

Women Teacher's Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction: Research Evidence From Indian Private Universities

¹P. Jyothi and ²Sita Neelakantan

¹Sathyabama University and SRM University,

²Department of Management Studies, SMEC, Chennai, India

Abstract: Human beings in recent era are treated, as important resources in any industrial nation, quality of work life has become essential in every employee life, it is not exempted in any sector. The concerns for quality of work life are increasing, as many researchers and industries are doing research to understand better about the dimensions and impact of quality of work life. Since, there are few literatures available on women teachers quality of work life in higher educational institutions in India, educational institutions have great interest in identifying the impact of quality of work life of women teachers on their job satisfaction. With this overall objective, the study was conducted on 400 women teachers from 25 private universities across India. Research first investigated the significant impact of factors on quality of work life and job satisfaction. Secondly, principle component analysis used to reveal the components of quality of work life and job satisfaction. Finally, regression analysis revealed the positive relationship among quality of work life among job satisfaction factors.

Key words: Quality of work life, job satisfaction, women teacher, private universities, India

INTRODUCTION

Women excellence in the fields of IT, education, services, manufacturing, health care and politics have made tremendous changes in Indian economy. In spite of women being in top positions, they prefer to be more responsible as a wife, mother, home maker, etc. and this causes overburden in life and work roles of women. The corporate gender gap report, 2011 focused on gender based disparities and barriers to the advancement of women in different countries. According to Joshi (2007), women employment is more in education sector compared with other sectors.

India is an chronicle for higher education, there are 1522 private engineering colleges and 1244 polytechnic colleges with annual student intake of 5,82,000 and 2,65,000, respectively and total teaching staff employed was 8,16,966 which indicate the high employment rate in education sector. However, still these institutions face shortage of faculty and concerns have been raised over the quality of education. Teaching faculties are key professionals to safeguard the nation and society, as they shape the future of students. The satisfied faculty could alone give their best productivity to the students and colleges.

Burke (2000) observed that men have greater job satisfaction compared to women at the cost of ignoring personal problems in case of women's; they do not tend

to feel in the same way. Marcinkus *et al.* (2007) found that work support have positive influence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and career accomplishment in the context of women. The wellbeing of a nation depends on its students because they plays an vital role in shaping good economic system. The teachers plays vital role in fulfilling these goals by shaping the future of the students. All these goals could be met only when teachers' academic and personal life satisfied and quality oriented.

Quality of work life is defined as is a philosophy or a set of principles which holds that people are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making a valuable contribution to their organization. It also, involves treating people with respect. Warr *et al.* (1979) defined quality of working life as a indicator of many job satisfaction factors. Davis and Cherns (1975) rightly pointed that the first international conference for quality of work life was held at Arden House in the year 1972 and served as a platform for coining quality of work life. Bharathi, research investigated that change in the working environment and improved flexible working environment could improve quality of work life in the context of Indian employees. Anbarasan and Mehta (2010) reveled that conducive work environment as an important aspect of employee's quality of working life while economic benefits and employee well being had been considered very seriously in the past while Tabassum (2012) in private universities stressed

upon the importance of quality of work life in enhancing job satisfaction and low employee turnover. Ganguly (2001) investigated and proved positive relationship between job satisfaction and QWL domains, where as Kameswara and Venugopal (2009) found several QWL dimensions related job. According to Meenakshi and Parul (2011) studied how overall QWL is related to its dimensions proposed by Walton (1975).

Many research investigations carried out for job satisfaction in various fields in Indian industrial psychology, as well as globally but the results were not that satisfactory in fulfilling objectives. So, there is a need to conduct more number of studies in associating job satisfaction with other variables. Job satisfaction often measures the variables like working conditions, work relationships, compensation system, management and organization, etc. Ketchen stressed out the importance of happiness and its impact on productivity at work place, also further stated that higher the job satisfaction and higher the happiness at work place. Hoppock (1935) in his famous book defined the job satisfaction as employee feeling about environment both in psychological and physical and the employee's subjective reaction to the working situation including the overall satisfaction of individual psychological, physical environment and working environment. According Caudron (2001) in current economic resurgence, employees can choose between numbers of jobs available in industry and moreover it is all about how the employee treats about other companies working environment and further he added there is no association between job satisfaction and absenteeism, turnover.

However, quality of work life had become key issue and it is essential for technology based education system employees all over the globe in bringing job satisfaction of employees. Quality of work influence on job satisfaction in this context is to meet faculty needs and enhance their academic and non academic performance. Therefore, quality of work life is needed for faculty to be more motivated, encouraged and productive in nature. Hence, this study is designed to measure the inter correlations among quality of work life and job satisfaction of women teachers in Indian private universities.

Review of literature and research framework

Past studies on QWL: History of QWL is essential to understand its origin and development. Initial steps of quality of work life were in 1930 and 1940's along with unionization movement but the emphasis was given to the concept related to QWL in 1950 and 1960's. Walton (1975) stated in his study that David Luis first time in the

year 1975, introduced this concept in international level labor conference and this concept had gained popularity after many organizations initiated QWL programme for work transitions. To have a good understanding of the concept, quality of work life one must look in the definitions. According to American Society of Training and Development, QWL is a process of work organizations which enables its members at all levels to participate actively and efficiently in shaping the organization environment methods and outcomes. It is a value based process aimed towards meeting twin objectives. Robbins (1989) defined QWL as a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work.

Wyatt and Wah (2001), research investigated that the QWL dimensions are supportive management and favorable work environment, personal growth and autonomy, the nature of the job and stimulating opportunities and co-workers. Normala (2010) furthermore stated that quality of work life influences organizational commitment, especially this commitment could be achieved through QWL dimensions of growth and development, participation, supervision, pay and benefits, fairness and the adequacy of their pay and benefits social integration and strong relationships and cohesiveness among employees in the workplace enhances organizational commitment. Jeyarathnam and Malarvizhi (2011), study recommended that high level of quality of work life results in improvement in productivity the study, also recommended that promotion policies can be improved by giving grade for designation according to the experience of the employees. Arranging meditation classes and entertainment programme for the employees can minimize occupational stress. Baba and Jamal (1991), outlined that QWL is concerned with job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment and turn-over intentions and this highlights the importance of job factor and job satisfaction. Ventegodt *et al.* (2008) good quality of working life is about much more than job-satisfaction, stress, the working environment, personal functioning, performance, health and immediate subjective well-being at work.

Saraji and Dargahi (2006) research viewed QWL in 14 dimensions related career, work environment and health related issue. Gillian considine research among Australian workers revealed good relations at work and feeling of being satisfied and interesting work were key issues in bringing high level of quality of work life, also stress levels, work and family balance, career prospects plays

vital role creating quality oriented work and life. Dhanapal (2012) found that QWL is highly correlated on following factors namely social support, interpersonal relationship, recognition and autonomy, working environment, relationship with boss and working hours. Rita Goyal suggested that sharing appropriate information, opportunities for advancement, sound feedback system, improved communication, better working conditions, participation in group discussions and solving problems are essential for safeguarding QWL in organizations. Harrington and Santiago (2006) research indicates that there is a strong association between dimensions of QWL and organizational cultural values. Walton (1975) suggested QWL is all about combination of 8 dimensions namely adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and total life space and social relevance of work life.

Louis (1998) quality of work life is strongly associated with teacher's commitment and sense of efficacy, whereas Akhter *et al.* (2008) proved that private universities are marked for high faculty turnover compared to public universities (Hasan *et al.*, 1985). It has been further noted that teachers plays the vital role in rendering their services for building good education system and nations economy. Chao *et al.* (2009), the perspectives of teachers were positive in leadership behavior of the principal and quality of work life themselves.

Asgari *et al.* (2012a, b) studied the relationship between quality of work life and performance of tonekabon guidance schools teachers and results revealed that there is a positive and significant relation between quality of work life and teachers performance. Asgari *et al.* (2012a, b) and Kashani (2012) researched on the relationship between quality of working life with organizational citizenship behavior of office of education staff and his results quality of working life and organizational citizenship. Indumathy and Kamalraj (2012), a study on quality of work life identified factors revealing quality of work life are attitude, environment, opportunities, nature of job, people, stress level, career prospects, challenges, growth and development and risk involved in the work and rewards. Siron *et al.* (2012), investigated a study of quality of working life amongst employees in Malaysian electronic factories and the relationship between job challenge, communication, support, freedom, salary, relationships and involvement with the quality of work life is proven to be positive

relationship. Heidarie *et al.* (2012) relationship between quality of work life, organizational health and commitment with job satisfaction quality of work life, organizational health and organizational commitment correlated to job satisfaction. Vijayaraj *et al.* (2012), a study on quality of work life revealed several notable factors that influence quality of work life are adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, opportunity to use and develop human capabilities, opportunity for career growth, etc. Dhar (2009) studied quality of work life: A study of municipal corporation bus drivers. Quality of work life initiatives, however can provide certain positive experiences for staff, especially when they promote the opportunity to socialize and build connections with co-workers and help to fulfill employee needs for humor and balance. Hence, such initiatives should be taken at regular intervals. Positive influences on quality of work life which can be provided through quality of work life initiatives can leave staff feeling more confident and encouraged about the service they provide to the commuters. Relevant to the association between quality of work life and quality of service is the idea that professionalism lends to the employees itself. Commitment to professionalism can transcend the detrimental forces that impact both quality of work life and quality of service. Meenakshi and Parul (2011) internally, making sure that the quality of work life is considered the correct approach to increase job satisfaction, increase productivity and enhance commitment.

Past studies on job satisfaction: Vroom (1964) in his definition on job satisfaction focuses on the role of the employee in the workplace. Thus, he defines job satisfaction as affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying (Vroom, 1964). Job satisfaction is a worker's sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity, as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction implies doing a job one enjoys, doing it well and being rewarded for one's efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment (Kaliski, 2007). Job satisfaction can be defined also as the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of his or her job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004). The term job satisfactions refer to the attitude and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favorable attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction. Negative and unfavorable attitudes

towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). Job satisfaction is the collection of feeling and beliefs that people have about their current job. People's levels of degrees of job satisfaction can range from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction. In addition to having attitudes about their jobs as a whole, people also can have attitudes about various aspects of their jobs, such as the kind of work they do, their coworkers, supervisors or subordinates and their pay (George and Jones, 2008).

Job satisfaction is a complex and multifaceted concept which can mean different things to different people. Job satisfaction is usually linked with motivation but the nature of this relationship is not clear. Satisfaction is not the same as motivation. Job satisfaction is more of an attitude, an internal state. It could, for example be associated with a personal feeling of achievement, either quantitative or qualitative (Mullins, 2005). Parker (2007) found that employees' satisfaction affects their job performance. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985), research revealed less direct correlation between job satisfaction and productivity, however Gazioglu and Tansel (2006) treated job satisfaction as important variable as it is related to productivity, quits, absenteeism. Job characteristics model proposed by Hackman and Oldham (1974) proposed 5 core job dimensions namely autonomy, feedback, task identity and task significance and skill variety which affects overall job satisfaction, personal and work related outcomes of employees and further he stated that job satisfaction refers to employee well being based on favor or disfavor regarding assessing job and job related experiences. Hu (2003) research indicated positive influence of job satisfaction on work environment in a Chinese study.

According to Amah and Okafor (2008), job satisfaction is determined by perceptions of work environment, organisational politics, organisational support and justice. Hosseinian *et al.* (2008) stressed on the importance of job satisfaction in enhancing manager's evaluation. Female managers were generally satisfied with their job and specific job facets indicate that the highest level of satisfaction occurs in the areas of supervision, job in general, present job and present pay, however relatively more number of women managers was dissatisfied with co-workers, pay and the present job (Santhapparaj *et al.*, 2005). Job satisfaction is correlated with leadership styles and it also plays an vital role in binding relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour was confirmed (Long and Thean, 2011; Rezaiean *et al.*, 2010).

Women teaching faculty in engineering colleges ratio is higher than the men teaching faculty. Based on the

above literature this study aims to investigate the quality of work life components and issues of women teaching faculty in affiliated engineering colleges. Hughes *et al.* (2003), since education and occupation are closely related it is obvious to find positive measurement of job quality of employees in managerial and professional growth in the context of women context of education attainment at high level and more access to management and professional jobs. It clearly indicates the fewer gender differences in job quality. Gayathiri and Ramakrishnan (2013), study on nurses' ensured quality of life can provide satisfaction and enhance job performance.

Objectives of the research: The study was designed to explore and retain better insights in to the influence of women teachers quality of work life on their job satisfaction in Indian private universities. As suggested by Shahbazi *et al.* (2011), QWL positively related to performance and job satisfaction, the investigation on this research helps the Indian private universities to reach roads for improving women teachers' performance in the education sector. The study was designed with a view to achieving following objectives:

- To identify the factors of quality of work life among women teachers in the private universities of India
- To identify the factors of job satisfaction among women teachers
- To investigate the factors affecting overall perception of quality of work life and job satisfaction
- To investigate the influence of quality of work life on women teachers job satisfaction

Hypothesis stated in its null form:

- H₁: Factors of quality of work life does not influence quality of work life
- H₂: Factors of job satisfaction does not influence job satisfaction
- H₃: Factors of quality of work life does not influence factors of job satisfaction

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Measuring device: Popular instrument used in the present study is Walton (1975) with 35 questions which proved to be a successful model for measuring quality of work life by many researchers Normala (2010), Boonrod (2009), Campos and Souza (2006) and Meenakshi and Parul (2011). He suggested the QWL framework based on 8 dimensions, namely; adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, opportunity for

Table 1: Cronbach alpha ranges

Ranges	Results
$\alpha > 0.9$	Excellent
$\alpha > 0.8$	Good
$\alpha > 0.7$	Acceptable
$\alpha > 0.6$	Questionable
$\alpha > 0.5$	Poor
$\alpha > 0.4$	Unacceptable

George and Mallery (2009)

continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and total life space and social relevance of work life. Based on literature review total of 6 factors identified to measure job satisfaction are working conditions, relation with co workers, fairness, job security, relationship with head, pay and fairness and these factors are assessed with the help of 22 items.

Data collection: Data collection was primary in nature and structured questionnaire was used to elucidate responses of respondents. Data were collected from 400 women teacher from various private universities offering engineering and science and humanities studies from India. Questionnaire was mailed to respondents. The response rate was 55 which is low due to data collection through mail to respondents. The Likert scale consist of 5-point ranging from 1 strongly agree to 5 strongly disagree where the respondents were asked to choose from the multiple choices. Reliability of the answers in the questionnaire analyzed using reliability analysis. Popular measure of reliability Cronbach's alpha (George and Mallery, 2009) adopted in the study. According to Cronbach's alpha reliability ranges of results are given in Table 1.

Quality of work life and job satisfaction factors has been tested using Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis using SPSS 13 version. t-test and principal component analysis was used to test the hypothesis. The study also attempted to measure mean, standard deviations and standard error for supporting hypothesis testing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of reliability: Data collected using questionnaire was tested for the reliability. The reliabilities of quality of work life factors, such as (adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and total life space and social relevance of work life) tested with

Table 2: Test of reliability

Variables	Cronbach's alpha (α)	Confinability
Quality of work life	0.926	>0.9 (Excellent)
Job satisfaction	0.905	>0.9 (Excellent)

Table 3: Demographic profile of respondents

Respondents profile	Independent variables	Frequency	Percentage
Age (years)	20-30	63	28.76
	31-40	92	42.00
	41-50	35	15.98
	51 and above	29	13.24
Position	Assistant professor	143	65.29
	Associate professor	53	24.20
	Professor	16	7.30
	Senior professor	7	3.19
Department	Engineering	129	58.90
	PG	37	16.89
	Science and Humanities	53	24.20
	Others	0	0.00
Experience (years)	Below 5	49	22.37
	5-10	109	49.77
	11-15	38	17.35
	Above 15	23	10.50
Qualification	Post graduation	185	84.47
	Doctorate	31	14.15
	Others	3	1.36
Income/Month	Below 20,000	59	26.94
	20,000-50,000	112	51.14
	51,000-70,000	39	14.15
	Above 70,000	17	7.76
Marital status	Single	54	24.65
	Married	158	72.14
	Others	7	3.19
Is spouse working?	Yes	153	95.62
	No	7	4.37

Cronbach's alpha reliability test using SPSS and it is found that cronbach alpha value is 0.926 and which is good sign for reliability variables (if $\alpha > 0.9$, confinability is excellent). Job satisfaction 6 factors Cronbach alpha reliability value calculated as 0.905 which indicates the good sign of reliability (Table 2).

Profile of the respondents: It is clearly indicated in Table 3 that major proportion of respondents belongs to the age group of 31 years to 40 (42%) which is followed by majority of women teachers in assistant professor designation (65%). The figures indicate that majority of sample teachers belongs to various engineering departments (60%) and their experience 5-10 years (50%) with the qualification of post graduation (84%) and most of the respondents registered to their doctorates. Since, the women teachers belongs to private engineering colleges in the survey most of the respondents income falls under the category of 20,000-50,000 (51%). Many female teachers were married (72%) and majority of their spouse are working (96%) (Table 3).

Women teacher's quality of work life: Likert scale with 5 points has been adopted in the study. The range of the points is:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

The mean score value of above points is 3 and it represents positive effects of given variables. However, below 3 indicates negative effect of respective variable. Formulated hypothesis have been tested with the help of t-test and p-value. The study, also attempted to measure mean, standard deviation and standard error for testing hypothesis.

Table 4 shows the descriptive analysis of teacher's quality of work life factors significant impact on their overall quality of work life. Among 8 factors of QWL, p-values of all factors except social relevance of work and constitutionalism are 0.000 (i.e., $0.000 < 0.01$) which are significant at 1% level of significance. The mean score of safety and healthy working conditions is 4.437 (i.e., $4.437 > 3$) which is the highest mean among other variables and ranked first and means that the women teacher's have high quality of work life with regard to safety and healthy working conditions. The mean score of Adequate and fair compensation is 2.877 (i.e., $2.877 < 3$) which is ranked last and lowest. It clearly indicates that women teacher's have low quality of work life with regard to adequate and fair compensation. The mean scores of social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization are 3.697 and 3.223, respectively and they not significant when referred to p-value. This indicates that these 2 factors do not affect women teachers quality of work life.

Women teachers' job satisfaction: The descriptive statistics of women teachers job satisfaction factors presented in Table 5. It shows the teachers job satisfaction regarding various factors. Since, the p-values of all job satisfaction factors are < 0.05 , the factors mean scores are significant at level of significance 5%. The mean score of working conditions 4.223 (i.e., $4.223 > 3$) which is the highest and ranked first. This shows that the women faculties are highly satisfied with this factor. The pay and fairness mean score is 2.624 (i.e., $2.624 < 3$) which is the lowest and ranked to be last. It indicates that women teachers are dissatisfied with that factor.

Quality of work life and job satisfaction of women teachers: As in Table 6, mean scores of quality of work life and job satisfaction of women teachers are 3.709 (i.e., $3.709 > 4$) and 3.546 (i.e., $3.546 > 3$), respectively. p-values of both the factors are 0.000 (i.e., $0.000 < 0.01$)

Table 4: Quality of work life of women teachers

Scale items	Mean	SD	SE	t-value	p-value	Rank
Adequate income and fair compensation	4.339	0.916	0.087	15.476	0.000	1
Safe and healthy working conditions	4.170	0.879	0.083	14.081	0.000	2
Opportunities for growth and security	3.938	0.952	0.090	10.424	0.000	3
Work and total life space	3.884	0.888	0.084	10.537	0.000	4
Opportunities to human capacities	3.768	0.816	0.077	9.955	0.000	5
Social integration	3.589	1.000	0.095	6.233	0.000	6
Social relevance of work	3.125*	1.309	0.124	1.010	0.314	7
Constitutionalism	2.866*	1.219	0.115	-1.163	0.164	8

*Symbol in mean values indicates corresponding p-value factors are not significant at 10% significance level

Table 5: Job satisfaction of women teachers

Scale items	Mean	SD	SE	t-value	p-value	Rank
Working conditions	4.223	0.941	0.091	10.037	0.0	1
Relation with co-workers	4.009	0.871	0.082	8.129	0.0	2
Fairness	3.863	0.910	0.086	7.823	0.0	3
Job security	3.402	1.021	0.095	6.964	0.0	4
Relationship with head	3.158	1.022	0.097	5.814	0.0	5
Pay and fairness	2.624	1.124	0.104	3.463	0.0	6

Table 6: Women teacher's perception on quality of work life and job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	SD	SE	t-value	p-value	Min.	Max.
Quality of work life	3.709	0.997	0.094	8.319	0	1	4.812
Job satisfaction	3.546	0.981	0.092	7.038	0	1	4.567

each, they are significant at 1% significance level. This result indicates the women teachers' satisfaction regarding both quality of work life and job.

For further analysis number of components to extract was needed. Table 7 represents the principal component loading matrix for quality of work life. The components total variability calculated as 73.76% and which is shown in Table 7. General cut off point 0.40 chosen for the purpose of interpretation. The components named on the basis of factor loadings. Name of the component chosen as follows: F1 is adequate and fair compensation, F2 is safe and healthy working conditions, F3 is immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, F4 is opportunity for continued growth and security, F5 is social integration in the work organization, F6 is constitutionalism in the work organization, F7 is work and total life space and F8 is social relevance of work life.

Principal components matrix for job satisfaction showed in Table 6. The total variance of 6 components is 69.49 which is represented in Table 8. The total variance of 5 components is 69.49, represented in Table 8. General

Table 7: Principal component loading matrix for quality of work life

Variables	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
Satisfaction with salary	0.78							
Satisfaction with salary compared to others	0.70							
Participation in results	0.68							
Extra benefits (alimentation, transport, doctor, etc.)	0.66							
Weekly work journey (quantity of work hours)		0.81						
Satisfaction with work load		0.76						
Use of technology in task		0.75						
Salubrity level (work conditions in work place)		0.73						
Satisfaction with collective protection by company		0.63						
Tiredness that your work cause to you		0.62						
Satisfaction with autonomy (opportunity to make decisions)			0.84					
Importance of task/work/activity which forward you carry			0.72					
Polivalence (possibility to perform several task and works)			0.71					
Satisfaction with performance evaluation			0.70					
Satisfaction with work responsibility			0.62					
Opportunity for professional growth				0.84				
Satisfaction with trainings you participate				0.73				
Frequency that occur the resigning at your work				0.65				
Incentive that institution gives to your studies				0.56				
Discrimination (social, religious, racial, sexual, etc.)					0.83			
Relationship with your colleagues and bosses at work place					0.78			
Teams and colleagues at work place					0.65			
Valorization of your ideas and initiatives at work place					0.52			
Institutional respect for women faculty rights						0.71		
Norms and rules at your work place						0.68		
Respect to your individualities						0.52		
Work influence on your family life/routine							0.72	
Work influence on your possibilities of leisure							0.71	
Schedule of work and rest							0.68	
Proud of performing your work								0.70
Image your institution have on society								0.69
Satisfaction with communication integration								0.67
Quality of education your institution provides								0.65
Satisfaction with institution way of treating faculty								0.67
Percentage variance explained	13.70	13.42	12.46	10.69	7.95	5.42	5.32	4.82
Percentage cumulative explained	13.70	27.10	39.56	50.25	58.20	63.62	68.90	73.76

Table 8: Principal component loading matrix for job satisfaction

Variables	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6
Satisfaction with work environment	0.81					
Satisfaction with job location	0.77					
Satisfaction with present working hours	0.56					
Satisfaction with salary structure		0.82				
Satisfaction with compensation		0.76				
Satisfaction with recognition and rewards		0.74				
Employee assistance policies (transport, lunch, etc.)		0.63				
Long term benefits and insurance policy		0.52				
Pay and the amount of work I do			0.75			
Present performance appraisal system is fair			0.66			
I feel comfortable to carry out my responsibilities			0.62			
My job provides steady employment				0.82		
Overall job security				0.64		
Relationship with people around me					0.73	
My colleagues have great competence to make decisions					0.71	
My colleagues help me in my research activities					0.61	
I have been awarded with right to set my duties according to my ability						0.82
I have given right to put forward my opinions						0.76
My superior praise for doing a good job						0.63
Rapport I maintain with my superior is good						0.55
Percentage variance explained	14.65	11.20	11.70	10.6	9.58	11.78
Percentage cumulative explained	14.65	25.90	37.60	48.1	57.70	69.49

cut-off point is 0.40 based on factor loading considered for naming components as: V1 is working conditions, V2 is relation with co workers, V3 is fairness, V4 is job security, V5 is relationship with head, V6 is pay and fairness.

Job satisfaction factors significant betas (β s) for quality of work life was calculated using step wise regression analysis. The 6 components of job satisfaction were used as potential predictor in this model. Quality of work life 8 components estimates revealed in Table 9. For

Table 9: Regression (parameter estimates) on quality of work life

QWL components	Predictors	Beta	SE	Partial R ²	Model R ²	F	Prob>F
F1	Intercept	9.2E-17	-	-	-	-	-
	V3	0.412	0.106	0.140	0.140	3.602	0.000
	V2	-0.243	0.106	0.084	0.232	-2.526	0.022
F2	Intercept	9.8E-16	-	-	-	-	-
	V6	-0.244	0.128	0.066	0.066	-2.242	0.025
F3	Intercept	4.2E-01	-	-	-	-	-
	V4	-0.242	0.134	0.068	0.068	-2.133	0.037
F4	Intercept	-1.E-14	-	-	-	-	-
	V4	-0.382	0.098	0.184	0.184	-3.824	0.000
	V2	-0.273	0.096	0.093	0.274	-2.925	0.004
	V5	-0.264	0.095	0.046	0.332	-2.272	0.025
	V3	0.242	0.084	0.042	0.362	2.305	0.018
F5	Intercept	-7.E-26	-	-	-	-	-
	V5	-0.207	0.118	0.094	0.094	-2.517	0.011
F6	Intercept	-6.E-23	-	-	-	-	-
	V6	0.286	0.104	0.086	0.086	-2.602	0.032
F7	Intercept	0.492	-	-	-	-	-
	V4	0.584	0.094	0.132	0.132	3.462	0.043
	V6	-0.462	0.086	0.098	0.284	-2.646	0.026
F8	Intercept	-6E.19	-	-	-	-	-
	V3	0.364	0.134	0.114	0.114	-2.829	0.000
	V2	-0.562	0.076	0.086	0.364	-2.624	0.034

the first component adequate and fair compensation (F1) regression function was at $R^2 = 0.23$ based on V2 is relation with co workers, V3 is fairness, second component F2 is safe and healthy working conditions yielded the regression function at $R^2 = 0.066$, based on one variable V6 is pay and fairness. The next component F3 is immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities regression is $R^2 = 0.068$, on one variable V4 is job security. Forth component F4 is opportunity for continued growth and security yielded regression function at $R^2 = 0.362$ on 4 variables, namely; V2 is relation with co workers, V3 is fairness, V4 is job security, V5 is relationship with head. The next component in the analysis was F5 is social integration in the work organization's regression function at $R^2 = 0.094$. Component F6 is constitutionalism in the work organization and V6 is pay and fairness regression function was $R^2 = 0.086$. F7 is work and total life space regression function at $R^2 = 0.284$ based on V4 is job security and V6 is pay and fairness and finally F8 is social relevance of work life yielded regression function at $R^2 = 0.364$ on V2 is relation with co workers, V3 is fairness (Table 9).

CONCLUSION

Hypothesis 1

The factors of quality of work life does not influence quality of work life: Among 8 factors of quality of work life adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, social, work and total life

space and social relevance of work life's p-value is 0.000 (i.e., $0.000 < 0.01$) which proves the significant relationship between these variables and quality of work life. The other two factor's social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization significance value are 0.209 and 0.214, respectively since, these values are greater than the tabulated value (0.01) at 1% level of significance hypothesis they does not influence quality of work life. Since, the majority of factors (i.e., 6 out of 8) influences quality of work, null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Hence, the relationship between factors of QWL on overall QWL is proven to be positive. Shahbazi *et al.* (2011) experimented and stated that QWL positively related to performance and QWL dimensions of developing human capabilities, constitutionalism in the work organization total life space and social integration in work organization predicts performance. Tabassum *et al.* (2011) investigated the growing interest in maintaining gender equity for attracting and retaining quality human resources and the study further revealed significant differences in overall QWL and the determinants of QWL, i.e., compensation, flexibility in work schedule and job assignment, attention to job design and employee relations.

Hypothesis 2

The factors of job satisfaction does not influence job satisfaction: All the factors of job satisfaction (working conditions, relation with co workers, fairness, job security, relationship with head, pay and fairness) p-value is 0.000 (i.e., $0.000 < 0.01$) which indicates the positive association between the job satisfaction variables and job satisfaction. So, null hypothesis rejected and alternative

hypothesis accepted. Hence, the factors of job satisfaction influence overall job satisfaction by Hackman and Oldham (1974) proposed five core job dimensions, namely; autonomy, feedback, task identity and task significance and skill variety which affects overall job satisfaction, personal and work related outcomes of employees. And further, he stated that job satisfaction refers to employee well being based on favor or disfavor regarding assessing job and job related experiences.

Hypothesis 3

Factors of quality of work life does not influence factors of job satisfaction: Step wise regression analysis revealed the positive influence among the factors of quality of work life and job satisfaction. Hence, null hypothesis rejected and alternative hypothesis accepted. Shalla and Fazili (2013) results of the study depict, a strong association between quality of work life and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the findings also point out a strong divergence in the perception of employees towards quality of work life and job satisfaction across gender and nature of job. Which is remarkable as it reflects the different requirements and priorities of employees based on their gender and the kind of job they hold. Apropos to findings, the study assumes enormous significance for better reflecting the employees' perception about the quality of work life based on gender and nature of job. The increase in quality of work life and organizational commitment of manpower (in all three aspects of affective, continuance and normative) can have a great impact on the level of interest, job satisfaction, willingness to stay and organization performance. Rossmiller (1992) found that QWL positively influenced the respect accorded to teachers, teacher participation in decisions affecting their work, professional collaboration and interaction, use of skills and knowledge and the teaching learning environment (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction is measure for appraising the quality of work life effectiveness. Efraty and Sirgy (1990) quality of work life conceptualized in terms of need satisfaction stemming from an interaction of workers' needs (survival, social, ego and self-actualization needs) and those organizational resources relevant for meeting them and it was been proved that quality of work life is positively related to organizational identification, job satisfaction, involvement, effort and job performance and negatively related to personal alienation. Khan (2007) in the context of female workers the gender discrimination is more in terms of pay, promotion and other facilities in private industries. Bruce and Blackburn (1992) satisfied worker possesses good motivation and his work would be quality oriented. Tabassum *et al.* (2011) research on private commercial banks shows the difference between

male and female employees QWL. There is significant influence of QWL on job satisfaction. Thus, women in female dominated workplaces may report higher job satisfaction because they value job flexibility and so choose to dominate the workplaces that provide job flexibility.

This research attempted to analyze the influence of quality of work life on job satisfaction of women teachers from Indian private universities. The proposed model of quality of work life is Walton (1975) consist of 8 factors of quality of work life namely fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and total life space and social relevance of work life. About 6 job satisfaction factors identified based on literature are working conditions, relation with co workers, fairness, job security, relationship with head, pay and fairness. Research findings revealed 3 parts, firstly positive influence between quality of work life factors and quality of work life, secondly positive influence between job satisfaction factors and job satisfaction and finally, regression analysis with the help of principal component loading matrix with varimax rotation revealed positive influence among quality of work life and job satisfaction variables. The findings stressed upon the importance of revising pay scales par with the other reputed institution in the state. Women's role in sharing family commitments and responsibilities with their spouse is increased equally, as cost of living index is more in metropolitan cities like Chennai; women also have a great thrust for fair and reasonable pay. It is, also noted that private universities in India must provide good avenues for women teacher's career growth prospects and create opportunities for their development of their capacities. Finally, working conditions must remain pleasant and bridging the gap between personal life and work life must be maintained.

REFERENCES

- Akhter, I., G. Muniruddin and K.J. Sogra, 2008. A trend analysis of faculty turnover at the private universities in Bangladesh: A business school perspective. *J. Bus. Stud.*, 4: 64-83.
- Amah, O.E. and A.C. Okafor, 2008. The interactive effect of organizational politics in the justice, rganisation support and job satisfaction relationships. *Asian J. Scient. Res.*, 1: 492-501.
- Anbarasan, V. and N.K. Mehta, 2010. Quality of working life among sales professionals in pharmaceuticals, insurance, banking and finance companies. *Indian J. Ind. Relations*, 46: 138-149.

- Armstrong, M., 2006. A HandBook of Human Resource Management Practices. 10th Edn., Kogan Page Ltd., London, pp: 159-173.
- Asgari, M.H., S.S. Nojbaee and O. Rahnama, 2012a. The relationship between quality of work life and performance of Tonekabon guidance schools teachers. *J. Basic. Applied Sci. Res.*, 2: 2269-2275.
- Asgari, M.H., M. Taleghani and S. Abadikhah, 2012b. The relationship between qualities of working life with organizational citizenship behavior of office of education staff in Rasht city. *J. Basic Applied Sci. Res.*, 2: 3547-3551.
- Baba, V.V. and M. Jamal, 1991. Routinization of job context and job content as related to employee's quality of working life: A study of Canadian nurses. *J. Org. Behav.*, 12: 379-386.
- Boonrod, W., 2009. Quality of working life: Perceptions of professional nurses at Phramongkutklao hospital. *J. Med. Assoc. Thai.*, 92: S7-S15.
- Bruce, W.M. and J.W. Blackburn, 1992. Balancing Job Satisfaction and Performance: A Guide for Human Resource Professionals. Praeger Publishers, USA., Pages: 256.
- Burke, R., 2000. Do managerial men benefit from organizational values supporting work-personal life balance? *Women Manage. Rev.*, 15: 81-87.
- Campos, L.C.A. and A.M. Souza, 2006. Study of the walton's criteria of quality of working life using multivariate analysis in a military organization. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Production Research America's Region, (ICPR'06), USA.*, pp: 1-14.
- Caudron, S., 2001. The myth of job happiness. *Workforce*, 80: 32-36.
- Chao, C.Y., Y.L. Huang and C.W. Lin, 2009. The relationship between leadership behavior of a principal and quality of work life of teachers in an industrial vocational high school in Taiwan. *Int. J. Bus. Rev.*, 45: 8-14.
- Davis, L. and A. Chermis, 1975. *The Quality of Working Life*. Free Press, New York, USA.
- Dhanapal, S.D., 2012. Quality of work life in small scale industrial units: Employers and employees perspectives. *Eur. J. Soc. Sci.*, 28: 262-271.
- Dhar, R.L., 2009. Quality of work life: A study of municipal corporation bus drivers. *Int. J. Indian Culture Bus. Manage.*, 2: 638-653.
- Efraty, D. and M.J. Sirgy, 1990. The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioral responses. *Soc. Indicators Res.*, 22: 31-47.
- Ganguly, R., 2001. Quality of work life and job satisfaction of a group of university employees. *Asian J. Manage. Res.*, 1: 209-216.
- Gayathiri, R. and L. Ramakrishnan, 2013. Quality of work life-linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *Int. J. Bus. Manage. Invention*, 2: 1-8.
- Gazioglu, S. and A. Tansel, 2006. Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and job related factors. *Applied Econ.*, 38: 1163-1171.
- George, J.M. and G.R. Jones, 2008. *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. 5th Edn., Pearson Prentice Hall, USA., ISBN: 13-9780132057035, Pages: 707.
- George, D. and P. Mallery, 2009. *SPSS for Windows Step by Step*. 8th Edn., Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd., Delhi, India.
- Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham, 1974. The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. Technical Report No. 4, Department of Administrative Sciences, Yale University.
- Harrington, S.J. and J. Santiago, 2006. Organizational culture and telecommuters quality of work life and professional isolation. *Commun. IIMA*, 6: 1-10.
- Hasan, K.M.S., M. Chowdhury and M.A. Alam, 1985. Faculty turnover in private universities of Bangladesh: A critical evaluation. *Bus. Econ. Rev.*, 1: 99-113.
- Heidarie, A., P. Askary, S. Saedi and B. Gorjian, 2012. Relationship between quality of work life, organizational health and commitment with job satisfaction. *Life Sci. J.*, 9: 2300-2306.
- Hoppock, R., 1935. *Job Satisfaction*. Harper and Brothers, New York, Pages: 303.
- Hosseinian, S., Y. Seyedeh-Monavar, Z. Shaghayegh and A. Fathi-Ashtiani, 2008. Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction. *J. Applied Sci.*, 8: 903-906.
- Hu, B., 2003. An empirical study on job satisfaction of mental workers. *J. Scient. Stud.*, 7: 378-385.
- Hughes, K., G.S. Lowe and G. Schellenberg, 2003. Men's and women's quality of work in the new canadian economy. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*, pp: 1-85.
- Iaffaldano, M.T. and P.M. Muchinsky, 1985. Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.*, 97: 251-273.
- Indumathy .R. and S. Kamalraj, 2012. A study on quality of work life among workers with special reference to textile industry in Tirupur district-a textile hub. *Zenith Int. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, 2: 265-281.
- Jeyarathnam, M. and V.R. Malarvizhi, 2011. Quality of work life among sugar mill employees-A study in Tamilnadu. *Zenith Int. J. Bus. Econ. Manage. Res.*, 1: 89-96.
- Joshi, R.J., 2007. Quality of work life of women workers: Role of trade unions. *Indian J. Ind. Relat.*, 42: 355-382.

- Kaliski, B.S., 2007. Encyclopedia of Business and Finance: A-I. 2nd Edn., Macmillan Reference USA, New York, ISBN: 9780028660622, pp: 446.
- Kameswara, R.P. and P. Venugopal, 2009. Perceptual factors in quality of work life of Indian employees. (Report). Paradigm Publisher. <http://business.highbeam.com/436196/article-1G1-200779941/perceptual-factors-quality-work-life-indian-employees>.
- Kashani, F.H., 2012. A review on relationship between quality of work life and organizational citizenship behavior (Case study: An Iranian company). *J. Basic Applied Sci. Res.*, 2: 9523-9531.
- Khan, N., 2007. Report of the workshop on promoting gender equality at the workplace. BRAC Centre, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Locke, E.A., 1976. The Nature and Cause of Job Satisfaction. Rand McNally, Chicago, IL.
- Long, C.S. and L.Y. Thean, 2011. Relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction and employees' turnover intention: A literature review. *Res. J. Bus. Manage.*, 50: 91-100.
- Louis, K.S., 1998. Effects of teacher quality of work life in secondary schools on commitment and sense of efficacy. *J. School Effectiveness Improv.: Int. J. Res. Policy Pract.*, 9: 1-27.
- Marcinkus, W.C., K.S. Whelan-Berry and J.R. Gordon, 2007. The relationship of social support to the work-family balance and work outcomes of midlife women. *Women Manage. Rev.*, 22: 86-111.
- Meenakshi, G. and S. Parul, 2011. Factor credentials boosting Quality of Work Life of BSNL employees in Jammu Region. *Asia Pacific J. Res. Bus. Manage.*, 2: 79-89.
- Mullins, J.L., 2005. Management and Organizational Behaviour. 7th Edn., Pearson Education Limited, UK., Pages: 700.
- Normala, D., 2010. Investigating the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.*, 5: 108-127.
- Parker, S.K., 2007. That is my job' How employees' role orientation affects their job performance. *Hum. Relat.*, 60: 403-434.
- Rezaiean, A., M.E. Givi, H.E. Givi and M.B. Nasrabadi, 2010. The relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating role of organizational commitment, satisfaction and trust. *Res. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4: 112-120.
- Robbins, S.P., 1989. Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies and Applications. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ., USA., pp: 256-278.
- Rossmiller, R.A., 1992. The secondary school principal and teachers quality of work life. *Educ. Manage. Admin.*, 20: 132-146.
- Santhapparaj, A.S., J. Srinivasan and K.L. Ling, 2005. Job satisfaction among woman managers in Malaysian automobile manufacturing sector. *J. Applied Sci.*, 5: 1553-1558.
- Saraji, G.N. and H. Dargahi, 2006. Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL). *Iranian J. Publ. Health*, 35: 8-14.
- Shahbazi, B., S. Shokrzadeh, H. Bejani, E. Malekinia and D. Ghoroneh, 2011. A Survey of relationship between the quality of work life and performance of Department Chairpersons of Esfahan University and Esfahan Medical Science University. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 30: 1555-1560.
- Shalla, S.A. and A.I. Fazili, 2013. Quality of work life and employee job satisfaction: A dimensional analysis. *Abhinav: Int. Month. Refereed J. Res. Manage. Technol.*, 2: 57-63.
- Siron, R., M. Amin, H. Tasripan, M. Yunus and A. Majid, 2012. A study of quality of working life amongst employees in Malaysian electronic factories. Proceedings of the International Conference on Management, Economics and Finance, October 15-16, 2012, Malaysia.
- Statt, D.A., 2004. The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management. Routledge Publishing, New York, pp: 78-89.
- Tabassum, A., T. Rahman and K. Jahan, 2011. Quality of work life among male and female employees of private commercial banks in Bangladesh. *Int. J. Econ. Manage.*, 5: 266-282.
- Tabassum, A., 2012. Interrelations between quality of work life dimensions and faculty member job satisfaction in the private universities of Bangladesh. *Eur. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4: 78-89.
- Ventegodt, S., N.J. Andersen and J. Merrick, 2008. Scientific research in the quality of working-life (QWL): Generic measuring of the global working life quality with the SEQWL questionnaire. *Int. J. Disabil. Human Dev.*, 7: 201-217.
- Vijayaraj, M., V. Sathyavathi and M. Malarvizhi, 2012. A study on quality of work life in Jeppiaar cements private Limited, Mela Mathur, Perambalur-District. *Ind. Streams Res. J.*, 2: 1-4.
- Vroom, H.V., 1964. Work and Motivation. John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, USA.
- Walton, R.E., 1975. Criteria for Quality of Working Life. In: The Quality of Working Life, Davis, L.E. and A.B. Cherns (Eds.). The Free Press, New York, pp: 99-104.
- Warr, P., J. Cook and T. Wall, 1979. Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *J. Occup. Psychol.*, 52: 129-148.
- Wyatt, T.A. and C.Y. Wah, 2001. Perceptions of QWL: A study of Singaporean employees development. *Res. Practice Human Resour. Manage.*, 9: 59-76.