers below 35 years of age have 31.6% of the low level of QWL, 29.0 % average level of QWL and 39.4 % of the high level of QWL. The 36-50 years of HEI teachers have 55.6 % of the low level of QWL, 29.6 % average level of QWL, 14.8 % high level of QWL. The above 50 years of age HEI teachers have 11.8 % low level of QWL, 5.9 % average level of QWL, 82.4 % high level of QWL.

*Objective-3:* To study the association between Gender and Quality of Work Life among HEI teachers.

For testing the hypothesis Chi-Square test was applied using cross-tabulation. The two categories under gender considered for the present study were male and female the three levels of Quality of Work Life (QWL) were Low QWL, Average QWL, and High QWL. Row percentages are given in curved brackets and column percentages are given in square brackets. Chi-square value was also computed.

**Table 4: Exhibiting the Chi-Square Values Among QWL Male and Female HEI Teachers**

S. No	Gender	QWL Level			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1.	Male	106	64	52	222	1.425	0.490
		(47.7%)	(28.8%)	(23.4%)	100.0%		
		[51.0%]	[50.0%]	[44.8%]	49.4		
2.	Female	99	64	64	227		
		(43.6%)	(28.2%)	(28.2%)	100.0%		
		[48.3%]	[50.0%]	[55.2%]	50.6%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>205</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>449</b>		

Source: SPSS 22.0 Version, Output

Note- 1. The value within curve bracket refers to row percentage

2. The value within square bracket refers to column percentage

Table-3 showing that the calculated Chi-square value is 1.425 with a p-value of 0.490, which means the p-value, is more than 0.05 (Alpha value). Here the null hypothesis was accepted. Hence it is concluded that there is no significant association between gender and levels of Quality of work life among HEI teachers. The HEI male teachers have 47.7% of the low level of QWL, 28.8 % average level of QWL and 23.4% of the high level of QWL. The female HEI teachers have 43.6 % of the low level of QWL, 28.2 % average level of QWL, 28.2% high level of QWL. It concludes that majority of the male and female teachers were lying in the category of low level of QWL. The result indicates that QWL of female teachers is marginally higher than the male teachers.

*Objective-4: To study the association between Working Experience and Quality of Work Life among HEI teachers*

For testing the hypothesis Chi-Square test was applied. The four categories under working experience considered for the present study were Below 10 years; 11-20 years; 21-30 years; above 30 years; and the three levels of Quality of Work Life (QWL) were Low QWL, Average QWL, and High QWL.

**Table 5: Exhibiting the Chi-Square Values between Working Experience and Quality of Work Life in HEI Teachers**

S. No	Working Experience (in Years)	Levels of QWL			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1.	Below 10 Years	103	64	67	234	5.57	0.473
		(44.0%)	(27.4%)	(28.6%)	100.0%		
		[50.2%]	[50.0%]	[57.8%]	52.1%		
2.	11-20 Years	57	37	29	123		
		(46.3%)	(30.1%)	(23.6%)	100.0%		
		[27.8%]	[28.9%]	[25.0 %]	27.4		
3.	21-30 Years	31	18	18	67		
		(46.3%)	(26.9%)	(26.9%)	100.0%		
		[15.1%]	[14.1%]	[15.5%]	14.9%		
4.	Above 30 Years	14	9	2	25		
		(56.0%)	(36.0%)	(8.0%)	100%		
		[6.8%]	[7.0 %]	[1.7%]	5.6%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>205</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>449</b>		

Source: SPSS 22.0 Version, Output

Note- 1. The value within curved bracket refers to row percentage

2. The value within square bracket refers to column percentage

Table-4 reveals that the calculated Chi-square value was 5.57 with a p-value of 0.473, which means the p-value is more than 0.05 (Alpha value). Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus it is concluded that there is a no significant association between working experience and levels of quality of work life among HEI teachers. The HEIs teachers below 10 years of working experience have 44% of the low level of QWL, 27.4% average level of QWL and 28.6 % of the high level of QWL. The 11-20 years of HEIs teachers have 46.3 % of the low level of QWL, 30.1 % average level of QWL, 23.6 % high level of QWL. The 21-30 years HEIs teachers have 46.3 % low level of QWL, 26.9 % average level of QWL and 26. 9% high level of QWL. The above 30 years of HEIs teachers have 56 % of the low level of QWL, 36 % average level of QWL and 8 % high level of QWL.

*Objective-5: To study the association between HEI teachers designation and Quality of Work Life*

It is observed that the designation may also play an important role in making individual Quality of Work Life. Senior–Junior experienced fresher problems are originated mostly from the position which they occupy. Here the researcher has classified the designation of HEIs teachers into three broad categories viz; Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor and the three levels of Quality of Work Life (QWL) were Low QWL, Average QWL, and High QWL.

**Table 6: Exhibiting the Chi-Square Values between HEI Teachers Designation and Quality of Work Life**

S. No	Designation	Levels of QWL			Total	Chi-Square	p-value
		Low	Average	High			
1.	Assistant Professor	107	77	92	276	61.21	0.00
		(38.8%)	(27.9%)	(33.3%)	100.0%		
		[52.2%]	[60.2%]	[79.3%]	61.5%		
2.	Associate Professor	98	49	13	160		
		(61.3%)	(30.6%)	(8.2%)	100.0%		
		[47.8%]	[38.3%]	[11.2 %]	35.6%		
3.	Professor	0	2	11	13		
		(0.0%)	(15.4%)	(84.6%)	100.0%		
		[0.0%]	[1.6%]	[9.5%]	2.9%		
	Total	205	128	116	449		

Source: SPSS 22.0 Version, Output

Note - 1. The value within curved bracket refers to row percentage

2. The value within square bracket refers to column percentage

Table-5 reveals that the chi-square value was 61.21 with the p-value is 0.00, which is less than 0.05 (Alpha value). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it is concluded that there exists a significant association between designation and levels of quality of work life. The HEI’s assistant professors have shown QWL’s level as low (38.8 % ) average (27.9 %) and high (33.3 %) respectively. The HEIs teachers who had the position of associate professor have 61.3 % of the low level of QWL, 30.6 % of the average level of QWL and 8.2% of the high level. The HEIs teachers who had the position of Professor have 15.4 % average level of QWL and 84.6 % high level of QWL. In low QWL no one falls in the category of Professor.

## FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study can be summarised as follows:

- The peculiar result, the researcher has in this study is that the majority of higher education institution's teachers are having average Quality of Work life, indicating that the majority of sampled HEI teachers are having satisfactory QWL. 28.5% of HEI teachers are falling into the high category of QWL and 25.8% are falling into the low category of QWL.
- There exists a significant association between different age groups of HEI teachers with respect to their Quality of Work Life. Researchers found that the negative trend of relationship exists between age groups of HEI's teachers and their QWL. It is observed that quality of work life decreases with the increase in the age of the HEI's teachers. In addition to the above statements, Hossain (1997) reported the same results stating that there is a significant relationship between the age of the workers and their QWL.
- Observational inferences on the basis of percentages it can be concluded that female teachers are comparatively better in terms of QWL than their male counterparts.
- In reference to teaching experience the results it is inferred that as the experience enhances, the HEI teachers have shown a low level of Quality of Work Life. Thus there exists a reciprocal relationship between QWL and teaching experience of HEI's teachers.
- 5 There exists a significant association between HEI teachers designation (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) and Quality of Work Life, which means a designation plays an important role in determining the Quality of Work Life. After visualizing percentage it can be concluded that Assistant Professors are comparatively better in terms of Associate and Professor Category.

## CONCLUSIONS

The quality of work life (QWL) is the pivot of HEI teachers which moves them for giving their best to higher education and for the well being of students and system as a whole. A higher level of QWL leads to better outcomes in form of quality of education for all stakeholders of HEI. This study was designed to assess the quality of work life for higher educational institute teachers along with certain demographic variables. In this study, the results show that QWL of HEI teachers is of low level. The researcher found that the age of Higher Education Institution(HEI) teachers plays a crucial role in deciding teachers QWL in his/her working environment. A teacher's expectancy on emoluments, comforts, workload and maturity of handling the stress are mostly detrimental to their age only. QWL also contribute at large in the reduction of the stress. It is unique findings that this study has not shown any sort of gender discrimination it means that both male and female are empowered with equality of opportunities and all sorts of resources, they desire as well as they have also similar synchronization in their QWL in HEI.

Working Experience of HEI teachers was influencing the Quality of Work Life. HEI teachers with Below 10 years of working experience may work more efficiently when compared to the more experienced teachers. Young, as well as experienced teachers, are more proficient in digital activities and during their work in a smooth and fast manner. Working experience can be improved by Orientation/Refresher Courses, Faculty Development Programme, Workshop,



Seminar, and Symposium etc. which organized for teacher up gradation on current trends, methods, strategies and pedagogy of Higher Education.

There exists significant association in the level of Quality of work life of HEI teachers and their designation, i.e., Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors category. Designation of the teachers was having much influence on the levels of Quality of Work Life. Lastly, it can be concluded that a low level of Quality of Work Life is found among the HEI teachers and demographic variables have no significant influence over the Quality of Work Life of the HEI teachers. QWL can be improved by transparency and decisive role of teachers in decision-making bodies of the institutions since teachers are not only the part parcel the institution but also the important instrument in the implementation of different policies, rules and regulations for the healthy academic environment in HEIs for its all stakeholders.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Aarthy, M. & Nandhini, M. (2016). *A Study on Quality of Work Life among the Engineering College Faculty Members in Coimbatore District. International Journal of Management Research & Review*, 6 (8), 1051-1057. Retrieved from [http://ijmrr.com/admin/upload\\_data/journal\\_AAarthy%20%20207aug16mrr.pdf](http://ijmrr.com/admin/upload_data/journal_AAarthy%20%20207aug16mrr.pdf)
2. Bharathi, S. P., Umaselvi, M. & Kumar, S. N. (2011). *Quality of Work Life: Perception of College Teachers. Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*. 2(1), 47-65. Retrieved from <https://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/27868/>
3. Boas, V. A. A. & Morin, M. E. (2013). *Quality of Working Life in Public Higher Education Institutions: Perception of Brazilian and Canadian Professors. International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 4 (12), 67-77. Retrieved from [https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_4\\_No\\_12\\_Special\\_Issue\\_September\\_2013/7.pdf](https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_12_Special_Issue_September_2013/7.pdf)
4. Cetinkanat, C. A. & Kosterolioglu, A. M. (2016). *The relationship between Quality of Work Life and Work Alienation: Research on Teachers. Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(8): 1778-1786. doi:10.13189/ujer.2016.040806
5. GUPTA, V. (2013). *Constructs of Quality of Work Life: an empirical evidence from Indian hospitals. Management (IJHRM)*, 2(2), 7-16.
6. Hamidi, F. & Mohamadi, B. (2012). *Teachers' Quality of Work Life in Secondary Schools. International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*. 4(1), 1-5. doi: 10.5897/IJVTE11.018
7. Hart, M. P. (2011). *Teacher Quality of Work Life: Integrating Work Experiences, Psychological Distress and Morale. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67 (2), 109-132
8. Hossain, J. A. (1997). *Quality of Working Life of Industrial Workers in Bangladesh: A Case Study in Greeter Kushtia District, Unpublished Research Monograph*.
9. Jain, B. & Swami, Y. (2014). *Quality of Work Life with Special Reference to Academic Sector. Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 3(1), 14-17. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0972063415589236>

10. Joiceswarnalatha, R. & Krishna, M. V. (2017). A Factor Analysis of Quality of Work Life-An Empirical Study of IT Companies. *International Journal of Innovations and advancement in computer Science (IJ IACS)*, 6 (8), 355-361. Retrieved from <http://academicscience.co.in/admin/resources/project/paper/f201708271503817561.pdf>
11. Kaur, K. & Sharma, D. (2016). A Comparative Study of QWL among University Teachers. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 106-119. Retrieved from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Conf.15010/Volume%202/33.%20106-120.pdf>
12. Kotze, M. (2005). The Nature and Development of the Construct Quality of Work Life. *Ada Academic*, 37 (2), 96-122. Retrieved from [http://scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11660/6757/academic\\_v37\\_n2\\_a5.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](http://scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11660/6757/academic_v37_n2_a5.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
13. Maccoby, M. (1984). Helping Labor and Management Setup a Quality of Work Life Program. *Monthly Labor Review*, 2(2), 28-32. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1984/03/art4full.pdf>
14. Mahmood, N. A., Saad, A. & Shah, S. M. (2018). The Level of Work Engagement on The Quality of Life Among Academicians in Private Higher Education Institutions (Phei) in Klang Valley. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*, 10(2S), 1119-1128, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v10i2s.83>.
15. Manju, N. D. (2014). Quality of Work Life: Perception of School Teachers. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research (IJEPR)*, 3(2), 77-80. Retrieved from [http://ijepr.org/doc/V3\\_Is2\\_June14/ij16.pdf](http://ijepr.org/doc/V3_Is2_June14/ij16.pdf)
16. Mirkamali, M. S. & Thani, N. F. (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 Behaviour Sciences*, 29,179-187. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.223
17. Nadler, D.A., & Lawler, E. E. (1983). *Quality of Work Life: Perceptions and Directions*. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11(3), 20-30.
18. Nakkeeran, K. S. (2010). *Quality of Work Life: Perception of College Teachers*. *Applied Psychology*, 39 (3), 275-291.
19. Rao, T., Arora S. R. & Vashisht, K. A. (2013). *Quality of Work Life: A Study of Jammu University Teachers*. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 20-25. Retrieved from: <http://www.publishingindia.com/GetBrochure.aspx?query=UERGQnJvY2h1cmVzfC8xNTE0LnBkZnwwMTUxNC5wZGY=>
20. Rethinam, G. S., & Ismail, M. (2008). *Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals*. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (1), 58-70. Retrieved from <http://www.sciepub.com/reference/180474>

21. Saravanan, S. & Elamathi, K. (2015). *Factor Analysis of Effects of Career on Quality of Work Life Among Women Employees Working in Private Sector Banks In Coimbatore District. International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, 6 (4), 215-221. Retrieved from: [http://scienceandnature.org/IJEMS-Vol6\(4\)-Oct2015/IJEMS%20Vol6\(4\)-8.pdf](http://scienceandnature.org/IJEMS-Vol6(4)-Oct2015/IJEMS%20Vol6(4)-8.pdf)
22. Sinha, C. (2012). *Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: Empirical Evidence from Indian Organizations. Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(11), 31-40. Retrieved from [http://ajbmr.com/articlepdf/AJBMR\\_20\\_07\\_4.pDf](http://ajbmr.com/articlepdf/AJBMR_20_07_4.pDf)
23. Soloman, V. V. (2015). *Quality of Work Life of Arts and Science Colleges Teachers, Chennai. International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering*, 3(2), 63-74. Retrieved from <http://ndpublisher.in/admin/issues/IJASEV3N2e.pdf>
24. Swamy, R. D., Nanjundeswaraswamy, S.T. & Srinivas, R. (2015). *Quality of Work Life: Development and Validation. International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 8(2), 281-295. Retrieved from [http://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/6\\_swamy.pdf](http://www.internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/6_swamy.pdf)
25. Torre, et al. (2018). *Association between Work-Related Stress and Health-Related Quality of Life: The Impact of Socio-Demographic Variables. A Cross-Sectional Study in a Region of Central Italy. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(1). doi: 10.3390/ijerph15010159.
26. Veleudhan, M. K T. & Yameni, D. M. (2017). *Quality of Work Life- A Study. IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 197, 1-15. Retrieved from <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1757-899X/197/1/012057>
27. Walton, R.E. (1973). *Quality of Working Life, What is it, Sloan Management, Review Fall 11-21.*

