

A Comparative Study of QWL among University Teachers in Madhya Pradesh

¹Dr Mukesh Chansoriya & ²Hemant Kayshap

¹Prof. & Director, Lakshmi Narian College of Technology-MBA, Bhopal (India)

²Research Scholar, Lakshmi Narian College of Technology-MBA, Bhopal (India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 13 March 2019

Keywords

Compensation, Job Satisfaction,
Motivation, Quality of work life,
University, Work load.

ABSTRACT

It is utmost important to retain competent employees for the success of every organization. Mere use of money, technology and infrastructure could not 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 what factors affect quality of work life of faculty members working in public and private sector universities in Madhya Pradesh. Data were collected from total six universities of Madhya Pradesh 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. As far as comparative study is concerned; factors which motivates to both sector's employees 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 both sectors are; too much workload, conduct of top management, long travelling hours and internal politics. Although vast literature exists about quality of work life in different sectors but, yet, hardly very few studies have been conducted in India to investigate QWL in higher education sector particularly in Madhya Pradesh. Present study adds to the literature by scour into this aspect in Indian higher education sector.

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 high quality of work life, while who are not satisfied with their job have a low 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 utmost important to retain competent employees. Mere use of money, technology and infrastructure could not 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 do not create satisfaction but absence of these definitely create dissatisfaction (Herzberg 1923). Due to changes in work environment i.e. technological, 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 rise 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; factors which motivates both sector's employees to work efficiently are salary & rewards, better leave plans, reasonable working hours and opportunities for promotion.

Employees often experts various quality requirement 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 programs of quality of work life stay feasible grow, engage, infuse the culture of the organization and create long term benefits and success. The experiences cross nation sufficiently reveal that development in quality of work life has exact scope and potential in civilizing 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).

Review of Literature

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 universities 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). 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).

NEED AND AIM OF STUDY

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

METHODOLOGY

The present study is based on primary data and secondary data. In this research, primary data is collected from faculty members of government and private universities of Madhya Pradesh, with the help of questionnaire. The questionnaire is developed for the respondents and it is specifically based upon the objectives of this study. The secondary data have also been collected from journals, books and various committees such as Yash Pal Committee report 2009, CSO (2008) Statistical Abstracts of Madhya Pradesh. Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of random 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, to which 510 questionnaires received back. Each of the responses received had been screened for errors or incomplete responses. However, responses that had more than 25% of the questions in the survey questionnaire left unanswered that had been discarded from data analysis. After the screening process carried out, only 500 (250 from each sector) responses have been considered complete and valid for data analysis. Keeping

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, 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; questionnaires were revised and sent for final survey. All the questions were close ended. Factor analysis was used to analyze the data.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

These were in general; reflecting perception of faculty members of Public and Private Universities in Madhya Pradesh. The 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 is applied to summarize the data into less and meaningful factors relevant to the sample.

PERCEPTION OF GOVERNMENT UNIVERSITY TEACHERS –A FACTOR ANALYSIS APPROACH

Data were examined for its suitability for factor analysis. Reliability is measured by using Cronbach's Alpha. Cronbach's Alpha ranges from 0 to 1. The Cronbach's Alpha of likert scaled items in the questionnaire was 0.732 which is deemed to be good. This was done by computing the correlation matrix which was depicted enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Correlation matrix was computed which depicted that there were enough correlations to carry out factor analysis. Community 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.

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 I. Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Public Sector University

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem	F ₃	Good Relationship with co-workers	0.639	4.88	7.96	7.96
		F12	Faculty members have friendly relations with each other	0.669			
		F13	Fellow colleagues are ready	0.708			
		F16	I feel satisfied after performing my work	0.584			
2	Effect Recognition and Career Progression	F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.577	2.56	7.30	15.27
		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			
		F10	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.515			
		F24	All the faculty member generally	0.695			

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
			support all the members of the universities				
3	Employee loyalty and Growth	F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the	0.584			

		F15	university On the basis of my own standards, I am satisfied with personal development	0.510			
		F28	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.787	1.87	6.03	21.30
		F29	All the members are generally committed to their work	0.587			
4	Quality on Work Place	F20	I feel that my university provides maximum facilities for doing my work properly	0.688	1.70	4.92	26.22
		F17	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.515			
5	Conducive Environment	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at the university	0.725	1.52	4.89	31.12
		F22	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.579			
6	Lower Self Esteem	F18	There are many political problems in this University	0.816	1.47	4.82	35.94
		F27	Most of my	0.574			

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
			activities are routine and boring				
7	Employee Development	F21	I am developing new skills and abilities at work	0.704	1.41	4.67	40.62
		F34	My superior always allows to attend	0.558			

			refresher courses and conferences				
8	Work load other than teaching	F32 F33	I feel too much burdened for research work. My university organizes FD for the up gradation of faculty	0.582 0.815	1.30	4.48	45.10
9	Rationality	F11 F25	Favoritism does not play any part in the institution of work Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work	0.754 0.511	1.18	4.46	49.57
10	Organizational satisfaction	F ₂ F14	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	1.15	4.30	53.88
11	Organizational communication and economic benefit	F ₁ F23	There is a reasonable periodical increase in salary There is an active low of ideas	0.795 0.501	1.08	4.26	58.15

Factor Number	Name of Dimension	Label	Statement	Factor loadings	Eigen Values	% of Variance	% of Cumulative Variance
12	Critical factors	F19 F26	Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization. Employer overdrive the employees	0.586 0.701	1.01	4.20	42.35

KMO 0.715

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.

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.

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, "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).

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.

FACTOR 6: LOWER SELF ESTEEM

Factor 6 enlists negative statements which lead to low 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. These statements create extra burden other than teaching on university faculty.

FACTOR 9: RATIONALITY

Factor 9 enlists favorable 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, "Favoritism 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 features 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 variance for 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 position 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 II. Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation- Private Sector University

Factor Number	Name of Dimensions	Label	Statement	Factor loading	Eigen Values	% of variance	% of Cumulative variance
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem	F ₃	Good relationship with co-workers	0.561	5.93	8.94	8.94
		F12	Friendly relations with each other	0.742			
		F13	Fellow colleagues ready to help in distress	0.686			
		F15	Feeling of success	0.702			
		F14	Superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions	0.583			
		F16	I feel satisfied after reforming my work	0.526			
2	Effort Recognition and Organizational Communication	F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.512	3.05	7.90	16.84
		F21	I am developing my skills and abilities at work	0.572			
		F23	There is an active flow of ideas	0.580			
		F24	Co-workers support each other	0.626			
		F25	Faculty members are given recognition for their work	0.800			
3	Quality on Job Freedom	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at university	0.651	2.22	7.39	24.24
		F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.588			
		F ₈	Support from top level management	0.703			
4	Employee loyalty and Growth	F ₁	There is reasonable periodical increase in my salary	0.559			

Factor Number	Name of Dimensions	Label	Statement	Factor loading	Eigen Values	% of variance	% of Cumulative variance
		F28	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.850	2.17	6.37	30.61
		F29	All members generally	0.769			

			committed to their work				
5	Work load other than Teaching	F32	I am too much burdened for research work	0.672	1.83	6.32	36.94
		F33	My university organizes FDP from up gradation of faculty	0.730			
		F34	Support to attend conferences and refresher courses	0.703			
6	Lower Self Esteem	F18	There are many political problems in this university	0.766	1.68	5.83	42.78
		F27	Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.677			
7	Work Pressure	F19	I am ready to join if same type of job under same terms and conditions in a different organization.	0.837	1.52	5.42	48.20
		F30	I have no time to pursue my area of interest	0.511			
8	Opportunity of Growth	F10	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.585	1.38	5.00	53.20
		F22	I do not feel under pressure from anybody in carrying out my duties	0.835			
9	Critical Factors	F26	Employer overdrive the employees	0.538	1.28	4.78	57.98
		F31	I have to do too much clerical work	0.583			
10	Rationality	F4	There is rational performance and appraisal system.	0.528			

Factor Number	Name of Dimensions	Label	Statement	Factor loading	Eigen Values	% of variance	% of Cumulative Variance
		F11	Favoritism do not ply and part in the institutions	0.836	1.05	4.77	62.77
11	Quality of Work (Independent Factor)	F17	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.785	1.02	4.20	66.97

12	Organizational satisfactions	F ₂	Job security exists at my university	0.713	1.01	4.15	71.13
		F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.671			

KMO=0.630

FACTOR 1: JOB SATISFACTION AND SELF ESTEEM

The first factor explains 8.949% of the total variance with 6 statements. 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).

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).

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 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. Due to work pressure in private universities; employees are ready to join the same position in some other organization.

FACTOR 8: OPPORTUNITY OF GROWTH

The 8th factor explains 5.002% of variance with 2 statements. 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).

FACTOR 10: RATIONALITY

This factor explains 4.780% of the total variance with 2 statements. 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 4.20% of the total variance with only one statement F₁₇, "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.

FACTOR 12: ORGANIZATIONAL SATISFACTION

The 12th factor explains 4.156% of the total variance with 2 statements the statement F₂₁ "Job security exists in my university" (0.713) followed by F₅, "Effective promotional opportunities exist in my university" (0.671). 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 UNIVERSITY

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 F₈ 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 F₁₀ 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 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

1. Kaur “Quality of work life, National foundation of Indian Engineers”, 2012.
2. Tabassum, “Interrelations between Quality of Work Life Dimensions and Faculty Members Job satisfaction in the Private Universities of Bangladesh”, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 4 (2), 2012, 78-79.
3. Bhanugopal, Ramudu Alan and Fish, “The Impact of Business Crime on Expatriate Quality of Work-Life in Papua New Guinea”, *Australian Human Resources Institute*, 46(1), 2008, 68–84.
4. Kaur, *Education in Madhya Pradesh (A Historical Study)*, (Intellectual Publishing House: New Delhi, 1992).
5. N. Al-Enezi, R.I. Chowdhury, M.A. Shah and M. Al-Otobi, “Job Satisfaction of Nurses with Multicultural Backgrounds: A Questionnaire Survey in Kuwait”, *Applied Nurses Research*, 22 (2), 2009, 94–100.
6. S. Fattah, “Longitudinal Effects of Pay Increase on Teachers' Job Satisfaction-A Motivational Perspective” *Journal of International Social Research*, 3(10), 2010, 12-20.