

Demographic Analysis of QWL- A Study of Government Universities in Punjab

Dr. Kawaljit Kaur

Assistant Professor
CKD Institute of Management & Technology,
Amritsar(Punjab)

Abstract

Quality of work life can be described as the satisfactory work environment which improves the relationship between employee and the organization. The present study aims to verify the quality of work life and motivation of employees and its impact on performance of faculty members. To reach quality of work life the universities have to create more opportunities to retain efficient employees. Good quality of work life is necessary for an organization to attract and to retain skilled and talented employees. Suitable techniques are applied to study the impact of demographic variable on quality of work life.

Keywords:

Motivation, Job Satisfaction, Job Environment, Work Life

Introduction

QWL programs will help both faculty and institution. It helps faculty by providing them superior work environment, support them in managing their individual work and improving the work environment and for institutions in achieving their goals effortlessly as motivated workforce would reveal enhanced performance and quality Rose et al. (2006). Work satisfaction, triumph and work balance are the important variables to achieve quality in deliverables and also updates that these methods motivates the employees and contribute significantly to job enrichment Hosseini et al. (2010). The growth of one institution depends on the regularity of workers. Institution must be notified well in advance of the absenteeism to reschedule the requisite task They can offer incentives for teachers who keep a good attendance record. Absenteeism could be avoided through increased financial support like earned leaves, good working environment and transportation facilities to commute. Developing infrastructure facilities like crèche nearby office would also help female staff to avoid absenteeism Aswathappa (2002). A reasonable level of attendance by faculties at work is essential to achieve goals and targets by a university. Absenteeism happens when a faculty fails to come to work due to organized time off, sickness, grievance, financial, marital problems or any other reason. The cost of absenteeism to educational sector, usually expressed in terms of lost continuity and effectiveness in the teaching (Adhikari& Gautam, 2012). Quality of work life will assist the well being of the employees in that way the well being of the entire

firm. This is an effort to capitalize an organization's human assets (Kumar et al. 1996).

Previous Research

Quality of work life is based on how the work is being communicated with in organization and how the organization is recognizing and encouraging faculty and rewarding them by providing incentives and helping in their career growth by giving promotions (Sheel, 2012). This section will present the literary works related to quality of work life especially with respect to the education industry. Occupational stress symptoms were measured by reflecting burnout, stress-related health problem, perceived work stress, productively, job satisfaction and consideration for job change. The majority of teachers indicated good fit between motivational style and job rewards. Teachers reported burnout, stress related health problems, lowered work productivity, inability to cope with work stress and job change consideration. Emotional fatigue, depression and less individual achievement are due to long term occupational stress and affect the academic growth of the students (Jennett et. al 2003). 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). This is a critical factor when we talk about social relations of an employee. 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 has 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).

Objective of Study

To map the profile of respondents on the basis of psychographic and demographic variables with respect to their perceptions towards different elements related with quality of work life and to study the impact of Quality of Work life on overall job satisfaction level and motivational level among teachers of universities

Problem Identified

Quality of work life has long been recognized as the key to growth of any organization including universities. The review of the existing literature reveals that a numbers of studies have been carried out on various aspects of quality but a very few comprehensive studies in this area could be found; which provides detailed information regarding quality of work life in universities of Punjab region. In the light of the above discussion comprehensive and detailed study regarding universities is of dire need.

Methodology

The present study deals with different variables related to job satisfaction among Government university teachers. Every employee perceives these variables differently. As suggested by Maslow's theory that every employee has different level of needs. A variable which is important for one employee may not be equally important for other. Data were collected from 3 Government Universities of Punjab region.

| Government Universities |
|-------------------------------|
| Guru Nanak Dev University |
| Punjabi University, Patiala |
| Punjab Agriculture University |

The faculty members were the basic sampling unit for the present study. The Universities were selected on the basis of year of establishment. The faculty members were approached to fill questionnaire. Of the 300 questionnaires that were distributed to faculty members, 83.33% complete questionnaires were returned. This resulted in a total sample of 250 faculty members. Data were collected through a structured, pre-tested and non-disguised questionnaire. To develop a list of information items for framing the questionnaire, previous studies were followed, experts suggestions were considered as well as online discussions were also held with other researchers. The suggestions led to meaningful modifications. The primary sketch of the questionnaire was pre-tested through personal interviews with 25 faculty members. This helped me to develop a final questionnaire. . The ten variables which positively contribute to the quality of work life were considered under study and matched with demographic variables with respect to their perceptions towards quality of work life. In order to find out significant differences ANOVA (one way) technique was applied. The obtained results were subsequently organized in various tables for analysis and interpretation. On the basis of 10 variables which positively contribute to their QWL. The following table shows different variables with their labeling.

Table 1**List of Variables**

| Variable Labels | Variables |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| C ₁ | Salary and Benefits |
| C ₂ | Promotion |
| C ₃ | Leave Plans |
| C ₄ | Rewards and recognitions |
| C ₅ | Acknowledgement |
| C ₆ | Scope for career growth |
| C ₇ | Job Security |
| C ₈ | Friendly superiors |
| C ₉ | Interactive and well-behaved students |
| C ₁₀ | Reasonable working hours |

Table 2(a)**Mean, SD Scores & SE of Different variables among Teachers of Different Age Groups: Public Sector University**

| Descriptives | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Variables | Age | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
| C ₁ | 25-35 | 167 | 4.26 | 3.144 | 0.243 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 4.73 | 2.895 | 0.387 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 4.47 | 3.300 | 0.800 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 4.20 | 3.584 | 1.133 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.38 | 3.105 | 0.196 |
| C ₂ | 25-35 | 167 | 5.53 | 3.020 | 0.234 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.46 | 2.815 | 0.376 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 4.71 | 3.057 | 0.741 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 4.90 | 2.644 | 0.836 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.44 | 2.956 | 0.187 |
| C ₃ | 25-35 | 167 | 6.25 | 2.991 | 0.231 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.61 | 3.043 | 0.407 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 4.47 | 2.211 | 0.536 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 5.40 | 2.271 | 0.718 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.95 | 2.959 | 0.187 |
| C ₄ | 25-35 | 167 | 5.13 | 2.751 | 0.213 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.80 | 2.561 | 0.342 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 5.41 | 2.671 | 0.648 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 4.80 | 2.394 | 0.757 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.28 | 2.692 | 0.170 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|-----|------|-------|-------|
| C ₅ | 25-35 | 167 | 4.98 | 2.911 | 0.225 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 4.27 | 2.793 | 0.373 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 5.47 | 2.375 | 0.576 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 5.00 | 2.357 | 0.745 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.86 | 2.838 | 0.179 |
| C ₆ | 25-35 | 167 | 5.28 | 2.657 | 0.206 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.46 | 2.885 | 0.386 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 5.47 | 3.064 | 0.743 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 6.70 | 2.751 | 0.870 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.39 | 2.739 | 0.173 |
| C ₇ | 25-35 | 167 | 6.00 | 2.755 | 0.213 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.57 | 2.859 | 0.382 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 5.18 | 2.531 | 0.614 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 3.50 | 2.121 | 0.671 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.75 | 2.778 | 0.176 |
| C ₈ | 25-35 | 167 | 5.68 | 2.738 | 0.212 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 5.71 | 2.484 | 0.332 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 7.00 | 2.449 | 0.594 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 6.10 | 3.281 | 1.038 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.80 | 2.692 | 0.170 |
| C ₉ | 25-35 | 167 | 6.16 | 2.544 | 0.197 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 6.54 | 2.960 | 0.396 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 7.18 | 2.877 | 0.698 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 6.20 | 2.486 | 0.786 |
| | Total | 250 | 6.32 | 2.662 | 0.168 |
| C ₁₀ | 25-35 | 167 | 5.32 | 2.707 | 0.209 |
| | 35-40 | 56 | 6.00 | 2.822 | 0.377 |
| | 40-45 | 17 | 5.71 | 2.801 | 0.679 |
| | 45-60 | 10 | 6.90 | 3.213 | 1.016 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.56 | 2.771 | 0.175 |

Table 2(b)

Analysis of variance of Different variables on Different Age Groups among University Teachers: Public Sector University

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Variables | Variation | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| C ₁ | Between Groups | 9.675 | 3 | 3.225 | 0.332 | 0.802 |
| | Within Groups | 2391.225 | 246 | 9.720 | | |
| | Total | 2400.900 | 249 | | | |
| C ₂ | Between Groups | 13.549 | 3 | 4.516 | 0.514 | 0.673 |
| | Within Groups | 2161.927 | 246 | 8.788 | | |
| | Total | 2175.476 | 249 | | | |
| C ₃ | Between Groups | 61.397 | 3 | 20.466 | 2.376 | 0.071 |
| | Within Groups | 2118.927 | 246 | 8.614 | | |
| | Total | 2180.324 | 249 | | | |
| C ₄ | Between Groups | 21.920 | 3 | 7.307 | 1.008 | 0.390 |
| | Within Groups | 1782.916 | 246 | 7.248 | | |
| | Total | 1804.836 | 249 | | | |
| C ₅ | Between Groups | 28.652 | 3 | 9.551 | 1.189 | 0.315 |
| | Within Groups | 1976.164 | 246 | 8.033 | | |
| | Total | 2004.816 | 249 | | | |
| C ₆ | Between Groups | 19.548 | 3 | 6.516 | 0.867 | 0.459 |
| | Within Groups | 1848.036 | 246 | 7.512 | | |
| | Total | 1867.584 | 249 | | | |
| C ₇ | Between Groups | 68.439 | 3 | 22.813 | 3.029 | 0.030 |
| | Within Groups | 1852.685 | 246 | 7.531 | | |
| | Total | 1921.124 | 249 | | | |
| D ₈ | Between Groups | 28.088 | 3 | 9.363 | 1.296 | 0.276 |
| | Within Groups | 1776.508 | 246 | 7.222 | | |
| | Total | 1804.596 | 249 | | | |
| C ₉ | Between Groups | 19.402 | 3 | 6.467 | 0.912 | 0.436 |
| | Within Groups | 1744.634 | 246 | 7.092 | | |
| | Total | 1764.036 | 249 | | | |
| C ₁₀ | Between Groups | 38.508 | 3 | 12.836 | 1.686 | 0.171 |
| | Within Groups | 1872.968 | 246 | 7.614 | | |
| | Total | 1911.476 | 249 | | | |

Analysis of variance of different variables (ANOVA) among different age groups. The results depicted in table 5.9 shows that 10 variables were compared with different categories of age. Table 5.9 shows that there is one variable "Job Security" have significant impact on age. Its p values=0.0.3 is found to be less than 0.05 significance level. Further comparison between different age groups

indicates that teachers working in public sector university prefer to have more job security. Mean values shows that Teachers between 25-30 have higher mean value 6.00 as compared to other age groups where as teachers between age group of 30-35 also scores mean value at 2nd highest level; 5.57. It can be concluded that public sector university teachers between age group of 25-35 prefer more job

security. Other nine variable's p value was found to be greater than 0.05 level of significance. Hence null hypotheses in case of these variables is not rejected which

indicates that there is no significance impact of the variables like salary, promotion rewards recognition, scope for growth, friendly superiors.

Table 3(a)
Mean , SD Scores & SE of Different variables among Teachers of Different Educational Qualification: Public Sector University

| Descriptives | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|-----|------|----------------|------------|
| Variables | Qualification | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
| C ₁ | PG | 143 | 4.01 | 2.950 | 0.247 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 4.77 | 3.242 | 0.350 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 5.29 | 3.334 | 0.727 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.38 | 3.105 | 0.196 |
| C ₂ | PG | 143 | 5.50 | 3.126 | 0.261 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.63 | 2.748 | 0.296 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 4.24 | 2.364 | 0.516 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.44 | 2.956 | 0.187 |
| C ₃ | PG | 143 | 6.12 | 3.057 | 0.256 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.64 | 2.782 | 0.300 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 6.05 | 3.025 | 0.660 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.95 | 2.959 | 0.187 |
| C ₄ | PG | 143 | 5.48 | 2.701 | 0.226 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 4.90 | 2.571 | 0.277 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 5.52 | 3.060 | 0.668 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.28 | 2.692 | 0.170 |
| C ₅ | PG | 143 | 4.97 | 2.886 | 0.241 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 4.78 | 2.888 | 0.311 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 4.43 | 2.315 | 0.505 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.86 | 2.838 | 0.179 |
| C ₆ | PG | 143 | 5.49 | 2.672 | 0.223 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.33 | 2.972 | 0.320 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 5.00 | 2.214 | 0.483 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.39 | 2.739 | 0.173 |
| C ₇ | PG | 143 | 5.84 | 2.777 | 0.232 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.52 | 2.768 | 0.299 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 6.05 | 2.889 | 0.630 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.75 | 2.778 | 0.176 |
| C ₈ | PG | 143 | 5.89 | 2.738 | 0.229 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.64 | 2.616 | 0.282 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 5.81 | 2.786 | 0.608 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.80 | 2.692 | 0.170 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----|------|-------|-------|
| C ₉ | PG | 143 | 5.99 | 2.576 | 0.215 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 6.70 | 2.723 | 0.294 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 7.00 | 2.775 | 0.606 |
| | Total | 250 | 6.32 | 2.662 | 0.168 |
| C ₁₀ | PG | 143 | 5.37 | 2.602 | 0.218 |
| | Ph.D | 86 | 5.93 | 2.918 | 0.315 |
| | Any other (M.Phil) | 21 | 5.38 | 3.232 | 0.705 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.56 | 2.771 | 0.175 |

Table 3(b)
Analysis of variance of Different variables on Educational Qualification among University Teachers:
Public Sector University

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Variables | Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| C ₁ | Between Groups | 49.293 | 2 | 24.647 | 2.589 | 0.077 |
| | Within Groups | 2351.607 | 247 | 9.521 | | |
| | Total | 2400.900 | 249 | | | |
| C ₂ | Between Groups | 33.825 | 2 | 16.913 | 1.951 | 0.144 |
| | Within Groups | 2141.651 | 247 | 8.671 | | |
| | Total | 2175.476 | 249 | | | |
| C ₃ | Between Groups | 12.567 | 2 | 6.284 | .716 | 0.490 |
| | Within Groups | 2167.757 | 247 | 8.776 | | |
| | Total | 2180.324 | 249 | | | |
| C ₄ | Between Groups | 19.833 | 2 | 9.917 | 1.372 | 0.255 |
| | Within Groups | 1785.003 | 247 | 7.227 | | |
| | Total | 1804.836 | 249 | | | |
| C ₅ | Between Groups | 6.046 | 2 | 3.023 | 0.374 | 0.689 |
| | Within Groups | 1998.770 | 247 | 8.092 | | |
| | Total | 2004.816 | 249 | | | |
| C ₆ | Between Groups | 4.966 | 2 | 2.483 | 0.329 | 0.720 |
| | Within Groups | 1862.618 | 247 | 7.541 | | |
| | Total | 1867.584 | 249 | | | |
| C ₇ | Between Groups | 7.417 | 2 | 3.709 | 0.479 | 0.620 |
| | Within Groups | 1913.707 | 247 | 7.748 | | |
| | Total | 1921.124 | 249 | | | |
| C ₈ | Between Groups | 3.323 | 2 | 1.661 | 0.228 | 0.796 |
| | Within Groups | 1801.273 | 247 | 7.293 | | |
| | Total | 1804.596 | 249 | | | |
| C ₉ | Between Groups | 37.924 | 2 | 18.962 | 2.713 | 0.068 |
| | Within Groups | 1726.112 | 247 | 6.988 | | |
| | Total | 1764.036 | 249 | | | |
| C ₁₀ | Between Groups | 17.586 | 2 | 8.793 | 1.147 | 0.319 |
| | Within Groups | 1893.890 | 247 | 7.668 | | |
| | Total | 1911.476 | 249 | | | |

Table 3(a) & 3(b) depicting the results of ANOVA shows that p value of all the variables was found to be greater than 0.05. Which indicate that there is no significant impact of different variables on educational qualification public sector to be statistically significant. It means as far as educational qualification was concerned all groups were similar in their attitude indicating thereby that there was no difference of these variables on the basis of qualification. As far as mean values are compared with different level of qualification of teachers, higher qualified teachers prefer

more job security, promotions, scope for career growth, leave plans. Higher qualified teacher's expectation is high as comparatively. Their supremacy in this regard may be attributed to certain factors like salary & benefits, lesser work load, job security and expect that more opportunities for growth are available as they fall in highly qualified category. Job security and better pay are two main attractions which lure most of the teachers for attaining job in public sector university.

Table 4(a)
Mean , SD Scores & SE of Different variables among Teachers with Different
categories of Teaching Experience: Public Sector University

| Descriptives | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|-----|------|----------------|------------|
| Variables | Experience | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
| C ₁ | 2-5 | 91 | 4.31 | 3.136 | 0.329 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 4.57 | 3.070 | 0.295 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 4.15 | 2.983 | 0.472 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 3.91 | 3.885 | 1.171 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.38 | 3.105 | 0.196 |
| C ₂ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.54 | 3.270 | 0.343 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.28 | 2.654 | 0.255 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.48 | 3.013 | 0.476 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 6.00 | 3.130 | 0.944 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.44 | 2.956 | 0.187 |
| C ₃ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.91 | 3.172 | 0.332 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 6.23 | 2.867 | 0.276 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.22 | 2.731 | 0.432 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 6.09 | 2.737 | 0.825 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.95 | 2.959 | 0.187 |
| C ₄ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.53 | 2.971 | 0.311 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.01 | 2.370 | 0.228 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.45 | 2.961 | 0.468 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 5.36 | 2.292 | 0.691 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.28 | 2.692 | 0.170 |
| C ₅ | 2-5 | 91 | 4.46 | 2.786 | 0.292 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 4.94 | 2.977 | 0.287 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.30 | 2.766 | 0.437 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 5.73 | 1.679 | 0.506 |
| | Total | 250 | 4.86 | 2.838 | 0.179 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------|-----|------|-------|-------|
| C ₆ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.42 | 2.569 | 0.269 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.37 | 2.896 | 0.279 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.52 | 2.736 | 0.433 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 4.91 | 2.844 | 0.858 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.39 | 2.739 | 0.173 |
| C ₇ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.73 | 2.548 | 0.267 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.84 | 2.996 | 0.288 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 6.05 | 2.601 | 0.411 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 3.91 | 2.663 | 0.803 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.75 | 2.778 | 0.176 |
| C ₈ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.92 | 2.701 | 0.283 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.69 | 2.831 | 0.272 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.62 | 2.382 | 0.377 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 6.45 | 2.464 | 0.743 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.80 | 2.692 | 0.170 |
| C ₉ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.93 | 2.573 | 0.270 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 6.51 | 2.624 | 0.253 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 6.72 | 2.900 | 0.459 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 6.09 | 2.809 | 0.847 |
| | Total | 250 | 6.32 | 2.662 | 0.168 |
| C ₁₀ | 2-5 | 91 | 5.86 | 2.416 | 0.253 |
| | 5-15 | 108 | 5.35 | 2.885 | 0.278 |
| | 15-25 | 40 | 5.50 | 3.154 | 0.499 |
| | Above 25 | 11 | 5.45 | 3.078 | 0.928 |
| | Total | 250 | 5.56 | 2.771 | 0.175 |

Table 4(b)
Analysis of variance of Different variables among teachers with different categories of teaching experience: Public Sector University

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Variables | Variation | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| C ₁ | Between Groups | 9.099 | 3 | 3.033 | 0.312 | 0.817 |
| | Within Groups | 2391.801 | 246 | 9.723 | | |
| | Total | 2400.900 | 249 | | | |
| C ₂ | Between Groups | 7.219 | 3 | 2.406 | .0273 | 0.845 |
| | Within Groups | 2168.257 | 246 | 8.814 | | |
| | Total | 2175.476 | 249 | | | |
| C ₃ | Between Groups | 29.930 | 3 | 9.977 | 1.141 | 0.333 |
| | Within Groups | 2150.394 | 246 | 8.741 | | |
| | Total | 2180.324 | 249 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------|-----|--------|-------|-------|
| C ₄ | Between Groups | 14.718 | 3 | 4.906 | 0.674 | 0.569 |
| | Within Groups | 1790.118 | 246 | 7.277 | | |
| | Total | 1804.836 | 249 | | | |
| C ₅ | Between Groups | 31.073 | 3 | 10.358 | 1.291 | 0.278 |
| | Within Groups | 1973.743 | 246 | 8.023 | | |
| | Total | 2004.816 | 249 | | | |
| C ₆ | Between Groups | 3.383 | 3 | 1.128 | 0.149 | 0.930 |
| | Within Groups | 1864.201 | 246 | 7.578 | | |
| | Total | 1867.584 | 249 | | | |
| C ₇ | Between Groups | 41.859 | 3 | 13.953 | 1.826 | 0.143 |
| | Within Groups | 1879.265 | 246 | 7.639 | | |
| | Total | 1921.124 | 249 | | | |
| C ₈ | Between Groups | 8.736 | 3 | 2.912 | 0.399 | 0.754 |
| | Within Groups | 1795.860 | 246 | 7.300 | | |
| | Total | 1804.596 | 249 | | | |
| C ₉ | Between Groups | 24.557 | 3 | 8.186 | 1.158 | 0.327 |
| | Within Groups | 1739.479 | 246 | 7.071 | | |
| | Total | 1764.036 | 249 | | | |
| C ₁₀ | Between Groups | 12.976 | 3 | 4.325 | 0.560 | 0.642 |
| | Within Groups | 1898.500 | 246 | 7.717 | | |
| | Total | 1911.476 | 249 | | | |

It is obvious from the above analysis that freshers are more attracted towards rewards and recognition and they are more conscious about scope for career growth. Whereas comparatively experiences teachers expect higher salary and Leave plans. They are more satisfied if job security is provided to them. The above Table shows variables with teaching experience p value at 0.05 level of significant shows that all the obtained values are greater than 0.05 hence there is no significant difference between these variables and teaching experiences, as far as mean values are compared, teacher having experience between 15-25 expect more salary leave pay, job security, interactive & well behaved students where as “Rewards & Recognition” and “Scope for career growth” are were preferred by teachers having experiences of 2-5 years. These variables (Rewards & Recognition, Scope for career growth) play an important role to make a person satisfied. As these variables also create healthy family relationship, social recognition and recreational work for making a teacher to be satisfied with their job.

Conclusion

Faculty of Public Sector University perceives that educational qualification was concerned; all groups were similar in their attitude indicating thereby that there was no

difference of these variables on the basis of qualification. As far as mean values are compared with different level of qualification of teachers, higher qualified teachers prefer more job security, promotions, scope for career growth, leave plans. Higher qualified teacher's expectations are sky-scraping. There exists job satisfaction and self esteem. The employees are committed towards their duties and sufficient promotional opportunities are provided to deserving employees. Public university also provides maximum facilities to conduct research work as well as to perform other activities concerned with academics.

References

- Abel, M.H. and Sewell, J. (1999), *"Stress and Burnout in Rural and Urban Secondary School Teachers"*, The Journal of Education Research, Vol. 92(5), pp. 287-293.
- Almalki M, Fitzgerald G, Clark M (2011), *"The Healthcare System in Saudi Arabia: An Overview"*, Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal 2011, Vol.17 (10), pp.784–793.
- Anitha, Rao S (1998), *"Quality of Work Life in Commercial Banks"*, Discovery Publication House, New Delhi.

- Ayesha Tabassum (2012), *"Interrelations between Quality of Work Life Dimensions and Faculty Members Job satisfaction in the Private Universities of Bangladesh"*, European Journal of Business and Management, Vol.4 (2), pp.78-79.
- 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), pp.68-84.
- Blix, G.A. and Lee, J.W. (1994), *"Occupational Stress among University Teachers"*, Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 36(2), pp. 157-159.
- Bragard, L. G. Dupuis D, Razavi C. Reynaert and A.M. Etienne (2012), *"Quality of Work Life in Doctors Working with Cancer Patients Occupational Medicine (London)"*, Vol.62 (1), pp. 34-40.
- Brown, F. (1972), *"Need Satisfaction of Educational Administrators"*, American Educational Research Association, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED pp.561-584.
- Chander, Subash and Singh, Parampal (1983), *"Quality of Work Life in a University: An Empirical Investigation"*, Management and Labour Studies, Vol.18 (2), pp. 97-101.
- Chandramohan A (2008), *Human Resource Management*, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
- Cunningham, W.G. (1983), *"Teacher Burnout-Solutions for the 1980s"*, The Urban Review, Vol. 15, pp. 37-51.
- De Nitish R (1984), *"Towards and Appreciation of Quality of Work life and Quality of Work"*, Economic and Political Weekly Vol.19 (20), pp. 46.
- Dick, R.V. and Wagner, U. (2000), *"Stress and Strain in Teaching: A Structural Equation Approach"* Journal of Organizational Behaviour, Vol. 18(3), pp. 146-165.
- Drago, R.,Caplan, R. and Lynn, R.(2005), *"New Estimates of Working Time Elementary School Teachers"*, Monthly Labour Review, April, pp.24-32.
- Eaton, A.E., Gordon, M.E., and Keefe, J.H. (1992), *"The Impact of Quality of Work Life Programs and Grievances System Effectiveness on Union Commitment"*, International and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 45(3), pp. 591-603.
- Ellis and Pompli (2002), *"Quality of Working Life for Nurses"*, Commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing. Canberra.
- Evans, V., Ramsey, J., Johnson, D. and Renwick, D. (1986), *"Analysis of the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Stress Factors of Physical Education Teachers"*, Educational Research, Vol. 36(6), pp.17-22.
- Fattah, S. (2010), *"Longitudinal Effects of Pay Increase on Teachers' Job Satisfaction-A Motivational Perspective"* Journal of International Social Research, Vol. 3(10), pp. 12-20.
- Friedman, I.A. (1991), *"High and Low Burnout Schools-School Culture Aspects of Teachers Burnout"*, Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 84(6), pp. 325-333.
- Gallie, Duncan, (2003), *"The Quality of Working Life: Is Scandinavia Different"*, Oxford Journal, Vol.19, pp. 61-79.
- Gilgeous, V., (1998), *"Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life"*, Integrated Manufacturing System", Vol. 9(3), pp.173-181.
- 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).
- Rudd, W.G.A. and Wiseman, S. (1962), *"Sources of Disaster among a Group of Teachers"*, British Journal of Eco-Psychology, Vol. 32 (8), pp. 275-291.
- Schulze, S. and Pauline, M.T. (2009), *"The factors that Promote the level of Job Satisfaction among school educators: An education Management Perspective"*, Education Development, Vol. 15(2), pp.141-153.
- Sirgy J (2001), *"Quality of Life Research: An Ethical Marketing Perspective"*, Kluwer Academic publishers, The Netherlands.
- 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), pp. 189-212.
- Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher (1984), *"QWL: New Working Relationships in the Communication Industry"*, Labor Studies Journal, Vol. 9, pp. 261-274.
- SubaRao P. and Anitha (1991), *Strees Management* in V.S.P Rao and Srilatha, *Organisation strees*, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi, pp.263.
- Sweeney, P. (1981), *"Human Needs and Job satisfaction"*,

Professional Journal, Vol. 32(1), pp. 42-55.

Thurman (1977), "*Job satisfaction: An International Overview*", International Labour Review, Vol. 117 (3), pp. 249.

Walton (1982), "*International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life*", Productivity, Vol. 22 (4), pp. 79-83.

Zembylas, M. and Papanastarian, E. (2004), "*Teacher Job Satisfaction in Cyprus: The Results of a Mixed-Methods Approach*", Educational Research and Evaluation, Vol. 13(2), pp. 305-331.

WEBSITES

ficci.com/sector/11/project_docs/ficci_sector_profile_education.pdf

hrcouncil.ca/hr_toolkit/compensation.cfm

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/education_in_punjab_india

<http://ebookbrowse.net/na/naresh=malhotra-a-marketing-research>.

link.springer.com/article/10.1007/510869-009-9139-page1.

www.dpipunjab.org.

www.emeraldinsight.com

www.gndu.ac.in