

INSIGHT OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS REGARDING JOB SATISFACTION

Dr. Kawaljit Kaur

Assistant Professor

P.G. Deptt. of Management

CKD INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT AND
TECHNOLOGY, Amritsar

Dr. Gurpartap Singh

Principal

CKDIMIT, Amritsar

ABSTRACT

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

Design/ Methodology -Data were collected from a total of six Universities of Punjab State of India (Three Government and Three Private Universities). Faculty members teaching in different Universities were the sampling unit for present study. Faculty members were asked to fill questionnaire.

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

Originality- Although vast literature exists about quality of work life in different sectors but, hardly very few studies have been conducted in India to investigate QWL in higher education sector particularly in Punjab. Present study adds to the literature by scour into this aspect in Indian higher education sector.

Keywords: *Motivation, University, Job Satisfaction, Quality of work life, Compensation, Work load*

1. Introduction: Quality of work life refers to the level of pleasure or displeasure with one's own career. The employees who enjoy their career are said to have a better quality of work life, while who are not satisfied with their job have a lower quality of work life. Various variables are taken which affect quality of work life of both Government and Private University Teachers. For the success of every

organization, it is of utmost importance to retain competent employees. Mere use of money, technology and infrastructure cannot bring success to an organization unless and until its employees are satisfied. For employee satisfaction; employees must be self-motivated. As mentioned in hygiene two factor theory, the presence of hygiene factors does not create satisfaction but absence of these definitely creates dissatisfaction (Herzberg 1923). Due to changes in work environment, i.e., technology high competition, rise of employee unions etc.; employers are not only offering pay as compensation, but are considering other benefits, both intrinsic & extrinsic, to create a quality working environment that will attract and retain the best brains in the industry. The quality of work life can be explained as the quality of association among the employees and the work surroundings such that the employees have an important pressure in structuring the organizational surroundings in techniques utilized to raise not only their personal inspiration and job satisfaction but also the profits and productivity of the organization.

The quality of work life covers numerous areas like getting rid of the health hazards for the employees, sufficient fair compensations, security of job, benefits for employees, profit sharing, work schedules and the work place contribution. As far as comparative study is concerned; the factors that motivate the employees of both sectors to work efficiently are salary & rewards, better leave plans, reasonable working hours and opportunities for promotion. Employees often expect various quality requirements from work place; these can be classified into personal, anticipatory, motivational insights, job freedom and working conditions. A worker must have an optimistic awareness of QWL in the organization. She / he should possibly struggle to further develop the working conditions, raise the quality and production of products (Runcie, 1980). The knowledge of a fair number of firms shows that a number of particular structures, roles and the systems of support must be in position and functioning efficiently in order that the program of quality of work life stay feasible, grow, engage, saturate the culture of the organization and create long term benefits and success. The experiences across the nation sufficiently reveal that development in quality of work life has similar scope and potential in systemized the productivity (Ledford and Lawler, 1982) and the whole effectiveness of the organization (Buchanan and Boddy, 1982) as also decreasing the turnover, absenteeism, grievances (Goodman, 1980) and accidents in the industry (Havolovic, 1991).

2. Previous Research

The most contented teachers are the ones who feel their jobs are secure and they are treated as experts by the community. This is one of the key factors as this ensures that they are capable of delivering the student requirement and they are capable of utilizing their overall skills (Walton et al.,

2003). Teachers whose jobs are secure are more likely to have prospects for professional development, interact cohesively with peers and greater parental involvement in their schools and to their students (Gupta & Sharma, 2011).

Rewards and Benefits serves as a motivating factor for teachers to perform well in the colleges. This also creates a healthy competition between teachers in using their overall skills in their performance and strives to increase the overall standard of the college (Kaur, 2012). Compensation plays a pivotal role in effectiveness of the university. Lesser compensation would not attract skilled and experienced people with great performance and would not help in achieving the quality in imparting education, while higher compensation might be an overhead with costs running more than the desired (Malarvizhi, 2012; Islam, 2012).

University should strive to provide opportunity for every team member to showcase their talent, proficiency, skills, capacity and abilities (Zakari, Khamis & Hamadi, 2010). Utilizing teacher's capacities in areas other than their present position will help them to understand that management appreciates and identifies that what the staff could provide to the university. This can also provide work variety and helps to break up the everyday grind of work and also helps to get free from the stress of the routine work (Gupta & Sharma, 2011).

Teachers will be dissatisfied if rational climate doesn't exist for them to differentiate work from family (Carr et al. 2003). The university's demand shouldn't be interfering with teacher's family responsibilities and personal duties apart from their carrier (Aziz et al., 2010; Al-Enezi et al. eds., 2009). Teachers experience poor mental health and lower job satisfaction as compared to other groups (Miller and Travers 2005). There is an association between the quality of work life with the commitment to university among some 205 students who possess the student job and it is found that there is a considerable association among the willingness to work and the commitment to university (Turner 2005) whereas there is a significant and positive association between the organizational commitment and the quality of work life (Ashoob 2006). Disappointment with quality of work life may affect faculties irrespective of their positions. When the universities start to identify that the faculties have their lives apart from work, trust and loyalty among faculties is created (Saraji and Dargahi, 2006). Workload pressure, role ambiguity and performance pressure were the predictors of job stress. But managerial role and relationship with others had no significant direct effect on job stress (Alam 2009). As far as association in the perception of employees towards quality of work life and job satisfaction across the gender and nature of job is concerned there is difference in the perception of males and females with regard to different dimensions like working conditions, work

life balance, opportunities of growth and social relevance of job (Shalla et al.2014).

3. Research gap

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

4. Need and Aim of Study

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

5. Methodology

The present study is based on primary data and secondary data. In this research, primary data were collected from faculty members of government and private universities of Punjab, with the help of questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed for the respondents and it was specifically based upon the objectives of this study. The secondary data have also been collected from journals, books and published reports of various committees such as Yash Pal Committee Report 2009, CSO (2008) and Statistical Abstracts of Punjab. Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of convenience sampling. The survey was conducted via email and Face to face interviews. The sample size is an important feature of an empirical study in which goal is to make inferences about a population from a sample. A total of 550 survey questionnaires had been sent, out of which 510 questionnaires were received back. Each of the completed questionnaires was screened for errors or incomplete responses. However, in cases where more than 25% of the questions in the survey questionnaire were left unanswered, those were not considered for data analysis. After carrying out the screening process, only 500 (250 from each sector) responses have been considered complete and valid for data analysis. Taking into consideration the objectives of the study, a structured questionnaire was prepared to meet the objectives. The questionnaire was framed on the basis of previous literature and discussion with experts of the related field. The suggestions of experts led to many meaningful modifications.

The preliminary draft was pre-tested on 50 respondents, including 25 from public sector universities and 25 from private sector universities. Questionnaires were received back with suggestions, on the basis of which the final questionnaire was revised and then sent for final survey. All the questions were close ended. Factor analysis was used to analyze the data.

6. Analysis and Conclusions

The above statements reflect perception of faculty members of Public and Private Universities. These statements were short listed on the basis of review of previous studies (Walton, 1972; Gordon, 1984 and Gilgeous, 1998), discussion with experts and institutions. Faculty members were asked to express their level of agreement/ disagreement with respect to various statements based on five-point Likert scale. Factor analysis was applied to summarize the data into less and meaningful factors relevant to the sample.

6.1 Perception of Government University Teachers –A Factor Analysis Approach

Data were examined for its suitability for factor analysis. Reliability is measured by using Crohnbach's Alpha. Crohnbach's Alpha ranges from 0 to 1. The Crohnbach's Alpha of likert scaled items in the questionnaire was 0.732 which is deemed to be good. Correlation matrix was computed which depicted that there were enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Communality and factor loadings were high enough to prove the suitability of data as well as the Kaiser-Meyer-Okin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was 0.715 which indicated that the sample was good enough for sampling. Barlett's Test of Sphericity showed statistically significant number of correlations among the variables. Hence, all the above mentioned parameters revealed that data was fit for factor analysis.

The Eigen values are the total variance attributed to that factor. Any factor that has an Eigen values of less than 1 does not have enough total variance explained to represent a unique factor and is therefore disregarded. The Eigen values represent the total variance explained by each factor. Out of 34 statements listed for assessing quality of work life after applying factor analysis total variance that 12 factors extracted together for 62.357% of total variance so it is possible to economize on the number of variables from 34 to 12.

Results of Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation, in case Public Sector Universities, are presented in Table 4 below. The 1st factor explains the largest portion of the total variance, the 2nd factor for the most of the residual variance, subject to being uncorrelated with the first factor. The second factor explains the second highest variance and so on. The Eigen values for the factors are in decreasing order of magnitude as we move from variable 1 to variable 12. Factor 1

accounts for a variance 4.885 which (4.885/34) or 14.367% of the total variance. Likewise the second factor accounts for (2.566/3.4) or 7.548% of total variance and so on. All factor loadings greater than 0.5 have been considered for factor analysis.

Table 4

Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation: Public Sector University

Factor Number	Name of Dimension (% of variance)	Label	Statement	Factor loadings
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem (7.965%)	F ₃	Good Relationship with co-workers	0.639
		F ₁₂	Faculty members have friendly relations with each other	0.669
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues are ready	0.708
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after performing my work	0.584
2	Effect Recognition and Career Progression (7.309%)	F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.577
		F ₈	Support from the top management is helpful in accomplishing a task	0.628
		F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.643
		F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.515
		F ₂₄	All the faculty member generally support all the members of the universities	0.695
3	Employee loyalty and Growth (6.032%)	F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.584
		F ₁₅	On the basis of my own standards, I am satisfied with personal development	0.510
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.787
		F ₂₉	All the members are generally committed to their work	0.587
4	Quality on Work Place (4.920%)	F ₂₀	I feel that my university provides maximum facilities for doing my work properly	0.688
		F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.515
5	Conducive Environment (4.897%)	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at the university	0.725
		F ₂₂	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.579
6	Lower Self Esteem (4.820%)	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this University	0.816
		F ₂₇	Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.574
7	Employee Development	F ₂₁	I am developing new skills and	0.704

Factor Number	Name of Dimension (% of variance)	Label	Statement	Factor loadings
	(4.679%)	F ₃₄	abilities at work My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences	0.558
8	Work load other than teaching (4.487%)	F ₃₂ F ₃₃	I feel too much burdened for research work. My university organizes FD for the up gradation of faculty	0.582 0.815
9	Rationality (4.464%)	F ₁₁ F ₂₅	Favoritism does not play any part in the institution of work Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work	0.754 0.511
10	Organizational satisfaction (4.309%)	F ₂ F ₁₄	Job security exists at my university. I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work	0.741 0.566
11	Organizational communication and economic benefit (4.269%)	F ₁ F ₂₃	There is a reasonable periodical increase in salary There is an active flow of ideas	0.795 0.501
12	Critical factors (4.205%)	F ₁₉ F ₂₆	Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization. Employer overdrive the employees	0.586 0.701

Factor 1: Job satisfaction and self esteem

This suggests that factor 1 is the combinations of four variables. Faculty of Public Sector University perceives that there exists job satisfaction and self esteem. This factor explains (7.965%) variance with 4 statements. Highest coefficient is for the statement F₃, "Good relationship with co-workers" (0.639), followed by F₁₂ "Faculty members have friendly relations with each other" (0.669) whereas next variable F₁₃ states that "Fellow colleagues are ready to help in distress" (0.708) and one more statement which is extracted in factor 1 is F₁₆ "feeling of satisfaction after performing my work". Our results go hand in hand with the results of study conducted by Schulz and Pauline (2009), Johansson and Heikinaro (2004) who too found that teachers derived most of their job satisfaction from interpersonal relations.

Factor 2: Effort Recognition and Career Progression

This factor explains a combination of 5 statements with 7.309% of variance. The statement F₇ scored the highest score. It is sufficient motivational strategies" (0.577), followed by F₈ "support

from top management is helpful in accomplishing a task" (0.628). The statement F₉ states that "university recognizes and acknowledge my work" with factor loadings 0.643 is also a combination of F₁₀ "Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression" (0.515) and statement F₂₄ All the faculty members generally support all the members of the universities with factor loadings 0.695. Effort recognition and career progression also fall in line with the findings of Jenkinsons and Chapman (1990), Sweeney (1981).

Factor 3: Employee loyalty and growth

This factor explains 6.032% of variance with 4 statements. These statements indicate that employees committed towards their duties and sufficient promotional opportunities are provided to deserving employees. The highest Varimax coefficient is secured by the statement F₅, "Effective Promotional Opportunities in the University" (0.584), followed by F₁₅, "On the basis of my own standards; I am satisfied with Personal Development" (0.510). Other two statements are related to commitment and good communication system, are loaded on the same factor. These are F₂₈, "Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other" with factor loadings 0.787 and F₂₉, "All the members generally committed to their work" (0.587). The results contradict with studies conducted by Sonmezer and Eryaman (2008).

Factor 4: Quality on Work Place

Public university provides maximum facilities to conduct research work as well as to perform other activities. Factor 4th explaining 4.920% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F₂, "My University provides maximum facilities for doing to my work properly" (0.688) followed by F₁₇ "Feeling good about the quality of work performed" (0.515). Bhanugopal et al. (2008) also found that there is correlation between quality of work life and work environment.

Factor 5: Conducive Environment

The 5th factor explains 4.897% of variance of 2 statements. The highest coefficient is 0.725 in case of the statement F₆, "Good safety measures adopted at my university" followed by F₂₂, "I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties" (0.579) employees feels comfortable in this environment and work efficiently. It is also found in the study of Mirvis and Lawler (1984) that quality of work life is associated to working environment, working hours and safe working conditions.

Factor 6: Lower Self Esteem

Factor 6 enlists negative statements which lead to decrease the morale of employees. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 6 explains 4.820% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.816 in case of statement F₁₈, "There are many political problems in this university" and F₂₇, "Most of my activities are routine and boring" with factor loadings of 0.484.

Factor 7: Employee Development

Factor 7 enlists statements related to employee development. 7th factor explains 4.679% of variance with 2 statements. The statement F₂₁, "I am developing new skills and abilities at work" 0.704 followed by F₃₄, "My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences" with factor loading of 0.558.

Factor 8: Workload other than teaching

This factor is a combination of 2 statements with 4.487% of variance. The statement F₃₂ highlights that "I feel too much burdened for research work" (0.582) followed by other statement F₃₃ "My university organizes FDP for the up gradation of faculty" (0.815). These statements create extra burden other than teaching on university faculty.

Factor 9: Rationality

Factor 9 enlists favourable statements which lead to job satisfaction among public sector university faculty. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 9 explains 4.64% of variance. The highest coefficient is 0.754, in case of statement F₁₁, "Favouritism does not play any part in the Institution" and F₂₅, "Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work" (0.511).

Factor 10: Organizational Satisfaction

The 10th factor explains 4.309% of variance with 2 statements; the statement F₂ scores highest score, "Job security exists at my university" (0.741), followed by F₁₄ "I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work" (0.566).

Factor 11: Organization Communication and Economic Benefits

This factor explains 4.269% of the variance with 2 statements. This factor shows that there is two way communications to make healthy environment and economic benefits are reasonably provided to the faculty. The highest varimax coefficient is secured by the statement F₁, "There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary" (0.795), followed by F₂₃, "There is an active flow of ideas" with factor loadings 0.501.

Factor 12: Critical Factors

The factor 12th explains 4.205% of variance with 2 negative statements. The statement F₁₉, "Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization" (0.586) followed by F₂₆, "Employer overdrive the employees" with factor loadings of 0.70%.

Perception of Private University Teachers –A Factor Analysis Approach

Out of 34 factors, only 12 factors extracted together with 71.133% of total variance, so it is possible to economize on the number of variables from 34 to 12. The 1st factor explains the largest portion of the total variance, the second factor for the most of the residual variance, subject to being uncorrelated with the first factor. The Eigen values for the factors are in decreasing order of magnitude as we move from variable 1 to 12. Factor 1 accounts for variance 5.934 which (5.934/34) or 17.454% of total variance. Likewise 2nd factor accounts for (3.056/34) or 8.989% of total variance and so on. Table 5 indicates that 12 factor have been extracted.

Table 5
Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Private Sector University
Naming of Factor (Private Sector)

Factor Number	Name of Dimensions (% of variance)	Label	Statement	Factor loadings
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem (8.944%)	F ₃	Good relationship with co-workers	0.561
		F ₁₂	Friendly relations with each other	0.742
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues ready to help in distress	0.686
		F ₁₅	Feeling of success	0.702
		F ₁₄	Superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions	0.583
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after reforming my work	0.526
2	Effort Recognition and Organizational Communication (7.905%)	F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.512
		F ₂₁	I am developing my skills and abilities at work	0.572
		F ₂₃	There is an active flow of ideas	0.580
		F ₂₄	Co-workers support each other	0.626
		F ₂₅	Faculty members are given recognition for their work	0.800
3	Quality on Job Freedom (7.392%)	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at university	0.651
		F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.588

Factor Number	Name of Dimensions (% of variance)	Label	Statement	Factor loadings
		F ₈	Support from top level management	0.703
4	Employee loyalty and Growth (6.371%)	F ₁	There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary	0.559
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.850
		F ₂₉	All members generally committed to their work	0.769
5	Work load other than Teaching (6.329%)	F ₃₂	I am too much burdened for research work	0.672
		F ₃₃	My university organizes FDP from up gradation of faculty	0.730
		F ₃₄	Support to attend conferences and refresher courses	0.703
6	Lower Self Esteem (5.839%)	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this university	0.766
		F ₂₇	Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.677
7	Work Pressure (5.420%)	F ₁₉	I am ready to join if same type of job under same terms and conditions in a different organization.	0.837
		F ₃₀	I have no time to pursue my area of interest	0.511
8	Opportunity of Growth (5.002%)	F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.585
		F ₂₂	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.835
9	Critical Factors (4.787%)	F ₂₆	Employer overdrive the employees	0.538
		F ₃₁	I have to do too much clerical work	0.583
10	Rationality (4.780%)	F ₄	There is rational performance and appraisal system.	0.528
		F ₁₁	Favoritism do not ply and part in the institutions	0.836
11	Quality of Work (4.200%) (Independent Factor)	F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.785
12	Organizational satisfactions (4.156%)	F ₂	Job security exists at my university	0.713
		F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.671

Factor 1: Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem

The first factor explains 8.949% of the total variance with 6 statements. The statement F₁₂, "Friendly relations with each other" (0.742), followed by F₁₅, is "Feeling of success" (0.702) gets second highest coefficient. The statement F₁₃, "Fellow colleagues ready to help in distress" (0.683) scored more than the statement F₁₄, "Superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions" (0.583),

followed by F₁₆, "I feel satisfied after performing my work". (0.526) and least coefficient is F₃, "Good relationship with co-workers" with factor loadings of 0.561. The results go hand in hand with the results of study conducted by Schulz and Pauline (2009), Johansson and Heikinaro (2004) who too found that teachers derived most of their job satisfaction from interpersonal relations.

Factor 2: Effect Recognition and Organizational Communication

This factor explains 7.905% of the variance with 5 statements. The highest coefficient 0.800% is scored by the statement F₂₅, "Faculty members are given recognition for their work" followed by F₂₄, "Co-workers support each other" (0.626). The findings of the study also matched with Islam (2012). He conducted study regarding the factors affecting quality of work life among employees of private limited companies in Bangladesh.

Factor 3: Quality on Job Freedom

The factor explains 7.392% of the total variance with 3 statements. The highest coefficient is scored by the statement F₈, "Support from top management". (0.703), followed by F₆, "Good safety measures" adopted at university (0.651). The statement which scored least is F₇, "Sufficient motivational strategies" (0.588). As explained by Owens (2006), that commitment has a major and constructive influence on job performance and on retaining workforce.

Factor 4: Employee Loyalty and Growth

The 4th factor explains 6.371% of variances with 3 statements. The statement F₂₈, "Faculty members communicate well with each other" has scored highest coefficient (0.850), followed by 2 statements F₂₉, "All members generally committed to their work" (0.769) and F₁, "There is reasonable increase in my salary" (0.559).

Factor 5: Workload other than teaching

This factor explains 6.371% of variance with 3 statements. The higher coefficient is scored (0.730) by F₃₃, "My university organizes FDP for the up gradation of faculty" followed by F₃₄, "Support to attend conferences and refresher courses" whereas F₃₂, "I am too much burdened for research work" (0.672) scores least. The results also fall in line with the studies Drago, Caplan and Lynn(2005) in which employees feel stressed with high commitment work system i.e. trainings, meetings and involvement in job.

Factor 6: Lower Self Esteem

The 6th factor explains 5.839% of the total variance with 2 statements. The high coefficient is scored

by the statement F₁₈, "There are many political problems in this university" (0.766) followed by F₂₇, "Most of my activities are routine and boring" (0.677).

Factor 7: Work Pressure

This factor explains 5.420% of the total variances with 2 statements. The highest coefficient is scored by the statement F₁₉, "I am ready to join a same type of job under same working conditions in different organization" (0.837) followed by F₃₀, "I have no time to pursue my area of Interest" (0.511). The results matched with the findings of Memeon (2008).

Factor 8: Opportunity of Growth

The 8th factor explains 5.002% of variance with 2 statements. The statements F₂₂ gets the highest coefficient (0.835), "I do not feel under pressure in carrying out my duties", followed by F₁₀, "Adequate opportunities of self improvement and career progression" (0.485). The findings of the study also fall in line with Sandrick (2003) found that intrinsic job satisfaction, job delight was a better predictor of self esteem and opportunities of growth and career achievement are helpful to retain employees in an organization.

Factor 9: Critical Factors

This factor explains 4.787% of variance with 2 statements. The highest coefficient is scored by F₂₆, "Employer over drive the employees" (0.583) followed by F₃₁, "I have to do too much clerical work" (0.583). Sarmah et al. (2012), Mourkani et al. (2013) also conducted research on work stressors.

Factor 10: Rationality

This factor explains 4.780% of the total variance with 2 statements. The statement F₁₁ scored maximum scores out of these. The statement "Favoritism does not play any part in this Institution". (0.828) followed by F₄, "There is rational performance Appraisal System" (0.528). The rationality among performance appraisal of faculties also fall in line with the results of study Aldakhilallah and Parente (2002) who serves as revised version of outdated methods of performance evaluation in the effective evaluation of the performance of faculties that fits with the idea of Total Quality Management (Almalki, 2012; Almalki, Fitzgerald & Clark; 2011).

Factor 11: Quality of Work

This factor explains 4.200% of the total variance with only one statement F_{17} , "I feel good about the quality of work performed" (0.785). This is an Independent factor. Itself it is an important factor which is essential to evaluate overall work environment. Present result also go hand in hand with Sheel (2012) that high quality of work is essential to retain and attract employees towards their organization.

Factor 12: Organizational Satisfaction

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

Comparison of Results of Factor Analysis for Public Sector and Private Sector Universities

Application of factor analysis to the responses of public sector and private sector teachers reveals 12 dimensions. Total variance explained by 12 factors was 62.35% in case of public sector university teachers and 71.13% in case of private sector university teachers. These results reveals that factors discovered as important in quality of work life are greater preferred by private sector university teachers than public sector. There has been similarly in case of 3 factors i.e. Job satisfaction and self esteem and effort recognition and career progression and lower self esteem as this has been expressed through 1st and 2nd and 6th factor by public sector and private sector university teachers. However, the importance of other factors differed considerably. The "work load other than teaching" appears as the F_8 explaining 4.48% variance in case of public sector University, while factor 5th explains 6.32% variance in case of private university teachers. There is a further 'Rationality' features as the 9th factor with 4.64% of variance in case of public sector while it features as F_{10} with 4.78% of variance in private sector teachers. The 'Employee loyalty and growth is observed as the 3rd factor by public sector university teachers with 6.37% of variance while it is at 4th level in case private sector with 6.032% of variance and critical factors features as 12th factor with 4.205% variance while it features at 9th level with 4.787% for private sector teachers. The factor 'organizational satisfaction' features at 10th level with 4.309% of variance in public sector where as at 12th level with 4.156% of variance. Hence, private university teachers are more affected by work load, rationality, critical factors and organization satisfaction. A comparison of two samples illustrates that the factors emerging from both university teachers are similar in constitution but private university teachers feel

more work load others than teaching and critical factors as well as they feel there are more growth opportunities in Private Sector University.

REFERENCES

- Almalki M, Fitzgerald G, Clark M (2011), *"The Healthcare System in Saudi Arabia: An Overview"*, Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal 2011, Vol.17 (10), 784–793.
- Bhanugopal, Ramudu and Fish, Alan (2008), *"The Impact of Business Crime on Expatriate Quality of Work-Life in Papua New Guinea"*, Australian Human Resources Institute.Vol.46 (1), 68–84.
- Brown, F. (1972), *"Need Satisfaction of Educational Administrators"*, American Educational Research Association, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED, 561-584.
- Buchanan, D. A., & Boddy, D. (1982), *"Advanced Technology and the Quality of Work Life"* Journal of Occupational Psychology, Vol.55, pp.1-11.
- Drago, R.,Caplan, R. and Lynn, R.(2005), *"New Estimates of Working Time Elementary School Teachers"*,Monthly Labour Review, 24-32.
- Gilgeous, V., (1998), *"Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life", Integrated Manufacturing System"*, Vol. 9(3), 173-181.
- Goodman, P.S. (1980), *Quality of Work Life Projects in 1980's* Industrial Relations Research Association, 487-494.
- Gupta and Sharma (2010), *"Factor Credentials Boosting Quality of Work Life of BSNL Employees in Jammu Region"*, Sri Krishna International Research & Educational Consortium, Vol. 1(2).
- Havolovic, S.J. (1991), *"Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes"* Industrial Relations, Vol.30 (3), 469-479.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.
- Islam B M (2012), *"Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: An Analysis on Employees of Private Limited Companies in Bangladesh"*, Global Journal of Management and Business Research Vol. 12(18) Version 1.0, Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA).
- Jenkinsons, R. and Chapman, W. (1990), *"Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers"*

International Review of Education, Vol. 36(3), 299-313.

Johansson, N. and Heikinaro, P. (2004), *"Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers in Finland"*, Paper Presented at Athens, Pre Olympic Conference.

Ledford, G. E. and Lawler, E. E. (1982), *"Quality of Work Life Programs, Coordination, and Productivity"*, Journal of Contemporary Business, Vol. 11, 93-106.

Malarvizhi (2012), *"A Study on Quality Of Work Life In Jeppiaar Cements Private Limited, Mela Mathur, Perambalur-District"*, retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.isrj.net/publishArticles/736.pdf>

Memeon, J.(2008), *"Teacher Strees, Job Performance and Efficacy of Women School Teachers"* Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol.20 (2), 178-187.

Miller, G.V. and Travers, C.J. (2005), *"Ethnicity and the Experience of work: Job stress and Satisfaction of Minority Ethnic Teachers in the U.K."*, International Review of Psychiatry, Vol. 17(5), 317-327.

Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984), *"Accounting for the Quality of Work Life"*, Journal of Occupational Behavior, Vol.5, 197-212.

Owens (2006), *"One More Reason not to Cut Your Training Budget: The Relationship between Training and Organizational Outcomes"*.Public Personnel Management.

Rao, D.B. & Sridhar, D. (2003), *"Job Satisfaction of School Teachers"*, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.

Runcie, J. F. (1980), *Dynamic Systems and the Quality of Work Life*, Personnel, Vol. 57(6) pp.13–24.

Sairam S., Saravanan(2012), *"Empirical Study on Factors Influencing on Quality of Work Life of Commercial Bank Employees"*, European Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 28(1), 119-127.

Saraji N. G. and Dargahi (2006), *"Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL), Department of Health Care Management,"* School of Allied Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran, 1053-1056.

Sarmah, Bidula, Baruah and Manoshikha (2012), *"Job Stress among Secondary School Teachers"*, Indian Stream Research Journal, Sep. 2012, Vol.2 (8), 34-36.

- Shalla S.A. and Asif Iqbal fazili (2014), *"Quality of Work Life and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Dimensional Analysis"*, ABHINAV, International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology.
- Sheel, Shalini, Dr. Panday, D.K. (2012), *"Quality of Work Life, Employee Performance and Career Growth Opportunities: A Literature Review"*, International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research.
- Sonmezer, M.G. and Eryaman, M.Y. (2008), *"Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction levels of Public and Private School Teachers"*, Journal of Theory and Practice in education, Vol. 4(2), 189-212.
- Sweeney, P. (1981), *"Human Needs and Job satisfaction"*, Professional Journal, Vol. 32(1), 42-55.
- Turner, B.A. & P. Chelleadurai (2005), *"Organization and Occupational Commitment, Intention to Leave and Perceived Performance of Intercollegiate Coaches"*, Journal of sport management, 682-686.
- Walton (1982), *"International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life"*, Productivity, Vol.22 (4), 79-83.
- Zakari NM, Al Khamis NI, Hamadi HY (2010), *"Conflict and Professionalism: Perceptions among Nurses in Saudi Arabia"* International Nurses Review, Vol.57 (3) 297-304.

