Impact of Quality of Worklife of Faculty in Select Engineering Colleges With Reference to Coimbatore District

KEYWORDS

S.KRISHNARAJ	DR. A. RAMACHANDRAN
Dr.N.G.P.Arts and Science College	DIRECTOR SNR INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES SNR SONS COLLEGE COIMBATORE

INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Quality of work life is the level of happiness or dissatisfaction with one's career. Employers have started concentrating on providing best work environment to its employees to get the best results. A good quality of work life reduces absenteeism, accidents & attrition. Quality of work life is useful to improve production, organizational effectiveness, morale of employees and the economic development of the country. QWL has been defined as "The quality of relationship between the employees and the total working environment". Quality of Work Life is the essential concept of favourable situations in a working environment. A better Quality of Work Life improves the growth of the employees along with the organization's growth (**Pugalendhi, Subburethina, Umaselvi, Nakkeeran, Senthil 2011)**[1]. **GunaSeelan & Maimunah 2008** defines QWL as "The effectiveness of work environment that transmit to the meaningful organizational and personal needs in shaping the values of the employees that support and promote better health and well-being, job security, job satisfaction, competency development and balance between work and non-work life." Quality of work life has also been defined as "A philosophy or a set of principles, which holds that people are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making a valuable contribution to their organization. It also involves treating people with respect." **(Farideh, 2012)**[2]

The initial step taken was the origin of the Quality of Work Life Legislation enacted in the early 20th century to protect employees from job-injury and to eliminate hazardous working conditions. This was followed by the unionization movement in the 1930s and 1940s. Emphasis was given to job security at the work place and economic gains for the workers. The 1950s and 1960s saw the development of different theories by psychologists proposing a "positive relationship between morale and productivity", and the possibility that improved human relations that would lead to the enhancement of both. Attempts at reform to acquire equal employment opportunity and job enrichment schemes were also were introduced. Finally, in the 1970s the ideal of QWL was conceived which, according to Walton, is broader than the earlier developments and is something that must include ' the values that were at the heart of the earlier reform movements' and 'human needs and aspirations'.

The term "Quality of Work Life" appeared in Research Journals and the press in USA only in 1970s. The term quality of work life was introduced by Louis Davis[3]. The first International QWL conference was held in Toronto in 1972. The international council for quality of work life was established in 1972. From 1980 onwards QWL was increasingly placed on employee - centered productivity programs. From the mid 1990s till date organizations are faced with challenges of economizing and corporate restructuring. QWL is reemerging where employees are seeking out more meaning. Rising educational levels and occupational aspirations in today's slow economic growth and reduced opportunities for advancement, are rising concerns for QWL and for career and personal life planning.

ABOUT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

An **Educational Institution** is a place where people of different ages gain an education, including preschools, childcare, elementary schools, colleges and universities.

The following are the types of Educational Institutions

1 Early childhood

2 Primary

3 Secondary

4 Further and higher education

Further and higher education
- Career college
- Community college
- Junior college
- Liberal arts college
- Madrasah
- Residential college
- Sixth form college
- Technical college or Institute of Technology
- University college
- Institute of technology (Polytechnic)

University
- Corporate university
- International university
- Local university
- Jamiah
- Medieval university

- Nizamiyya

- Private university

- Public university

- University of the Third Age

- Urban university

- Vocational university

Historical Perspective of Teaching in India

The entire Indian social organization since ancient times is planned on the principle that it should, in all its classes, ranks, and grades, offer the best scope for the development of the individual as its center and chief concern. Nowhere is this distinctive tendency more manifest than in the sphere of education and learning. It is the physical, mental, emotional, spiritual and social elevation of the individual which is necessarily the epicenter of the whole education system in India.

Since ancient times, education therefore, has also been necessarily individual. It has always upheld an intimate relationship between teacher and the taught. An erudite teacher edified his pupil and according to Shatpat Brahman, held his student "within him as in a womb, impregnates him with his spirit, and delivers him in a new birth". Such a pupil then became a 'dvija' or 'twice born' in a new existence.

A teacher who converted him into a human-being from a simple creature thus possessed a venerable place in the society. Such teachers were expected to possess piety, religiousness, illuminated vision, high character, self-confidence, and sound judgment, awareness of his social duties, efficiency and self-restraint. But how were these teachers trained and educated to imbibe these qualities in themselves and in their students. Before the introduction of English education in India, there were no direct evidences of teachers' education in ancient or medieval India.

Yet, considering the high ideals and standards of educational system during these periods, it is difficult to accept that a teacher was thus appointed without any kind of basic training or education to improve the physical facilities of training colleges. Valuable recommendations, conferences and refresher courses have been suggested for those teachers who were already in service in order to raise the standard of school teachers. As a result, refreshes courses for teachers began to be organized, education departments were established in some universities and research degrees in Education was started.

Present Situation in Teaching

For various reasons inside and outside a college, there is no scope for self-discipline and character building. So the students cannot form good habits, and after reading a few books they pass the examinations and become teachers outright. Once they become teachers, they think themselves all perfect and forget that, in order to be perfect teachers they should do lifelong study and self-discipline. So, students cannot find an ideal teacher before them and consequently become wild and wayward. So, it is natural that the modern teachers have no influence on their students and the modern students have no appreciation for their teachers.

STATEMENT OF THE Problem

Quality of Work Life leading to career growth and self improvement of faculty is a real phenomenon and it is associated with job involvement and satisfaction level of employees universally. In this case, faculty members working in Engineering Colleges in Coimbatore District is considered for the study. There are many factors leading to the respondents to underperform in situations. Some important factors associated with their quality of work life is work environment, familial management, personal management, welfare and training and finally, pay and benefits, which is also classified as dimensions leading to quality of worklife among faculty working in select engineering colleges in Coimbatore District. Theoretically, considering these factors having association with each other then there is a definite recuperation that can be achieved both by institution and faculty. Hence, this study is an attempt to understand the QWL among the faculty working in select Engineering Colleges.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the major objectives of the present study:

- To analyse the Quality of work life of faculty in select engineering colleges in Coimbatore city.

- To assess the demographic factors influencing the work life of the faculty members.

- To analyse the dimensions of quality of work life and its significant effect on faculty of engineering colleges.

- To contribute suggestions to improve the quality of work & life of the faculty.

Methodology

This study attempts to describe the various characteristics related to QWL teaching environment, and to find out the association between the selected socio-economic variables and the various dimensions of QWL. Hence descriptive and diagnostic research design has been adopted as defined by Kothari C.R. (2007) Descriptive research studies are concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual, or a group, whereas diagnostic research studies determine the association between the variables. . In this study the researcher has chosen the teaching professionals of select engineering colleges in Coimbatore, Tamilnadu, India, affiliated to Anna University, to find out the quality of work life. The universe of the study includes 15 colleges located within the city limit and 3007 faculty were working during January to September 2014. The researcher used disproportionate stratified random sampling method to select a sample of 275 respondents from the universe. The researcher used a standard questionnaire as a primary tool for data collection. The questionnaire focuses on 5 dimensions are namely, working environment, familial management, personal management, welfare & training and pay and benefits. The first part of the questionnaire deals with the socio-economic characteristics and the second part deals with various dimensions of quality of work life among teaching faculty in the Engineering colleges affiliated to Anna University.

STATISTICAL TOOLS USED

The following are the statistical tools used in this project to arrive at specific results

- ➢ Simple Percentage Method

- ➢ M ultiple Correlation

- ➢ One-Way Anova

- ➢ Garrett Ranking Method

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

One cannot judge an individual to be always consistent. Some respondents were hesitant to answer the questions. The respondents took a long time to fill up the questionnaire.

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS
Table 1 : Age of the Respondents

Age	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Below 25	138	50
26 to 35	27	10
36 to 45	62	23
46 to 55	29	11
Above 55	19	7
Total	275	100

The above table shows that half (50%) of the respondents belong to the age below 25 years, 23% of the respondents belong to the age between 36 and 45 years, 11% of the respondents belong to the age from 46 to 55 years, 10% of the respondents belong to the age from 26 to 35 years and the remaining 7% of the respondents belong to the age above 55 years.

Table 2 : Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Male	82	30
Female	193	70
Total	275	100

It is clear that a majority (70%) of the respondents are female and 30% of the respondents are male.

Table 3 : Educational Qualification of the Respondents

Educational Qualification	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Post Graduate	105	38
M.Phil.	110	40
Ph.D.,	60	22
Total	275	100

It is understood that maximum (40%) of the respondents have qualified with Master of Philosophy, 38% of the respondents are post graduates and the remaining 22% of the respondents are doctorates.

Table 4 : Experience of the Respondents

Experience	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Below 5 years	74	27
6 to 10 years	83	30
11 to 15 years	46	17
16 to 20 years	34	12
Above 20 years	38	14
Total	275	100

The above table shows that maximum (30%) of the respondents have experience between 6 and 10 years, 27% of the respondents have experience below 5 years, 17% of the respondents have experience between 11 and 15 years, 14% of the respondents have experience above 20 years and the remaining 12% of the respondents have experience from 12 to 20 years.

Table 5 : Monthly Income of the Respondents

Monthly Income	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Below Rs.30000	60	22
Rs.30000 to 40000	82	30
Rs.40000 to 50000	44	16
Above Rs.50000	89	32
Total	275	100

The above table reveals that most (32%) of the respondents have monthly income above Rs.50000, 30% of the respondents monthly income is from Rs.30000 to 40000, 22% of the respondents monthly income is below Rs.30000 and the remaining 16% of the respondents' monthly income is between Rs.40000 and 50000.

Table 6 : Multiple Correlation based on attributes leading to quality of work life of faculty working in select engineering colleges

Factors		Work Environment	Familial Management	Personal Management	Welfare and Training	Pay and Benefits
Work Environment	Pearson Correlation	1	.018	.023	-.052	.104
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.771	.705	.387	.084
	N	275	275	275	275	275
Familial Management	Pearson Correlation	.018	1	.473(**)	-.002	.195(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.771	.	.000	.975	.001
	N	275	275	275	275	275
Personal Management	Pearson Correlation	.023	.473(**)	1	.052	.200(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.705	.000	.	.391	.001
	N	275	275	275	275	275
Welfare and Training	Pearson Correlation	-.052	-.002	.052	1	.227(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.387	.975	.391	.	.000
	N	275	275	275	275	275
Pay and Benefits	Pearson Correlation	.104	.195(**)	.200(**)	.227(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.084	.001	.001	.000	.
	N	275	275	275	275	275

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

X1: Working Environment

X2: Familial Management

X3: Personal Management

X4: Welfare and Training

X5: Pay and Benefits

The correlation based on the quality of work life among faculty working in Engineering Colleges in Coimbatore with the dimensions namely, work environment, personal management, familial management, welfare and training and pay and benefits.

There is a significant positive correlation towards quality of work life among faculty working in Engineering Colleges in Coimbatore. The level of significance at 1% level between the factors namely, Personal Management and Familial Management (r=0.473, sig. 0.000), Familial Management & Pay and Benefits, (r=0.195, Sig.0.001), Personal Management and Pay and Benefits (r=0.200, Sig.0.001), Welfare and Training and Pay and Benefits (r=0.227, Sig. 0.001).

To sum up, it is inferred that the pay and benefits has significant correlation with the other dimensions and there is significant positive correlation found among familial and personal management that leads to quality of work life among the faculty working in Engineering Colleges in Coimbatore.

ANOVA

H_0 : There is no significant analysis of Variance between Age of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

H_1 : There is significant analysis of Variance between Age of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

Table 7 : Analysis of Variance between Age of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

QWL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Environment	Between Groups	32.881	4	8.220	2.016*	.092
	Within Groups	1100.755	270	4.077		
	Total	1133.636	274			
Familial Management	Between Groups	35.264	4	8.816	2.218*	.067
	Within Groups	1073.281	270	3.975		
	Total	1108.545	274			
Personal Management	Between Groups	52.397	4	13.099	2.126*	.078
	Within Groups	1663.603	270	6.161		
	Total	1716.000	274			
Welfare and Training	Between Groups	37.813	4	9.453	1.637	.165
	Within Groups	1559.183	270	5.775		
	Total	1596.996	274			
Pay and Benefits	Between Groups	34.875	4	8.719	1.726	.144
	Within Groups	1363.612	270	5.050		
	Total	1398.487	274			

* Significant @ 10% level

The above table shows that,

✓ There is no significant difference between age of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life such as Welfare and Training F=1.637, Sig.0.165 and Pay and Benefits F=1.726, Sig.0.144 is not significant and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

✓ There is significant difference between age of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life such as namely, Work Environment, (F=2.016, Sig. 0.092), Familial Management, (F=2.218, Sig.0..067), and finally, Personal Management, (F=2.126, Sig..078) is significant @ 10% level and hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

H_0 : There is no significant analysis of Variance between Educational Qualification of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

H_1 : There is significant analysis of Variance between Educational Qualification of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

Table 8 : Analysis of Variance between Educational Qualification of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

QWL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Environment	Between Groups	15.925	2	7.963	1.938	.146
	Within Groups	1117.711	272	4.109		
	Total	1133.636	274			
Familial Management	Between Groups	40.461	2	20.230	5.152**	.006
	Within Groups	1068.085	272	3.927		
	Total	1108.545	274			
Personal Management	Between Groups	9.495	2	4.747	.757	.470
	Within Groups	1706.505	272	6.274		
	Total	1716.000	274			
Welfare and Training	Between Groups	17.471	2	8.735	1.504	.224
	Within Groups	1579.526	272	5.807		
	Total	1596.996	274			
Pay and Benefits	Between Groups	10.238	2	5.119	1.003	.368
	Within Groups	1388.249	272	5.104		
	Total	1398.487	274			

** Significant @ 5% level

The above table shows that,

✓ There is no significant difference between educational qualification of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life such as Work Environment, (F=1.938, Sig.0.146), Personal Management, (F=0.757, Sig.0.470), Welfare and Training (F=1.504, Sig.0.224) and Pay and Benefits (F=1.003, Sig.0.368) is not significant and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

✓ There is significant difference between educational qualification of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life with regards to Familial Management, (F=5.152, Sig.0.006) is significant @ 5% level and hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

H_0 : There is no significant analysis of Variance between Experience of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

H_1 : There is significant analysis of Variance between Experience of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

Table 9 : Analysis of Variance between Experience of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

QWL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Environment	Between Groups	16.920	4	4.230	1.023	.396
	Within Groups	1116.716	270	4.136		
	Total	1133.636	274			
Familial Management	Between Groups	24.774	4	6.194	1.543	.190
	Within Groups	1083.771	270	4.014		
	Total	1108.545	274			
Personal Management	Between Groups	50.967	4	12.742	2.066*	.086
	Within Groups	1665.033	270	6.167		
	Total	1716.000	274			
Welfare and Training	Between Groups	31.930	4	7.982	1.377	.242
	Within Groups	1565.067	270	5.797		
	Total	1596.996	274			
Pay and Benefits	Between Groups	55.792	4	13.948	2.805**	.026
	Within Groups	1342.695	270	4.973		
	Total	1398.487	274			

** Significant @ 5% level
* Significant @ 10% level

The above table shows that,

✓ There is no significant difference between experience of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life towards Work Environment, (F=1.023, Sig.0.396), Familial Management, (F=1.543, Sig.0.190) and finally, Welfare and Training, (F=1.377, Sig.0.424) is not significant and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

✓ There is significant difference between experience of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life with regards to Personal Management, (F=2.066, Sig.0.086) is significant at 10% level and Pay and Benefits (F=2.805, Sig.0.026) is significant @ 5% level and hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

H_0 : There is no significant analysis of Variance between monthly income of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

H_1 : There is significant analysis of Variance between monthly income of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

Table 10 Analysis of Variance between monthly income of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life

QWL		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Environment	Between Groups	16.734	3	5.578	1.353	.257
	Within Groups	1116.902	271	4.121		
	Total	1133.636	274			
Familial Management	Between Groups	9.777	3	3.259	.804	.493
	Within Groups	1098.768	271	4.054		
	Total	1108.545	274			
Personal Management	Between Groups	11.820	3	3.940	.627	.598
	Within Groups	1704.180	271	6.288		
	Total	1716.000	274			
Welfare and Training	Between Groups	12.914	3	4.305	.736	.531
	Within Groups	1584.083	271	5.845		
	Total	1596.996	274			
Pay and Benefits	Between Groups	38.645	3	12.882	2.567**	.050
	Within Groups	1359.842	271	5.018		
	Total	1398.487	274			

** Significant @ 5% level

The above table shows that,

✓ There is no significant difference between monthly income of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life towards Work Environment, (F=1.353, Sig.0.257), Familial Management, (F=0.804, Sig.0.493) Personal Management, (F=0.627, Sig.0.598) and finally, Welfare and Training (F=0.736, Sig.0.531) is not significant and hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

✓ There is significant difference between monthly income of the faculty members and attributes measuring quality of work life with regards to Pay and Benefits (F=2.567, Sig.0.050) is significant @ 5% level and hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

To sum-up,
There is significant difference between age and attributes measuring quality of work life such as Work Environment, Familial Management and Personal Management is significant @ 10% level, while significant difference between educational qualification and Familial Management is significant @ 5% level, there is significant difference between educational qualification and Personal Management is significant at 10% level, while experience and Pay and Ben-

efits is significant @ 5% level and finally, there is significant difference between monthly income and Pay and Benefits is significant @ 5% level. Therefore it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

GARRETT RANKING

Table 11 : Garrett Ranking towards Achievement of Quality of Work Life

Attributes	Rank-1	Rank-2	Rank-3	Rank-4	Rank-5	Rank-6
Working Environment	35	35	107	18	28	52
Physical Wellbeing	26	40	42	31	56	80
Psychological Wellbeing	76	62	13	7	67	50
Career Opportunities & Growth	111	97	36	2	22	7
Grievance Handling	7	29	58	65	49	67
Work Life Balance	20	12	19	152	53	19

Table 12: Garrett Ranking towards Achievement of Quality of Work Life

Attributes	Garrett Score	Garrett Mean	Rank
Working Environment	13342	48.52	3
Physical Wellbeing	11446	41.62	4
Psychological Wellbeing	14257	51.84	2
Career Opportunities & Growth	17625	64.09	1
Grievance Handling	10412	37.86	5
Work Life Balance	9368	34.07	6

Source : Computed from Primary Data
Interpretation
The above table shows that the ranking of the respondents stated that the achievement of quality of work life based on the attributes in which the respondents rated highly (64.09) towards Career Opportunities and Growth which achieved the 1st position, followed by the second position (51.84) was achieved towards psychological wellbeing, 3rd position (48.52) towards working environment provided by the institution, 4th position was towards physical wellbeing, 5th position (37.86) was achieved towards the Grievance Handling and finally, the sixth (34.07) was achieved towards Work life Balance.

The ranking towards achievement of quality of work life based on the attributes in which the respondents rated highly (64.09) towards Career Opportunities and Growth and finally, the sixth (34.07) was achieved towards Work life Balance.

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS
▪ It is understood that half (50%) of the respondents belong to the age below 25 years, 23% of the respondents belong to the age between 36 and 45 years, majority (70%) of the respondents are female, maximum (40%) of the respondents have qualified with Master of Philosophy, maximum (30%) of the respondents have experience between 6 and 10 years. most (32%) of the respondents have monthly income above Rs.50000

▪ it is found that the pay and benefits has significant correlation with the other dimensions and there is significant positive correlation found among familial and personal management that leads to quality of work life among the faculty working in Engineering Colleges in Coimbatore.

▪ It is evident that there is significant difference between age and attributes measuring quality of work life such as Work Environment, Familial Management and Personal Management is significant @ 10% level, while significant difference between educational qualification and Familial Management is significant @ 5% level, there is significant difference between educational qualification and Personal Management is significant at 10% level, while educational qualification and Pay and Benefits is significant @ 5% level and finally, there is significant difference between monthly income and Pay and Benefits is significant @ 5% level. Therefore it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

▪ It is clear that the achievement of quality of work life based on the attributes in which the respondents rated highly towards Career Opportunities and Growth and finally, the least was achieved towards Work life Balance.

Few of the respondents have disagreed with the welfare and training provided by the institutions which shall be conducted effectively to improve the quality of work life and enhance the commitment of the faculty. Some of the faculty disagree that their institutions link their pay to the performance of the faculty members and it is suggested that the institutions shall get the feedback of the faculty to satisfy the benefits provided to the faculty. Few of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that the initiative towards career growth and development of the faculty does not satisfy the faculty which need to be improved by the management. It is suggested that to prove the model statistically and understand the path-wise significance of the study, structural equation modeling can be done which will help to prove each path and the level of regression of each path of the model.

CONCLUSION
The study concentrates the work environment, familial, personal management and welfare and training, pay and benefits that covers the quality of work life dimension. When considering all these dimensions, there is a significant correlation among three dimensions namely, familial, personal and welfare and training that has significant positive correlation with pay and benefits. Whereas, the correlation was found with familial and personal management that contributes towards the improvement of the quality of work life of their faculty based on understanding their needs, management shall consider the experience, strategic gaps in the institutions and take necessary steps to improve the quality of work life of the faculty. This will help the institution achieve greater heights in their growth and also help the faculty to improve themselves with a stable commitment.

REFERENCE
▪ Ali, Ashraf and Prabhu R. Quality of Work Life – Organizational Management 19 (3) October – December 2003, Page (22 –26) | | ▪ Arun Monappa , Industrial Relations, Ninth print (1995), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company Ltd., Quality Control – Tool for Worker Development, Page (351 to 355) | | ▪ Arun Monappa, Mirza S. Saiyadain, Personnel Management, Second edition (2000), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing company, New Delhi, Page (373 – 387) | | ▪ Aswathappa. K, Human Resource and Personnel Management, Second edition(2002), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company, New Delhi, Page (390,391,523) | | ▪ Biswajeet Pattanayak, Human Resource Management (2002), Prentice Hall of India Private Ltd., New Delhi, Page (248 -259) | | ▪ Biswajeet Pattanayak, Human Resource Management (2003), Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi, Page (249 – 258) | | ▪ Biswanath Ghosh, Human Resource Development and Management (2000), Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Page (26 -27) | | ▪ Black .L, and Forro D. Humor in the academic library : You must be joking! Or, how many academic librarians does it take to change a light bulb? College and Research Libraries 60 (2) March 1999, Page (65-72) | | ▪ C.B. Memoria, S.V. Gankar, Personnel Management Text and Cases, Twenty Second Edition (2002), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (599 – 604) | | ▪ C.S. Venkata Rathnam, B.K. Srivastava, Personnel Management and Human Resources, Eleventh reprint (1999), Page (236 – 239) | | ▪ Choudhury, Anuva and Giri, D.V. Quality of Work life : A study in NALCO – Excellence in Supervision 11 (2) March – April 1995, Page (37-44) | | ▪ Cohem, Susan G and others, Hierarchical construct of self-management leadership and its relationship to quality of work life and perceived work group effectiveness, Personnel Psychology 50 (2) 1997. | | ▪ David A. De Cengo & Stephan P. Robbins, Personnel/Human Resource Management (1999), Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, Page (8 – 9) | | ▪ De Nitish R, Towards and appreciation of quality of work life and quality of work, Economic and Political Weekly 19 (20) 1984, Page M-46. | | ▪ Edwin B. Flippo, Personnel Management, International edition(1984), Mc Graw – Hill International Editions, Management Series, Page (416,421) | | ▪ Farideh Haghshenas Kashani,A Review on Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational, Citizenship Behavior, J. Basic. Appl. Res., 2(9), 2012, 9523-9531 | | ▪ Gani .A and Ahamad, Riyaz, Correlates of Quality of Work Life - An analytical study, Indian Journal of Industrial Relations 31 (1) July 1995-96, Page (17) | | ▪ H.L. Kaila, S. Ravisankar, Sathish Pai, Managing Occupational Health in Service Industries (2001), Himalaya Publishing House. Infinite Books, New Delhi, Page (295) | | ▪ Ivanovic, MBA, Dictionary of Personnel Management, Reprint (2000), Universal Book Stall, New Delhi, Edited by P.H.Collin. | | ▪ J.H. Hartley and G.M. Stephenson, Successful Employee Relations, First edition (2000) | | | ▪ Kaushal, Shyam Lal, Quality of work life : Gate way to job satisfaction, International Journal of Management and Tourish 6(2) October – December 1997, Page (52 – 56) | | ▪ Kumar K, Pradeep and Ganesh, Quality of Work Life in small scale industries, SEDME 23 (4) December 1996. | | ▪ Kumar, H. and Shanubhogue A, Quality of worklife : An empirical approach, Manpower Journal 32 (3) October – December 1996, Page (17 – 24) | | ▪ Kumar, Satish, Gender issues and quality of work life : A case study of the formal lbour market in Delhi, Labour and Development 1 (1) 1995 Page (31) | | ▪ Lewis D., Brazil K., Krueger P., Lohfeld L. and Tjam E., Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life, Leadership in Health Services, 14(2), 9-15 (2001) | | ▪ Meyer J.P. and Herscovitch L., Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model, Human resource management review, 11(3), 299-326 (2001) | | ▪ Mirza S. Saiyadain, Human Resource Management (2003), Tata Mc Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, Page (359 – 389) | | ▪ Muraleedharan, K.P. and Krishnavani, S. Quality of Work Life in the SSI sector, SEDME 21 (3) Septemeber 1994, Page (53 – 57) | | ▪ Murali, Krishna P. and others, Quality of Work Life among women employees of Andra Bank, Indian Journal of Public Enterprise 12 (21) December 1996. | | ▪ Normala D. Investigating the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment amongst Employees in Malaysian Firms, International Journal of Business and Management, 5(10), 1121-1132 (2010) | | ▪ Pandiya, D. and others, Industrial democracy and Quality of Work Life : An empirical stury of its dimension in North Eastern | | ▪ Pugalendhi, Subburethina Bharathi and M, Umaselvi and Nakkeeran, Senthil, Quality of work life: Perception of College teachers , Indian journal of commerce & Management studies, 2(1) 2011. 47-65 | | ▪ Preethi vijaimadhavan, et.al. (2012), "An Empirical Study on relationship among Quality of work life and its factors" IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 12, Issue 3 (Jul. - Aug. 2013), PP 20-28 | | ▪ Coal Fields, Coal India Ltd., Marherita, Indian Journal of Public Enterprise 10 (18) June, Page(61 – 88) | | ▪ Sengupta, Palas R. and Sadique, Zafor, The effect of Quality of Work Life on group cohesiveness : An empirical analysis, Labour and Development 7 (2) 2001, Page (126) | | ▪ Sharma, Anuradha , Pandey P.N, Organizational Commitment and Quality of Work Life, Perception of Indian Managers, ABHIGYAN Summer 1995, Page (39 – 44) | | ▪ Shibata, Kenneth E and others, Mission of Quality, Community and Junior College Journal 55 (2) October 1984, Page (29) | | ▪ Srinivas R. Kandula, Human Resource Management in Practice (2003), Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, Page (129 – 130) | | ▪ Subba Rao. P, Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations, Text Cases and Games (2001), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (657 - 663) | | ▪ Subba Rao. P, Personnel and Human Resource Management Text and Cases (2002), Himalya Publishing House, Page (403 – 409) | | ▪ Subba Rao. P, VSP Rao, Personnel/Human Resource Management, Text, Cases and Games (2000), Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Page (482 – 506) | | ▪ Walton R.E., Quality of working life: what is it, Sloan Management Review, 15(1), 11-21(1973) |