

A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG FACULTIES OF BCOM AND BBA

¹Dr. Arpana Patel, ²Desai Tarjani

¹HOD, ²PhD Research Scholar

¹BV Patel Institute of Commerce, ²Department of Management,
UKA Tarsadia University, Bardoli, Gujarat, India.

Abstract: Quality of work life (QWL) has a noteworthy impact on performance of work and job satisfaction also. Quality of work life which features of Equitable pay and rewards, Justice in the work place, Job Security, Decision Making Opportunities, Recognition of Contributions, Work Authority, Opportunity for career growth, Work Feedback and Knowledge of Results, Control over Self, Work and Work Place, Meaningful and Interesting Work, Supervision. The present paper is a try to understand as well as factor which is affecting faculties of BCOM and BBA. For this purpose data on QWL were collected from 100 faculties affiliated to VNSGU BCOM and BBA colleges. Data collected through questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed using factor analysis and Mann Whitney Test. Study found eleven factors of QWL and they are; Meaningful and Interesting Work, Extra Responsibilities with Rewards, Equal Compensation and Opportunities, Work pressure and Adequate Resources, Interpersonal Relationship, Work Generate Fatigue and Monotony, Adequate Reimbursement, Work Freedom & Fair Treatment for Clashes, Communication & Encouragement regarding Work, Working Hours and Work Evaluation. Man Whitney test conclude that male and female both agree on points like do not have encouragement to experiment new methods and support for FDP as well as workshops seminars, No respect rewards and recognition, no freedom of expression, fatigue and monotony from work, they have pressure of assigning biased marks, upset with job responsibilities, no chance of development.

(Key points: Quality of Work Life, Faculties of BCOM and BBA, Gender, Factors affecting, Satisfaction)

1. Introduction:

The Quality of Work Life is a current burning idea and we can outlined Quality of Work Life as individual's general quality of working life. Quality of Working Life from time to time take into thought as a sub-concept of the broad concept of quality of life, which point out the total quality of an individual's life. In today's modern world a large mass of people's life is spent at work. On an average, individuals go through around twelve hours per day in the work place which forms one third of their entire life. Hence work should generate satisfaction, give peace of mind, fulfilment regarding a task and having spent time purposefully, beneficially, and fruitfully at work place. Each individual at work tries to make his work more enjoyable for himself/herself and those around themselves people. In this framework, literatures on making work more enjoyable is being talked about and therefore the phrase, "Quality of Work Life" came in the picture. Every single individual feel that their work should give them fulfilment and encourage them to recognize their work. Educators are no exemption to it. This has offered rise to endeavors on improving the QWL of the educators. Dealing with the personnel in the modern era is challenging activity. Today employees who are working in the organizations have higher capabilities and various aptitudes. Likewise, they are participating in the organizations with more consciousness and opportunities. Sustaining the employees today isn't a simple task. Organizations should make the employees feel honored to work for the organizations. The QWL idea is getting encouraging attention in the area of Human Resource Management. The QWL incorporates the aggregate of understanding of individual's involvement with different parts of the work life. The responses of workers towards work depends upon three factors: i) The personality qualities and individual characteristics for example need array, acceptance of uncertainty, work ethics, values, aptitudes and skills of the employees. ii) Job characteristics, for instance challenge job offers, the level of autonomy worker getting for performing his job, the level of capacities utilized in performing the job iii) Facilities proposed by the organization at the organization like reward and training facilities. Giving better QWL is a significant methodology to keep the employees satisfied, furthermore, to make them have a great time at workplace. Quality of Work Life is not only worried with earnings related outlooks that a present employee worries about but in addition it is business status, interpersonal conflicts, work weight, lack of flexibility of work and absence of testing work and so on. Employees anticipate the helpful and suitable working conditions and great terms of employment. So profitability and proficiency of an organization in large part depend on the Quality of Work Life provided by the organization. QWL of an establishment can be discover by the conduct of its employees. One method for measuring the work life would be to emphasis on the behavioral outcomes for example turnover rate, drug abuse, absenteeism, heavy drinking as well as mental and physical sickness resulting from the psychologically hazardous employment. In contrast, job involvement or self-investment of a person at work may be a valuable record of quality of work life experienced by the employees at work place. QWL implies aggregate of standards just as material and non-material achieved by an employees through his life as a bread earner. Understanding QWL in a business or organization will clarify weak and strong points which interface between the organization and its workers. It is a wide term that can hold every possible aspect of work ethic and working conditions. QWL is directly related to the idea of Quality of Life. Therefore quality of work life in organizations is a main element of quality of life in all-purpose. Several scholars and investigators have projected different components of QWL, which includes a vast variety of aspects. It started from Human Relations Movement which was an important take-off from the "Taylorian Scientific Management" approach. Then QWL has its fundamentals with Maslow, Herzberg and McGregor theories. Several researchers like Hackman and Suttle (1977), Walton Richard (1979), Warr et al. (1979), Robert H. Guest (1979), Nadler and Lawler (1983), Mirvis and Lawler (1984), Baba, V. V., & Jamal, M. (1991), Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001) who have done researcher on QWL and gave different variables. Here this study has taken into consideration Walton Richard eight variables; The social relevance of work, Constitutionalism in the work organization, Adequate and fair compensation, Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, Safe and healthy working conditions, Work and total life space and Social Integration in the Work Organization.

2. Review of Literature:

Subash Limbu and Nabasmita Bordoloi (2017) have discussed perceptive of teachers about quality of work life. Researcher has analyzed quality of work life of 300 college teachers of private degree colleges, Guwahati who were selected through convenience sampling. Study has included major six dimension of QWL. Data collected through interview method and researcher discovered that factors like financial benefit & rewards, work load & content, job security, career development opportunities and work life balance is negatively influencing the QWL at private colleges, Better social life is only factor influencing QWL positively at private degree colleges at Guwahati. Survey has focused on six factors only, QWL has other major important factor where research can focus for further study. **K. Malarkodi, S. Prasanna and R. Renukadevi (2017)** have researched in area of quality of work life among 200 faculties of Higher Educational Institutions (HEI's) in Private Engineering Colleges. Objective of this research are to identify actual culture and working style of faculties, to analysis critical factors of quality of work life of faculties as well as relationship status between faculties and institute in light of quality of work life of institute. Researchers have used questionnaire method for data collection and analysis part through Spearman correlation coefficient. Research concluded that majority of faculties of institute is satisfied with quality of work life but still few areas where institute need to work. Here in future researcher can focused on demographic factors and their relationship with quality of work life of institute. **Dr. Y Poornima and Sunil M Rashinkar (2017)** have discovered QWL among 1000 teachers engineering institutions in the state of Karnataka. Engineering institutions in the state of Karnataka selected through the simple random sampling and convenient sampling techniques was used to collect data from teaching professionals of engineering institutions in the state of Karnataka. Major objective of research is to identify perception of teachers towards QWL parameters. The eight parameters were considered to measure the quality of work life among teaching professionals, viz. academic opportunity and environment, recognition and encouragement, adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, welfare measures, team coordination, job satisfaction and work life balance. Simple percentage method used to identify parameters. Result found that the personal life of an individual will bring the quality of work life to professional life where monetary benefits are more important to bring the quality of work life among teaching professionals & Flexible working time must be introduced for better working conditions. Researcher have focused on QWL parameters only, for further research they can focus on demographic factors as well as EQ, Organizational Commitment, Job motivation and Performance, Work climate, Leadership and so on to know QWL level and its impact on teachers. **Chandrashekar M. Mathapati (2016)** has discovered impact of quality of work life with HR strategy. Survey is based on identify various factors of QWL which influence teachers, present scenario of QWL and various career, personal and organizational aspect of QWL. Study is descriptive in nature. Population of research is faculty members of different department of Karnataka colleges. Sample size is 100. Study has used primary data tool and research analysis method is factor analysis, KMO. **Tanushree Bhatnagar (2015)** examined the impact of quality of work life on job satisfaction of school teachers working in govt. and private schools restricted to Udaipur City in the State of Rajasthan, India. The method of this study is descriptive research and the survey was conducted among 100 school teachers in Udaipur city. The study considered various factors such as work-life balance, recognition, role clarity, salary, working hours, promotion and development, working conditions, security, advancement, management employee relation etc. which helps in finding out the level of satisfaction in teaching profession in Udaipur city. The data collection instrument is a questionnaire and the reliability is based on Pearson's correlation coefficient. Results show that there is a relationship between QWL and Job satisfaction. In short if there is good level of QWL in the organization, people would be highly satisfied with their jobs. **Vemuri Swathi and Sudhir Reddy (2015)** have researched on difference in stress and QWL based on demographic factors. Demographic factors are gender, experience and organizational type. Population of research is school teachers working in government and private organizations. Sample size is 140 teachers selected through simple random sampling. The data was analysed using mean, standard deviation, one way ANOVA and t-test. T-test concluded that female teachers feel more stress than male teachers; there exists no difference in stress and QWL among teachers based on the gender. One way ANOVA is carried out to calculate the differences based on experience of the teachers and result is a significant relation between stress and QWL based on the experience where there exists no significant relation in stress and in QWL among teachers based on organization type. Study revealed that there are no differences in stress and QWL among teachers based on gender and organization type. As well as there is difference between stress and QWL based on the experiences of the teachers. **S.Sivakumar and Dr. N.M. Ganesan (2014)** have study teachers quality of work life. Major focused of this research is on various dimensions of quality of work life and factors affecting quality of work life. Study has compared the QWL of college teachers between government aided and self-financing college in Madurai District. Objectives of research are; identify perception of college teachers towards QWL dimensions, relationship between the socio economic factors and QWL of college teachers. Population of study is College teachers of government aided and self-financing colleges. Study is descriptive in nature and used primary data for data collection. Sample size 420 is selected using the disproportionate stratified random sampling techniques. Independent sample 't' test and Chi-square tests have been used for analysis. From analysis it is conclude that there is difference between QWL among the staff members of both colleges. Here study has focused on Income and wage equality of teachers, for further research researcher can focused on other socio economic and demographic factors as well as comparison between self-finance colleges only and government aid colleges only.

3. Objectives:

- To identify factors affecting Quality of Work-life among faculties.
- To study the relationship between Quality of Work-life and gender.

4. Research Methodology:

The descriptive research design used. The study is based on primary data collected from BCOM and BBA Faculties of Navasari and Vapi Colleges Affiliated to VNSGU, Surat and Secondary data as well through internet, books and Journals. Convenient Sampling used to select sample units. Population of research was Faculties of Colleges, Surat, Gujarat. Sample of research was BCOM and BBA Faculties of Navasari and Vapi Colleges Affiliated to VNSGU, Surat. Total number of sample was 100. Data collection instruments was questionnaire. It is 42 items prepared on bases of Walton Richard eight variables; the social relevance of work, Constitutionalism in the work organization, Adequate and fair compensation, Immediate Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, Safe and healthy working conditions, Work and total life space and Social Integration in the Work Organization. Rating Scale were "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree" based on Likert Scale. The statistical technique like factor analysis and Mann Whitney Test were used to analyze and interpret the data.

5. Data Analysis and Interpretation:**FACTOR ANALYSIS**

- To identify factors affecting Quality of Work-life among faculties.

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.705
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2677.420
	df	861
	Sig.	.000

Source: SPSS Output

As per the recommendation of Kaiser (1964), KMO test statistics should be greater than 0.5 and values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good. It measures the sampling adequacy for carrying out the factor analysis. Here KMO value is 0.705 which is an excellent indication and suggest that we can definitely go for factor analysis with given variables and samples.

Total Variance Explained

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 %
1	11.465	27.297	27.297	11.465	27.297	27.297	6.292	14.980	14.980
2	4.523	10.768	38.066	4.523	10.768	38.066	3.563	8.483	23.464
3	2.345	5.582	43.648	2.345	5.582	43.648	3.146	7.490	30.954
4	2.021	4.813	48.461	2.021	4.813	48.461	2.867	6.825	37.779
5	1.746	4.158	52.619	1.746	4.158	52.619	2.363	5.626	43.405
6	1.659	3.950	56.570	1.659	3.950	56.570	2.314	5.510	48.915
7	1.499	3.569	60.139	1.499	3.569	60.139	2.192	5.220	54.134
8	1.473	3.506	63.645	1.473	3.506	63.645	2.055	4.892	59.027
9	1.289	3.069	66.714	1.289	3.069	66.714	1.926	4.586	63.613
10	1.165	2.773	69.487	1.165	2.773	69.487	1.797	4.278	67.891
11	1.001	2.383	71.870	1.001	2.383	71.870	1.671	3.979	71.870
12	.918	2.185	74.055						
13	.889	2.116	76.171						
14	.831	1.978	78.149						
15	.810	1.929	80.077						
16	.705	1.678	81.756						
17	.679	1.618	83.373						
18	.650	1.548	84.922						
19	.558	1.328	86.250						
20	.519	1.237	87.486						
21	.507	1.207	88.694						
22	.482	1.147	89.840						
23	.461	1.098	90.939						
24	.431	1.027	91.966						
25	.372	.886	92.852						
26	.337	.803	93.655						
27	.311	.741	94.396						
28	.301	.716	95.112						
29	.280	.667	95.780						
30	.252	.601	96.380						
31	.244	.581	96.961						

32	.228	.542	97.504						
33	.173	.411	97.915						
34	.163	.387	98.303						
35	.136	.323	98.625						
36	.121	.289	98.914						
37	.109	.260	99.174						
38	.098	.232	99.406						
39	.085	.202	99.608						
40	.073	.175	99.783						
41	.059	.140	99.923						
42	.032	.077	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix

	Component										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Fac1	.122	-.249	.753	.072	-.075	-.014	.234	.042	-.110	-.131	.007
Fac2	.209	-.110	.784	.054	.097	.072	-.190	.156	.127	.039	.227
Fac3	.044	-.025	.196	.172	-.043	.070	.010	.112	.088	.186	.811
Fac4	-.141	.294	-.126	.066	-.004	.119	-.080	.087	.008	.703	.151
Fac5	.376	.120	.226	.049	.672	.100	.190	.054	.122	.060	.142
Fac6	.332	.158	.571	-.168	.351	-.063	.121	-.027	.128	-.168	.049
Fac7	.242	-.064	.253	-.270	.033	-.068	.282	.213	-.237	-.385	.490
Fac8	.396	-.135	.381	-.165	.306	-.040	.078	.184	-.178	-.185	.245
Fac9	.386	.031	.570	-.066	.066	.014	.474	-.138	.008	-.178	.151
Fac10	-.092	.365	-.002	.294	-.119	.297	.200	-.040	-.536	.009	.169
Fac11	-.099	.110	-.032	.741	-.202	-.016	.067	-.021	-.034	.126	.066
Fac12	-.310	.228	.086	.508	-.563	.045	.043	.035	-.025	.059	.116
Fac13	-.100	.249	-.006	.185	-.710	.332	.047	-.032	.055	.087	.090
Fac14	-.058	.278	-.091	.611	-.259	.046	.116	.000	-.402	.351	-.058
Fac15	.529	-.153	.273	-.080	.142	.065	.245	.108	.150	-.075	.216
Fac16	-.034	.533	-.086	.323	-.202	.268	.022	-.343	-.111	.090	-.234
Fac17	.221	.056	.063	.109	.028	.029	.669	.318	.115	-.189	.036
Fac18	.306	-.211	.289	-.157	.360	.348	.452	.154	.181	.142	-.033
Fac19	.043	.066	-.182	.053	.033	.842	.127	-.008	-.099	-.008	.082
Fac20	-.028	.107	.210	.009	-.235	.766	-.121	.076	.024	.126	-.012
Fac21	.129	.204	.022	.034	-.043	.051	.132	.795	.164	-.015	.089
Fac22	.351	-.245	.060	-.095	.089	.035	.068	.669	-.057	.139	.111
Fac23	.670	-.033	.323	-.090	.057	-.211	.165	.128	.154	-.122	.140
Fac24	.695	-.108	.155	-.250	-.006	.026	-.076	.237	-.086	-.266	.045
Fac25	.666	.008	.135	-.216	.152	.039	.032	-.035	.070	-.439	.111
Fac26	.697	.118	.040	.135	.249	-.124	-.161	.235	.025	-.048	.006
Fac27	.688	-.037	.280	-.110	.043	-.032	.165	.034	.237	-.039	-.123
Fac28	.575	-.150	.139	.207	.140	.319	.151	.201	.077	-.166	-.168
Fac29	.477	-.234	.238	.082	.113	.374	.291	.091	.300	-.080	-.137
Fac30	.467	.007	.218	-.003	.300	-.063	.183	.172	.366	-.142	-.065
Fac31	.187	.080	.004	-.034	-.038	.018	.196	.103	.820	.035	.110

Fac32	-.136	.346	-.002	.728	.131	.092	-.177	-.058	-.002	-.096	.032
Fac33	-.287	.539	-.145	.205	-.051	.321	-.028	-.234	-.041	.126	.159
Fac34	.743	-.081	-.129	-.240	.135	.165	.036	.177	-.118	.204	-.052
Fac35	.216	-.032	.355	-.123	.334	.044	.425	.436	.094	.034	-.041
Fac36	.299	-.302	.133	.414	.230	.199	.066	.057	.331	-.282	.330
Fac37	-.036	.754	.005	.056	-.085	-.184	.250	.015	.104	.121	-.099
Fac38	.103	.735	-.171	.102	.011	.053	-.203	.195	-.021	.014	-.094
Fac39	-.434	.674	-.011	.301	-.059	.199	-.059	-.053	-.086	.106	.076
Fac40	.506	-.251	.396	-.147	-.164	.038	.404	-.119	.101	.251	.122
Fac41	-.097	.504	-.080	.293	-.082	.047	-.194	.026	-.127	.402	.275
Fac42	.709	-.168	.088	.027	.104	-.009	.338	-.071	.149	.108	.196

The rotated component matrix which gave 11 factors after a Varimax rotation. Followings are the factor name given by research as per their loadings emerged.

Factor 1: Meaningful and Interesting Work	Factor 7: Adequate Reimbursement
QWL : 34, 42, 26, 24, 27, 23, 25, 28, 15, 40	QWL: 17
Factor 2: Extra Responsibilities with Rewards	Factor 8: Work Freedom & Fair Treatment for Clashes
QWL: 37, 38, 39, 33, 16, 41	QWL: 21, 22
Factor 3: Equal Compensation and Opportunities	Factor 9: Communication & Encouragement regarding Work
QWL: 2, 1, 6, 9	QWL: 31, 10
Factor 4: Work pressure and Adequate Resources	Factor 10: Working Hours
QWL: 11, 32, 14	QWL: 4
Factor 5: Interpersonal Relationship	Factor 11: Work Evaluation
QWL: 13, 5, 12	QWL: 3
Factor 6: Work Generate Fatigue and Monotony	
QWL: 19, 20	

Mann Whitney U Test

- To study the relationship between Quality of Work-life and Gender.

H₀: There is no significant difference in mean rank of Quality of work life between male and female.

H₁: There is significant difference in mean rank of Quality of work life between male and female.

Test Statisticsa

	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
QWL1	1109.500	1704.500	-.094	.925
QWL2	950.500	3161.500	-1.288	.198
QWL3	893.000	1488.000	-1.707	.088
QWL4	1026.000	1621.000	-.740	.460
QWL5	1092.000	1687.000	-.228	.819
QWL6	976.000	1571.000	-1.110	.267
QWL7	1039.000	1634.000	-.650	.516
QWL8	814.000	1409.000	-2.317	.021

QWL9	930.500	1525.500	-1.426	.154
QWL10	1052.000	1647.000	-.529	.597
QWL11	911.000	1506.000	-1.614	.106
QWL12	883.000	1478.000	-1.826	.068
QWL13	1084.000	1679.000	-.295	.768
QWL14	857.500	1452.500	-1.975	.048
QWL15	1080.000	3291.000	-.327	.744
QWL16	960.500	1555.500	-1.216	.224
QWL17	986.000	1581.000	-1.031	.302
QWL18	955.500	1550.500	-1.262	.207
QWL19	1023.500	1618.500	-.738	.460
QWL20	1017.500	1612.500	-.788	.431
QWL21	853.500	1448.500	-2.030	.042
QWL22	942.500	1537.500	-1.350	.177
QWL23	900.500	1495.500	-1.689	.091
QWL24	859.500	1454.500	-2.045	.041
QWL25	868.000	1463.000	-1.964	.050
QWL26	1084.500	1679.500	-.301	.764
QWL27	853.000	1448.000	-2.072	.038
QWL28	790.000	1385.000	-2.536	.011
QWL29	786.000	1381.000	-2.522	.012
QWL30	1092.500	3303.500	-.227	.821
QWL31	920.500	1515.500	-1.602	.109
QWL32	1084.500	3295.500	-.282	.778
QWL33	979.000	1574.000	-1.073	.283
QWL34	984.500	1579.500	-1.065	.287
QWL35	856.000	1451.000	-2.014	.044
QWL36	1081.000	3292.000	-.308	.758
QWL37	762.500	1357.500	-2.686	.007
QWL38	859.500	1454.500	-1.972	.049
QWL39	1057.000	1652.000	-.486	.627
QWL40	815.000	1410.000	-2.296	.022
QWL41	962.000	1557.000	-1.200	.230
QWL42	926.500	1521.500	-1.502	.133

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

The above result shows the Mann Whitney U test summary for gender being a two independent variable and 42 QWL questions as dependent (Ratio Scale) variable. The table clearly indicates that in 30 the cases, we failed to reject the null hypothesis, as the probability value comes out to be greater than 0.05. In other words, we can conclude that there is no significant difference between Quality of work life and gender consider under study. However we can see some difference in mean rank of male and female for 12 cases, we reject the null hypothesis where probability value is less than 0.05. So here we can conclude that there is significant difference between Quality of work life and gender.

6. Conclusion:

The present study reveals that major eleven factors have identified and they are; Meaningful and Interesting Work, Extra Responsibilities with Rewards, Equal Compensation and Opportunities, Work pressure and Adequate Resources, Interpersonal Relationship, Work Generate Fatigue and Monotony, Adequate Reimbursement, Work Freedom & Fair Treatment for Clashes, Communication & Encouragement regarding Work, Working Hours and Work Evaluation. From second objectives researcher can concluded that male and female has different association with QWL in certain areas like proud of institute, inadequacy of resources, disputes handle impartially, worthwhile contribution to society, right to select subject, education quality is collective responsibilities, teaching load and next day preparation, properly enforced rules, sufficient authorities and opportunities, non-teaching responsibilities, work without reward, employment securities. Where adequate compensation, feedback about

performance, promotions, working hours, interpersonal relationship, workers participations in decision making, work life balance, possibilities of leisure, encouragement to experiment new methods and support for FDP as well as workshops seminars, respect rewards and recognition, sufficient working space, freedom of expression, fatigue and monotony, Values teaching and non-teaching, gratified with institute image, adequate circulations of information, pressure of assigning biased marks, job responsibilities, chance of development, overall satisfaction with working life.

There is matter of great concern that male and female both agree on point that they do not have encouragement to experiment new methods and support for FDP as well as workshops seminars, No respect rewards and recognition, no freedom of expression, fatigue and monotony from work, they have pressure of assigning biased marks, upset with job responsibilities, no chance of development. Institutes need to work in these areas so institutes can retain and satisfy faculties.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Subash Limbu, Nabasmita Bordoloi (June 2017), Quality of Work Life in Private Degree Colleges of Guwahati: an Analysis from the Perspectives of Teaching Community, International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Science Society and Culture(IJRSSC), Volume – 3, Issue – 1, ISSN - 2455-2909
- [2] K. Malarkodi, S. Prasanna, R. Renukadevi (April 2017), A Critical Study on Quality of Work Life Among Faculty Members of Higher Educational Institutions In Private Engineering Colleges, International Journal of Latest Engineering Research and Applications, Volume – 2, Issue – 4, ISSN – 2455-7137
- [3] Dr. Y Poornima, Sunil M Rashinkar (January 2017), Quality of work life among teaching professionals with special reference to engineering institutions in Karnataka, International Journal of Commerce and Management Research, Volume -3, Issue – 1, ISSN - 2455-1627
- [4] Chandrashekar M. Mathapati (December 2016), Quality of Work Life (QWL) In Higher Education: HR Strategy as a Means for Sustainable Development, International Journal of Ethics in Engineering & Management Education, Volume 3, Issue - 12, ISSN - 2348-4748
- [5] Tanushree Bhatnagar, Dr. Harvinder Soni (March 2015), Impact of Quality of work life on Job satisfaction of School Teachers in Udaipur city, IOSR Journal of Business and Management, Volume – 17, Issue – 3, ISSN - 2278-487X
- [6] Vemuri Swathi, Sudhir Reddy (March 2015), Relationship Between Stress and Quality of Worklife of School Teachers Based on Demographic Variables, IJCEM International Journal of Computational Engineering & Management, Volume – 18, Issue – 2, ISSN - 2230-7893
- [7] S.Sivakumar, Dr. N.M.Ganesan (August 2014), Quality of Work Life of College Teachers – A Study with reference to Madurai District, Indian Journal of Applied Research, Volume – 4, Issue – 8, ISSN - 2249-555X
- [8] <https://gobalhrm.blogspot.com/p/quality-of-work-life.html>