

Impact of Quality of Work life on Overall Job Satisfaction Level and Motivational Level: A Study of Government Universities in Punjab

Dr. Kawaljit Kaur

Assistant Professor
P. G. Dept. of Commerce and Management
Khalsa College, Amritsar

Abstract

The present study is an endeavour to examine Quality of Work Life of faculty members of Government and Private Universities in Punjab. To identify the factors affecting quality of work life of university teachers and to study the impact of quality of work life on overall job satisfaction level and motivational level among teachers of universities. The universe of the study comprises of faculty members working in government universities of Punjab. Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of random sampling. Major findings of the study showed that public sector employees are motivated if supportive work environment is provided. They make positive choices and do not follow rat race. They want respect in their work and quality time. Public Sector University teachers were found to be satisfied with co-workers behaviour and job security.

Keywords: Work life, Job Satisfaction, Compensation, Extrinsic factors, Motivation, work environment.

Introduction

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. Thurman (1977) it is being recognized that achieving organizational goal is not only the responsibility of management or head of the organization; it is also the responsibility of subordinates of the company. The quality of work life re-emerged where the workers are looking for more sense where increasing levels of education and the occupational desires in current periods gradual growth in economic and decreased chances for the advancement, which naturally leads to the increasing concerns for the QWL and for the planning for the personal life and career (De Nitish, 1984).

Review of Literature

CLASSIFICATION OF VARIABLES WITH STUDIES REVIEWED

Sr. No.	Variables	Researcher(s)
1.	Job Satisfaction	Rudd and Wiseman (1962), Brown (1972), Walton (1972), Stone (1978), Calfee and Passirilo (1980), Knoop (1980), Farrah (1981), Sweeney (1981), Cunningham(1983), Straw and Heckscher (1984), Warr (1987), Efraty and Sirgy (1990), Navalani (1990), Hips and Smith (1991), Blix and Lee (1994), Lam (1995), Mishra (1996), Davoodi (1998), Os haghbemi (2000), Berg (2002), Ellis and Pompli (2002), Graca Maria(2002), Mehrotra(2002), Rai and Sinha (2002), Weiss (2002), Rao and Sridhar (2003), Sandrick (2003), Johansson and Heikinaro(2004), Zembylas and Papanastasion(2004), Rose et al.(2006), Saraj i and Dargahi(2006), Alam(2009), Islam et al.(2009), Joshi (2009), Schulze and Paulanc(2009), Fattah (2010), Ganguli (2010), GalawatSuman (2010), Skaalvil (2010), Stefan et al.(2010), Fattah (2011), Sheel et al. (2012), Subramannian and Saravanan (2012), Tabassum (2012), Lutz C. Kaiser(2014), Shalla S.A. and Iqbal(2014).
2.	Motivation	Knoop(1980), Blix and Lee(1994),Zingeim and Schuster(2001), Ellis and Pompli(2002),Owens(2006), Sheel et al.(2012), Subramannian and Saravanan(2012), Thaynmal P.R.(2014).

Teacher self-efficiency can be abstracted as belief of each one in their own ability to design, shape and carry those action that are needed to reach goal of education. He describes collective teacher's efficiency as achieving the goal of institution by working in team. The quality of work life in education sector can be defined as the bond between the teachers and working environment of the universities. Organization must satisfy the requirement of the employees to help them progress and involve them in decision making.

The research studies on this subject have discerned mixed results regarding impact of **Quality of Work life on** overall job satisfaction level and motivational level among teachers of universities

Grayson (1973) defined quality of work life is significant to the performance of the organization. It is thought by Glasier (1976) that the quality of work life entails the security of job, better working conditions, sufficient and fair reimbursement, more even than equivalent opportunity of employment all together. It is said by Ghosh (1992), that the QWL is a significant feature that affect the inspiration at work. The programs of the quality of work life have two objectives; to improve the satisfaction of the employees and to improve the productivity of the employees (Gardon, 1984).**Navalani (1990)** has conducted a survey to measure

the level of satisfaction of the professional and semi professional manpower working in the university libraries in India with various characteristics of job study. The study reveals that majority of the professionals are satisfied with most of the attributes of their work, but there is a difference in the perception of men and women and seniors and juniors.**Hips and Smith (1991)** conducted a study to determine the amount of variance in burnout and job satisfaction in public school teachers and principals. Results of the study suggested that educators were experiencing a significant amount of stress related to their everyday job situations and performance-based accreditation standards.**Blix and lee (1994)** used the Pearson-Environment Fit model to analyse the lock of fit (misfit) between motivational style and job rewards as a contributing factor in developing occupational stress symptoms in university teachers.**Lam (1995)** surveyed 350 teacher trainees from Singapore to examine relationships among quality of work life, career commitment, job satisfaction and withdrawal cognition. Results showed that perceptions of the social status of teaching strongly related to commitment to and satisfaction with teaching.**Mishra (1996)**conducted a study to compare the levels of occupational stress and job satisfaction among male and female teachers of higher educational institutions. Results indicated that significant

differences observed between male and female teachers on overall stress and overall job satisfaction scores. Stress was found to be correlated negatively and significantly with job satisfaction in both the groups. Abel and Sewell (1999) investigated differences in the sources of stress between rural and urban schools. For both urban and rural schools, student misbehaviour and time pressures were the leading sources of stress, with no significant differences between groups. **Oshagbemi (2000)** conducted a study on "Gender differences in job satisfaction of university teachers" to investigate the effects of gender on the job satisfaction of UK teachers. The interaction effect of gender and rank was found to be significant. Female academics at higher ranks namely; senior lecturers, readers and professors were satisfied with their jobs than male academics of comparable ranks. Zingheim and Schuster (2001) While rewards and benefits helps the university in motivating the teachers to perform better, compensation pays a vital role in attracting more talent into the university and retaining them. **Berg (2002)** job satisfaction is one of the significant factors that impact relationship between teachers and students. Unless the teachers are happy with their current job, they might not be able to demonstrate their commitment in delivering the contents efficiently and there may not be complete utilization of the skills of teachers (Man et. al. 2011). Ellis and Pompli (2002) listed down the various effects when universities lack quality work life. The various issues that can arise are aggression among the employees in the organization due to their low motivation levels, unhealthy relationship between the peers causing disregard to their concerns, negligent learning curve due to lack of prospects to learn new skills which would denigrate the efficiency of employee which transforms to organization effectiveness, quality of deliverables due to lack of focus and lack of participation in organization level decision making which affects the ability of organization to extract new ideas from employees and strive towards innovation. **Graca Maria (2002)** conducted a study with a view to assess the relative contribution of intrinsic and extrinsic factors in teachers' satisfaction. The study also revealed that psychological constructs had greater predictive value than socio demographic variables in promoting job satisfaction. **Weiss (2002)** defined job satisfaction as how teachers assess their job constructive or destructive. It is a measure of how people have understood the current work and how they analyse their job under various circumstances and it is found in most of the studies that the highly paid employees tend to have higher job satisfaction and quality of work life (Okpara, 2005). **Rao and Sridhar (2003)** attempted to identify the importance of job satisfaction in the life and career of teachers. The sample consisted of 80 teachers working in secondary schools in Guntur district of Andhra Pradesh. A number of variables such as age, sex, experience, qualification, teaching subjects, location of the school and

type of management were examined in relation to the job satisfaction of teachers. Job satisfaction of teachers was found to be independent of sex, location of school (urban/rural) and the type of management (government /private) also. **Feather and Rauter (2004)** investigated organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) in a sample of 154 school teachers from Victoria, Australia of whom 101 were in permanent employment and 52 on fixed term contracts. Results showed that the contract teachers reported more job insecurity and more OCBs compared to permanent teachers. **Turner (2005)** analysed the association between the quality of work life with the commitment to university. It is found that there is a considerable association among the willingness to work and the commitment to university. In US, the Sports College is much dependent on the students' jobs to a greater extent. **Ashoob (2006)** observed the relationship between organizational commitment and the quality of work life among the High Schools located in the Gonbad-e- Kavus City by using the Walton's eight components of QWL. It is concluded by Ashoob that there is a significant and positive association between the organizational commitment and the quality of work life. **Owens (2006)** faculties with higher level of commitment also had a higher level of turnover cognitions. Commitment has a major and constructive influence on job performance and on retaining workforce. More committed tutor will perform better at their job than compared to that of the less committed tutors who might not interested in doing their work with full enthusiasm. Saraji and Dargahi (2006) concluded that quality of work life is important to retain the faculties. It is university level program aimed at developing job satisfaction that is to give right income for the good amount of work, which enables faculties to adapt easily to the work environment. Disappointment with quality of work life may affect faculties irrespective of their positions. When the universities starts to identify that the faculties have their lives apart from work, trust and loyalty among faculties is created. Abeid (2007) assessed the relationship between demographic and work variables and job stress. Multiple regressions technique was applied to find out results. The Results showed that (i) there was negative relationship between demographic variables and job stress (ii) there was positive relationship between work variables and job stress and (iii) the work variables affect job stress more than demographic variables. **Bhanugopan et al. (2008)** it is found in the study that one of the most important factors that were supposed by the respondents is the safe and healthy working environment. **Skinner and Ivancevich (2008)** urged that QWL is associated with adequate and fair compensation, safe & healthy working conditions, opportunities to develop human capacities, opportunities for continuous growth and job security, more flexible work scheduling and job assignment, careful attention to job design and workflow, better union-management

cooperation, and less structural supervision and development of effective work teams. **Islam et al. (2009)** has conducted a study on the influence of workers quality of work life (QWL) on job satisfaction and organizational performance. The findings suggest QWL although is positively related to organizational performance but it is not significant as hypothesized. However, there is a positive and significant relationship between QWL and employees' job satisfaction. Finally, conclusion and policy implications are given. Van Hooft et al. (2009) observed in his study that how motives for having a temporary job influence the effects of experienced fairness on work related attitudes. Findings of the study indicated that the temporary employees who accepted it voluntarily, low fairness are related to lower self-reported performance. But the employers who accept their job as a way to obtain permanent employment, fairness is not related to work related attitudes and behavioural intentions but there who are involuntarily in a temporary job react stronger on fairness and have higher intention to quit. **Fattah (2010)** investigated the longitudinal effects of pay increments not have a significant effect on teacher's job satisfaction. After pay increase, teachers with high academic attainments were found to be significantly less satisfied with their teaching profession than teachers with low academic attainments. Male teachers were found to be significantly more satisfied with their teaching profession than the female teachers. **Ghalawat Suman (2010)** conducted a study in professional institutions which aims at identifying the level of participation in decision making in the job, overall experience of employees in the organization, satisfaction level of the employees towards organization Culture & the level of satisfaction among the employees in professional institutions. The results showed that although quality of supervision is good, yet the faculties are not satisfied with present job. They were satisfied with their compensation and other benefits and were not willing to get more training. Skaalvik (2010) conducted a study on "Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout a study of relations", the job satisfaction and work life balance of teacher is an ambiguous term depending on various factors, but directly affects the relationship with students. The factors that accounts for correct work life balance are, how much the teacher was able to enjoy the profession, if they are re-looking to change their career based on available opportunity or quitting the profession due to the stress encountered. **Fattah (2011)** validated a scale for measuring the quality of work life in higher education. The results of factor analysis and principal components analysis, using a Varimax rotation, showed that building factors of quality of work life consisted of salary and merits, the table of work time, the physical aspects of job, staff participation, suitable supervision, feedback, job value and the possibility of progress, justice in assigning roles and tasks, the psychological, physical and job security, the balance between the individual and

organizational goals. **Emadzadeh et al. (2012)** analysed the quality of work life with the teachers of a primary school in Isfahan city and identified that the quality of work life of the teachers were less compared to that of the average. Though, their inspiration was elevated in spite of dissatisfaction in compensation paid. Sarmah et al. (2012) conducted research on job stress among Secondary School Teachers. Work stressors can be identified in almost all jobs teaching is not an exception. Gender and stressor wise comparison was done by adapting standardized scale named as Indore Teachers Stressor Scale (ITJSS) developed by Dr. Buddhisagar Rathod and Dr. M. Varma. **Sheel et al. (2012)** worked on quality of work life, employee performance and career growth opportunities. In their research they discussed about the reason why QWL concept has gained momentum because world economics have recently recovered from recession blues and continued restructuring, downsizing and reorganization in the post recession scenario have created havoc for HR managers as they have to struggle with preserving staff morale and job satisfaction. **Tabassum (2012)** aims to investigate the interrelation between QWL dimensions and job satisfaction of faculty members in the private universities of Bangladesh through quantitative survey on 72 full-time faculty members. The sample includes 11 private universities. The correlation analysis reveals that all the dimensions of QWL are positively correlated with the job satisfaction of faculty members, which indicates that enhancement in the dimensions of QWL, can lead to increased amount of job satisfaction in the private universities of Bangladesh. Mourkani et al. (2013) aimed at investigating the relationship between the QWL and the faculty member's and staff's entrepreneurship in Islami Azad University, Izeh Branch during academic year of 2011-12. The results showed that there was a significant positive correlation between the QWL and entrepreneurship and also between the QWL and ambiguity tolerance, risk preference, sense of independent where as there is no significant relationship between QWL and need for achievement, internal control centre and creativity. **Lutz C. Kaiser (2014)** conducted study on job satisfaction and public service motivation. Based on a unique case study data set analysis job satisfaction and public service motivation in Germany. The findings of the study indicated that a general dominance in intrinsic motivators. Additional these kind of motivators play an important role with regard to building up and keeping job satisfaction in the public sector. Further the results reveals that transferability of competences, autonomy, regular appraisal interviews, and productivity feedback as factors incorporating a positive significance in terms of job satisfaction. **Thaynmal P.R. (2014)** Conducted study on development of women entrepreneurs in small scale industries in Trinuvveli District. The results of the study reveal that development factors of personal innovation and intellectual development have highest

loadings on development of women entrepreneurs. Most of women entrepreneurs faced different problems like health problems and social barriers for which proper communication system and motivation is required.

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.

Research Methodology

The present study is based on primary data and secondary data. In this research, primary data is collected from faculty members of government universities of Punjab, with the help of questionnaire. 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 Punjab. It includes 3 Public sector universities

Government Universities	
1.	Guru Nanak Dev University
2.	Punjabi University, Patiala
3.	Punjab Agriculture University

SAMPLE AND SAMPLING DESIGN

Universities were selected on the basis of quota sampling and respondents were selected on the basis of random sampling. Data was collected from 250 respondents. The survey was conducted via email and face to face interviews. 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.

Analysis

In order to find out the factors that determine the perception of teachers towards their work environment factor analysis has been applied.

Part: A Perception of Government University Teachers –A Factor Analysis Approach

First of all, the data was examined for its suitability for factor analysis. Reliability is measured by using Crohnbach's Alpha. Crohnbach's Alpha ranges from 0 to 1. The Crohnbach's Alpha of likert scaled items in the questionnaire was 0.732 which is deemed to be good.

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. Communality and factor loadings were high enough to prove the suitability of data as well as the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) was .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.

In factor analysis each variable is expressed as linear combinations of underlying factors. The amount of variance a variable shares with all the other variables included in the analysis is defined as communality. Thus, the communality is the amount of variance; a variable shares all the other variables being considered. Communality ranges from 0 to 1. Zero means common factors do not explain any variance, one means that the common factor explains all the variance.

Table 1.1
Total Variance Explained: Public Sector University

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.885	14.367	14.367	4.885	14.367	14.367	2.708	7.965	7.965
2	2.566	7.548	21.914	2.566	7.548	21.914	2.485	7.309	15.275
3	1.873	5.510	27.424	1.873	5.510	27.424	2.051	6.032	21.306
4	1.709	5.028	32.452	1.709	5.028	32.452	1.673	4.920	26.226
5	1.526	4.489	36.941	1.526	4.489	36.941	1.665	4.897	31.123
6	1.470	4.324	41.265	1.470	4.324	41.265	1.639	4.820	35.943
7	1.413	4.157	45.421	1.413	4.157	45.421	1.591	4.679	40.622
8	1.301	3.825	49.247	1.301	3.825	49.247	1.526	4.487	45.109
9	1.188	3.495	52.742	1.188	3.495	52.742	1.518	4.464	49.574
10	1.159	3.409	56.150	1.159	3.409	56.150	1.465	4.309	53.883
11	1.081	3.181	59.331	1.081	3.181	59.331	1.452	4.269	58.152
12	1.029	3.026	62.357	1.029	3.026	62.357	1.430	4.205	62.357

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 1.1 indicates the data of public sector universities. This table shows the initial solution. 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 factors listed for assessing quality of work life after applying factor analysis, it is clear from the Table 1.1 explaining the 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.

Table 1.2
Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation: Public Sector University

Rotated Component Matrix												
	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
F1-Hike in salary	0.101	-0.054	0.030	0.024	0.029	0.003	-0.091	-0.011	0.138	0.195	0.795	-0.077
F2-Job security	-0.048	0.066	0.159	-0.049	0.046	-0.004	-0.078	-0.153	0.143	0.741	0.152	0.104
F3- Good relationship	0.639	0.052	0.093	0.056	0.301	-0.069	0.022	0.192	0.052	0.026	-0.053	-0.266
F4- Rational performance app.	0.327	0.075	0.438	-0.216	-0.067	-0.192	0.100	-0.046	0.145	-0.059	0.350	-0.124
F5- Promotional opp.	0.082	0.409	0.584	0.101	-0.043	0.304	0.147	-0.047	-0.027	0.019	0.029	-0.240
F6- Safety measures	0.111	0.215	0.021	0.002	0.725	0.027	0.163	-0.057	0.056	0.103	-0.095	-0.009
F7- Motivational strategies	0.080	0.577	-0.003	-0.420	-0.038	0.065	-0.012	0.225	0.103	0.285	-0.110	0.057
F8- Support from mgt.	0.223	0.628	0.131	0.110	0.242	-0.085	-0.306	0.062	0.014	0.058	0.119	0.106
F9- Acknowledgement of work	0.020	0.643	0.078	0.011	0.220	-0.069	0.169	-0.049	-0.158	0.175	-0.136	-0.162
F10- Opp. For self improvement	-0.050	0.515	-0.110	0.216	0.035	0.007	0.424	0.012	-0.047	-0.091	0.259	-0.114
F11-No favouritism	0.107	-0.025	0.086	-0.043	-0.024	-0.010	0.035	0.072	0.754	0.121	0.124	0.001
F12-Friendly relations	0.669	0.099	0.028	0.025	0.127	-0.160	0.197	-0.033	0.311	0.119	-0.055	-0.016
F13-Help in distress	0.708	0.176	0.153	0.173	-0.054	0.105	-0.038	0.023	-0.018	-0.024	0.037	0.156
F14-Attention to Suggestions	0.476	-0.050	0.125	0.264	-0.023	0.008	0.091	0.065	0.038	0.566	0.001	-0.080
F15-Satisfied with Personal Development	0.407	-0.076	0.510	0.074	-0.101	-0.042	0.132	0.115	-0.264	0.169	0.172	0.150
F16-Feeling of Satisfaction	0.584	0.099	0.097	-0.226	-0.093	0.052	0.093	-0.172	-0.087	-0.138	0.260	-0.057
F17-Good Quality of work	0.308	-0.010	0.001	0.515	-0.198	0.143	0.356	0.078	0.199	0.248	0.254	0.118
F18-Political Problems	-0.025	-0.090	0.003	-0.028	0.004	0.816	-0.007	-0.021	-0.009	0.004	-0.031	-0.013
F19-Ready to shift job	0.121	0.007	-0.107	0.302	0.064	0.312	-0.167	-0.049	0.363	-0.068	-0.026	0.586

F20-Max. Facilities	0.092	0.123	0.068	0.688	0.029	-0.068	0.059	0.004	-0.018	0.004	0.013	0.013
F21-Developing my Skills	0.224	0.014	0.091	0.066	0.165	-0.012	0.704	-0.110	-0.005	0.026	-0.019	0.205
F22-No work pressure	-0.059	0.033	0.144	0.189	0.579	0.096	0.071	0.227	-0.197	-0.018	0.383	0.270
F23-Active flow of ideas	0.272	0.233	0.304	-0.146	0.157	-0.118	0.232	0.323	-0.272	-0.155	0.501	0.256
F24-Fellow Teachers support each other	0.161	0.695	0.027	0.123	-0.042	-0.199	0.089	-0.010	0.029	-0.181	-0.040	0.228
F25-Recognition of work	0.098	0.322	0.208	0.170	0.134	-0.431	0.353	-0.016	0.511	-0.258	0.053	0.269
F26-Employer overdrive the employees	-0.091	0.038	0.053	-0.058	0.039	-0.090	0.130	0.019	-0.054	0.098	-0.062	0.701
F27-Routine and Boring Activities	0.060	-0.099	-0.012	-0.420	0.380	0.574	-0.022	-0.038	0.199	-0.198	0.096	0.020
F28-Good Communication	0.078	0.081	0.787	0.002	0.061	0.002	-0.033	-0.048	0.040	0.067	-0.034	0.113
F29-Commitment Towards Work	0.172	-0.042	0.587	0.356	0.166	-0.134	0.055	0.138	0.301	0.158	-0.010	-0.109
F30-No time to pursue own area of interest	0.100	-0.025	0.081	0.358	-0.437	0.164	0.069	0.143	0.272	0.174	-0.397	-0.013
F31-Too much Clerical Work	-0.196	-0.128	0.275	-0.071	-0.199	0.164	-0.238	-0.049	0.312	-0.349	-0.168	-0.086
F32-Overburdened for research work	-0.145	-0.083	-0.045	-0.167	-0.149	0.250	0.069	0.582	0.267	-0.128	0.090	-0.196
F33-Organise FDP for Faculty	0.099	0.061	0.006	0.119	0.041	-0.115	-0.078	0.815	-0.033	-0.008	-0.050	0.107
F34-Support to attend conferences and refresher courses	-0.019	0.280	0.068	-0.129	0.095	-0.141	0.558	0.349	0.007	-0.085	-0.062	-0.222
Eigen Valuc	4.88	2.56	1.87	1.70	1.52	1.47	1.41	1.30	1.18	1.15	1.08	1.02
% of Variance	7.96	7.30	6.03	4.92	4.89	4.82	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.20
Cumulative variance	7.96	15.27	21.30	26.22	31.12	35.94	40.62	45.10	49.57	53.88	58.15	62.35

(KMO=0.715)

Referring to table 1.2, factor loadings are the correlations between the variables and the factors. A coefficient with a large absolute value indicates that the factor and the variables are closely related. The coefficient of the factor matrix is used interpret the factors. Although the initial and unrotated factor matrix indicates the relationship between the factors and the individual variables, it seldom results in factors that can be interpreted, because the factors are correlated with many variables therefore, through rotation, the factor matrix is transformed into a simple one that is easier to interpret. Rotation does not affect communalities and the percentage of total variance explained.

The method used for rotation is the varimax procedure. This method of rotation minimizes the number of variable, with high loadings on a factor, thus enhancing the interpretability of factors. Rotations brings simplicity, higher the factor loadings, a stronger is the correlation between factors and the variables. All factor loadings greater than 0.5 have been considered for factor analysis.

Naming of Factors (Public Sector)

The final factors have been categorized on the basis of variables represented in each case. The names of factors statements in the factor and factor loadings have been shown in Table 1.3

Table 1.3

Naming of Factors: Public Sector University

Factor Number	Name of Dimension (% of variance)	Label	Statement	Factor loadings
1	Job Satisfaction and Self Esteem (7.965%)	F ₃	Good Relationship with co-workers	0.639
		F ₁₂	Faculty members have friendly relations with each other	0.669
		F ₁₃	Fellow colleagues are ready	0.708
		F ₁₆	I feel satisfied after performing my work	0.584
2	Effort Recognition and Career Progression (7.309%)	F ₇	Sufficient motivational strategies	0.577
		F ₈	Support from the top management is helpful in accomplishing a task	0.628
		F ₉	University recognizes and acknowledge my work	0.643
		F ₁₀	Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression	0.515
		F ₂₄	All the faculty member generally support all the members of the universities	0.695
3	Employee loyalty and Growth (6.032%)	F ₅	Effective promotional opportunities in the university	0.584
		F ₁₅	On the basis of my own standards, I am satisfied with personal development	0.510
		F ₂₈	Faculty members in this university communicate well with each other	0.787
		F ₂₉	All the members are generally committed to their work	0.587

4	Quality on Work Place (4.920%)	F ₂₀	I feel that my university provides maximum facilities for doing my work properly	0.688
		F ₁₇	I feel good about the quality of work performed	0.515
5	Conducive Environment (4.897%)	F ₆	Good safety measures adopted at the university	0.725
6	Lower Self Esteem (4.820%)	F ₁₈	There are many political problems in this University	0.816
		F ₂₇	Most of my activities are routine and boring	0.574
7	Employee Development (4.679%)	F ₂₁	I am developing new skills and abilities at work	0.704
		F ₃₄	My superior always allows to attend refresher courses and conferences	0.558
8	Work load other than teaching (4.487%)	F ₃₂	I feel too much burdened for research work.	0.582
		F ₃₃	My university organizes FD for the up gradation of faculty	0.815
9	Rationality (4.464%)	F ₁₁	Favoritism does not play any part in the institution of work	0.754
		F ₂₅	Faculty members are given recognition for their creative work	0.511
10	Organizational satisfaction (4.309%)	F ₂	Job security exists at my university.	0.741
		F ₁₄	I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions as regards method of work	0.566
11	Organizational communication and economic benefit (4.269%)	F ₁	There is a reasonable periodical increase in salary	0.795
		F ₂₃	There is an active low of ideas	0.501
12	Critical factors (4.205%)	F ₁₉	Ready to shift job at same position in a different organization.	0.586
		F ₂₆	Employer overdrive the employees	0.701

Factor 1: Job satisfaction and self esteem

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

Factor 2: Effort Recognition and Career Progression

This factor explains a combination of 5 statements with 7.309% of variance. The statement F₇ scored the highest score. It is sufficient motivational strategies” (0.577), followed by F₈ “support from top management is helpful in accomplishing a task” (0.628). The statement F₉ states that “university recognizes and acknowledge my work” with factor loadings 0.643 is also a combination of F₁₀ “Adequate opportunities for self improvement and career progression” (0.515) and statement F₂₄ All the faculty members generally support all the members of the universities with factor loadings 0.695.

Factor 3: Employee loyalty and growth

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

Factor 4: Quality on Work Place

Public university provides maximum facilities to conduct research work as well as to perform other activities. Factor 4 the explaining 4.920% of variance with 2

statements. The statement F₂, “My University provides maximum facilities for doing to my work properly” (0.688) followed by F₁₇ “Feeling good about the quality of work performed” (0.515).Bhanugopal et.al. (2008) also found that there is correlation between quality of work life and work environment.

Factor 5: Conducive Environment

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

Factor 6: Lower Self Esteem

Factor 6 enlists negative statements which lead to low the morale of employees. It consists of 2 statements. Factor 6 explains 4.820% of variance. The highest coefficient is .816 in case of statement F₁₈, “There are many political problems in this university” and F₂₇, “Most of my activities are routine and boring” with factor loadings of 0.484.

Factor 7: Employee Development

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

Factor 8: Workload other than teaching

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

Factor 9: Rationality

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

Factor 10: Organizational Satisfaction

The 10th factor explains 4.309% of variance with 2 statements the statement F₂ scores highest score, “Job security exists at my university” (0.741), followed by F₁₄ “I feel that my superiors give reasonable attention to my suggestions are 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 F₁₅, “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%.

Research Limitations

1. The study is limited to educational sector alone.
2. The study is limited to only the higher education universities among the educational institutions.

Conclusion

Faculty of public sector university perceives that 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 but university employees perceive that there is politics among teachers that creates dissatisfaction among teachers regarding work environment.

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.

Asgari, Mohammad Hadi and Dadashi, Mohammad Ali (2011), “Determining the Relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Organizational Commitment of Melli Bank Staff in West Domain of Mazandaran”, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, Vol.5(8), pp.682-687.

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.

Barlow KM, Zangoro GA: “Meta-Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of the Anticipated Turnover Scale across Studies of Registered Nurses in the United States”, *Journal of Nurse Management*, (2010), Vol.18 (7), pp.862–873.

Berg D V (2002), *Teachers' Meaning Regarding Educational Practice*, *Review of Educational Research*.

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.
- Davoodi, Seyed Mohammad Reza (1998), "Study of the Impact of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction among The Staff of Mobarakeh Steel Complex", Master's Dissertation, Tehran, Islamic Azad University.
- 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.
- Efraty, David and Sirgy, M. Joseph (1990), "The Effects of Quality of Working Life (QWL) on Employee Behavioral Responses", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol.22(1).
- 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.
- Farrah, S.M. (1981), "Teachers Performance Motivation Los Angeles", CA: American Educational Research Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206-096).
- 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.
- Gani, A. (1993), "Quality of Work Life (QWL) in a State Setting: Findings of an Empirical Study", *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.36 (4), pp. 817-823.
- Gilgeous, V., (1998), "Manufacturing Managers: Their Quality of Working Life", *Integrated Manufacturing System*, Vol. 9(3), pp.173-181.
- Gosh, Subrathesh (1992), "Quality of Work Life in Two Indian Organizations Decisions", Vol.19 (.2), pp. 89-102.
- Graca Maria dos Santos Seco (2002), "Teacher Satisfaction: Some Practical Implications for Teachers Professional Development Models", *European Conference on Educational Research*, University of Lisbon.
- Grayson, C.J (1973), *Management Science and Business Practice*, Harvard Business Review, Vol.51 (4).
- 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).
- Hannif and Zeenobiyah (2008), "Call Centers and the Quality of Work Life: Towards a Research Agenda", *Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.50 (2), pp.271-284.
- Havolovic, S.J. (1991), "Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes" *Industrial Relations*, Vol.30(3), pp.469-479.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.
- Hipps, E. and Smith, E. (1991), "Job Stress, Stress Related to Performance Based Accredited, Locus of Control, Age and Gender as related to Job Stress and Satisfaction in Teachers and Principals", *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 16 (6), pp. 25-28.
- Jenkinson, R. and Chapman, W. (1990), "Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers" *International Review of Education*, Vol. 36(3), pp. 299-313.

- Johansson, N. and Heikinaro, P. (2004), "Job Satisfaction among Physical Education Teachers in Finland", Paper Presented at Athens, Pre Olympic Conference.
- Kaur A (2012), "Quality of work life, National foundation of Indian Engineers", Retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.nafenindia.com/nafdigjun12.pdf>
- Kaur, C. (1992), *Education in Punjab (A Historical Study)*, Intellectual Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Khan, A. A. (2008), *Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations (2nd Edn.)*. Abir Publications: Dhaka.
- Knoop, R. (1980), "Job Involvement of Teachers", Toledo, OH: Mid Western Educational Research Association, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 208-508.
- Kumar, H. and Shanubhogue A (1996), "Quality of Work Life: An Empirical Approach", *Manpower Journal*, Vol.32 (3), pp. 17-24.
- Lam, P. (1995), "Work life, Career Commitment and Job Satisfaction as Antecedents of Career Withdrawal Cognition among Teacher Interest", *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Vol.28, pp.230-236.
- Lawe, R.S.M(2000), "Quality of Work Life and Performance: An ad hoc investigation of two key elements in the service profit chain model", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol.11(5), pp. 422 – 437.
- Ledford, G. E. and Lawler, E. E. (1982), "Quality of Work Life Programs, Coordination, and Productivity", *Journal of Contemporary Business*, Vol. 11, pp. 93-106.
- Lowe, G., & Schellenberg, G. & Shannon H. (2003), "Correlates of Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.7 (3), pp.385-425.
- Luthans, F.(2002), "The Need for and Meaning of Positive Organizational Behaviour", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol.23(6).
- Lutz C. Kaiser (2014), "A study on Job Satisfaction and Public Service Motivation: IZA" Discussion Paper No. 7935, January, 2014.
- Mehrotra, Anju (2002), "A Comparative Study of Leadership Styles of Principals in Relation to Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Organisational Climate in Government and Private Senior Secondary Schools of Delhi". Ph.D. Thesis, Jamia Millia Islamia University, Delhi.
- Memeon, J.(2008), "Teacher Strees, Job Performance and Efficacy of Women School Teachers" *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol.20(2), pp. 178-187.
- Miller, G.V. and Travers, C.J. (2005), "Ethnicity and the Experience of work: Job stress and Satisfaction of Minority Ethnic Teachers in the U.K.", *International Review of Psychiatry*, Vol. 17(5), pp.317-327.
- Mirvis, P.H. and Lawler, E.E. (1984), "Accounting for the Quality of Work Life", *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol.5, pp. 197-212.
- Mishra, S. & Gupta, B. (2009), "Work Place Motivators and Employee's Satisfaction: A Study on Retail Sector in India", *The Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol 44(3), pp. 509-517.
- Mount M, Ilies R and Johnson E (2006), "Relationship of Personality Traits and Counter Productive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effects of Job Satisfaction", *Personnel Psychology*.
- Mourkani, G.S. and Avand, S.K. (2013), "A Study of the Relationship Between Quality of Work Life and Entrepreneurship of the Faculty and Staff Members: A Case Study", *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research* ISSN No. 2090-4304, Vol. 3(9), pp.119-125.
- Okpara, J.S. (2005), "The Impact of Salary Differential on Managerial Job Satisfaction: A Study of the Gender Gap and its Implications for Management Education and Practice in a Developing Economy", *Journal of Business Development Nations*, Vol 8, pp. 66-92.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000), "Gender differences in the Job Satisfaction of University Teachers", *Journal of Work Management Review*, Vol. 15(7), pp. 331-340.
- Owens (2006), "One More Reason not to Cut Your Training Budget: The Relationship between Training and Organizational Outcomes". *Public Personnel Management*.

- Payne R L (1987), *Organizations as Psychological Environments*, In Warr, P. *Psychology at Work*. London: Penguin Books.
- Rao, D.B. & Sridhar, D. (2003), "Job Satisfaction of School Teachers", Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Rose, R. C., Beh, L. S., Uli, J., Idris, K. (2006), "Quality of Work Life: Implications of Career Dimensions", *Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.2(2), pp.61-67
- 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.
- Sairam Subramaniam, Saravanan (2012), "Empirical Study on Factors Influencing on Quality of Work Life of Commercial Bank Employees", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 28(1), pp. 119-127.
- Sandrick K (2003), "Putting the Emphasis on Employees as an award. Winning Employer, Baptist Health Care has distant memories of the Workforce Shortage", *Trustee*, pp. 6-10.
- Saraji N. G. and Dargahi (2006), "Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL), Department of Health Care Management," School of Allied Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran.
- Sarmah, Bidula, Baruah and Manoshikha (2012), "Job Stress among Secondary School Teachers", *Indian Stream Research Journal*, Sep. 2012, Vol.2 (8).
- Savery, L.K. and Detiuk, M. (1985), "Principals' stress in Elementary and Secondary Schools", *Education Quarterly Review*, Vol. 16, pp. 16-23.
- 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.
- Stefan Hub and Markus Kleiner (2010), "Commitment on Work Related Expectations in Flexible Employment Forms: An Empirical Study of German IT Freelances", *European Journal of Management*, Vol. 28 (1), pp. 40-54.
- Straw, R.J. and C.C. Heckscher (1984), "QWL: New Working Relationships in the Communication Industry", *Labor Studies Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 261-274.
- Suba Rao 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.
- Turner, B.A. & P. Chelleadurai (2005), "Organization and Occupational Commitment, Intention to Leave and Perceived Performance of Intercollegiate Coaches", *Journal of sport management*.
- Van Hooft, A. J., Q De Jong, M. (2009), "Predicting Job Seeking for Temporary Employment using the Theory of Planned Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Individualism and Collectivism", *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 82(2) 295-316.
- Walton (1982), "International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life", *Productivity*, Vol.22 (4), pp. 79-83.
- Warr P B (1987), "Job Characteristics and Mental Health In Warr," P. *Psychology at Work*, London: Penguin Books.
- Weiss (2002), *Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluations, Beliefs and affective Experiences*. Human Resource Management Review.
- Yoon, J.S. (2002), "Teacher characteristics as Predictors of Teacher-Student Relationship: Stress, Negative Effect of Self-Efficacy", *International Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, Vol. 30 (5), pp. 485-493.
- 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.

Zingheim K P and Schuster R J (2001), "Retaining Top Talent", Article published in Executive Excellence, Vol.18.

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.

uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstreams/handle/10500/1004/03dissertation.

www.chitkara.edu.in

www.col.org/sitecollectiondocumentspub_gate_intro.pdf

www.dpipunjab.org.

www.emeraldinsight.com

www.gndu.ac.in

www.graphpad.com/guides/prism/6/statistics/index.htm?how_the_mann_whitney_test_work.htm

www.lpu.in

www.mbaskool.com

www.pau.edu

www.punjabiuniversity.ac.in

www.stanford.edu/inweiler/texts/07/notes_on_indian_higher_education.pdf.

www.thapar.edu

www.ugc.ac.in