

A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF COLLEGE TEACHERS PERCEPTION.

D.ELAMPARUTHY*

Dr.S.JAMBULINGAM**

**Asst.Professor, Business Administration Wing, DDE,
Annamalai University.**

Abstract

Several research studies in the world have measured the quality of employees in Universities, Colleges, government and non-government organisations. This study highlights the quality of work life of college teachers in various dimensions. This research helps the college teachers to know the level of perception towards QWL and to enhance the same by the educational Institutions. Quality of work life is the essential concept of favorable situation in a working environment. The quality of work life facilitates employees training opportunities, job satisfaction and working conditions. A good quality of work life (QWL) improves the growth of the employees along with the organisation growth. The study includes 18 colleges located within the (Tiruchirappalli and Kumbakonam) city limits and 1308 college teachers were working during the year March 2014 to 2015 Dec, 230 Samples was collected from the colleges. We are using the statistical tools for data analyze were applied based on hypotheses and matching variables. The study says there is a significant association between qualities of work life in teaching environment. It means QWL of college teachers is in low level.

Key Words: Quality of work life, college teachers and Perception.

INTRODUCTION

Many of the study defined as the Quality of Work Life (QWL) has been “The quality of relationship between the employees and the complete functioning environment”. Quality of work life is fearful with the complete climate of work and the effect on work and people as well as on organizations success. Quality is a further generalized word but has become an elementary and must for the best power. Maintaining the quality of such human inputs rises from the quality of work life perfectly. The quality of work life (QWL) help the employees’ well-being there by the whole organization. This study is an attempt of the quality of work life of college teachers. Legislation enacted in early 20th century to protect the employees from job-injury and to disregard the hazardous of the working environments followed by the unionization measure in the 1930 and 1940s were the initial steps. Highlighting was given to job security, due to practice at the work place and commercial gains for the workers. The 1950s and the 1960s the study saw the

growth of different theories by psychologists stretch out a “confident relationship between morale and productivity”, and the possibility that improved human relationship would lead to the enhancement. Attempts at reform to acquire equal employment opening and job upgrading schemes also were familiarized. Finally, in the 1970s the best of QWL was comprehended which, according to Walton, is wider than these earlier changes and is somewhat that must include the values that were at the nature of these previous reform movements and ‘human needs and expectations’. The theories and the many studies of motivation and leadership on condition that a sound base for the concept of QWL. If the lower-order needs are satisfied, people seek satisfaction for the higher-order needs.

Origin of Quality of Work Life

In the early 20th century to protect employees from work place injury and to disregard the hazardous functioning circumstances. Prominence was given to job security, due to process at the work place circumstances and economic increases for the workers in the work place. The 1950s and the 1960s the development of different theories and studies by psychologists recommending a “progressive relationship between self-confidence and productivity”, and the possibility that improved human relationship lead to the enhancement. Endeavors at reform to obtain equal employment opening and job enrichment schemes also were hosted. In the 1970s the model of QWL was perceived which, according to Walton, is extensive than these previous progresses and is rather that must include the values that were at the heart of these previous reform movements’ and ‘human basic needs and aspirations’. The theories and studies of motivation and leadership provided a sound background for the concept of QWL. If the lower-order needs are gratified, people seek satisfaction for the higher-order needs. QWL activity increased significance between 1969 and 1974. When a broad group of researchers, scholars, union leaders and government personnel development departments attention in how to improve the quality of an individual person through on-the-job experience. The United States department (USD) of education, welfare, and health sponsored a study on this related issue, which led to the publication of work in America. Instantaneously, the compression of price increases promoted the US Government to address some of these issues and related. According to a Federal Productivity Commission was recognized, this assignment supported several labor management of the QWL experiments which were jointly conducted by the University of Michigan (UM) quality of work programme (QWLP) and the newly-evolved National Quality of Work Centre (NQWC).

In USA 1970s the term “Quality of Work Life” has given the impression in Research Journals and press. Louis Davis was first coined the term quality of work life (QWL). The first International conference quality of work life (QWL) was held in Toronto and the international council for quality of work life was established in 1972. From the 1980s onward QWL was progressively more placed on employee-centered efficiency programs. In the mid off 1990s till today faced with challenges of economize growth and the corporate are restructuring, QWL is re-materializing where employees are on the lookout for out more meaning where rising educational levels and occupational desires in today’s slow economic growth and reduced

opportunities for innovation, naturally, there are rising anxieties for QWL and for career and personal life planning. QWL compromises an assessment framework and the social technology of organizational revolution most imperative to task usefulness of micro-entities through utilization and recitation of human potential. A number of proof of the rising tide interest in the quality of work life (QWL) issue is the fact that the second International Conference on quality of work life held in Toronto in 1981 there involved 1,500 participations in the conference. The 200 unionist and 750 management people collective out-numbered the, academicians, consultants and government officials in attendance. Quality is no more a specialized word but has become a necessary and a must work for the best endurance. Quality of human inputs is the greatest asset to any organization they Maintaining the quality of human inputs increases ranch maintaining the quality of work life without a glitch. A picture-perfect quality of work life would help the organization. The quality of work life would help employees' well being thereby the well being of the whole organization. This is a challenge to get the most out of the human assets of the organization.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A number of researchers and theorists have been elasticity outdeliberation in the meaning of the QWL concept and consume aggravated to identify the categories of factors that determine such an experience at work place (Rosen, Ian C. (2000), Ellen S. (2001), Richard Robert (2002), Verna Marie (2002), Johnsrud (2002), Waheeda Khan (2003), Lorraine (2004), Chih Yang (2005), Nasal Saraji G (2005), Raduan Che Rose, Loo See Beh (2006), William Hendricson, (2007), Rishu Roy (2008) and Zeenobiyah Hannif, (2009).

(Table: 1) QWL factors from previous research studies

Study	Factors Identified	
	Work Environment	Employee
Rose, Ian C. (2000)	Work Locus of Control	Employee Involvement
Pruett, Ellen S. (2001)	Work Load	Perception
Richard Robert (2002)	Relationship	Motivation
Verna Marie (2002)	Productivity	Performance
Johnsrud (2002)	Employee Retention	Perception
Waheeda Khan (2004)	Organizational Development	Effectiveness
Burning (2004)	Employee Commitment	Perception
Chih Yang (2005)	Promotion	Performance
Nasal Saraji G (2005)	Health and Safety	Employee Satisfaction
Rauduanche Rose et.al (2006)	Career achievement	Career Satisfaction
Willam Hendricson et.al (2007)	Job satisfaction	Perception
Rishu Roy (2008)	Job Performance	Motivation and Rewards
Zeenobiyah Hannif, (2009)	Working conditions	Employee focus

The above table presents a number of earlier studies representative the various issues thought to be of significance for employees in the colleges.

Methodology

In this study the researcher has chosen the teaching professionals of colleges in Trichirappalli and Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu, The universe of the study includes 18 colleges located in the city and town and 1308 college teachers were working during March 2014 to 2015 Dec. The researcher used in this study disproportionate stratified random sampling method to select a sample of 230 respondents from the universe. The researcher used a standard questionnaire tools as a primary data collection. The questionnaire was divided into two sections as follows: Adequate and fair compensations, safe and healthy working conditions, Opportunities for growth and security, Social Integration, Opportunities for development Constitutionalism, QWL feeling, Work and total life space, Social relevance and working life, Curricular aspects, Teaching-Learning and evaluation, Research consultancy and extension, Infrastructure and learning resources, Student support and progression, Organization and management and Healthy practices. The part first of the questionnaire tools arrangements with the socio-economic characteristics and the part second arrangement with numerous proportions of quality of work life and quality of work life in teaching environs. In the second part the researcher used two types of questionnaire tools to measure the level of perception of the respondents. They are given below namely,

1. Quality of Work Life Questionnaire
2. Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire

The reliability of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is found to be 0.879 and the reliability of Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment (QWLTE) is found to be 0.960 by using split half reliability test.

The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS and various statistical tests were applied based on hypotheses. Statistical tools are Chi-square Test, Students' t-test, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation.

't' TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS SEX WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Table: 2

Quality of Work Life	Sex	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Work Life	Male	144.2500	17.52483	237	.130
	Female	143.9461	14.35784		P> 0.05

There is no significant difference between the sex of the respondents with respect to the number of dimensions of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

**Between the Respondents Sex and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment
 Total
 Table No:3**

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Sex	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Male	146.2083	27.32895	237	.500
	Female	155.7844	26.79487		P>0.05

There is a significant difference between the sexes of the respondents with respect to the number of dimensions of quality of work life in teaching environment total.

**t' TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS FAMILY TYPE WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT
 Difference between the Respondents Type of Family and their perceived Quality of work life Total
 Table No:4**

Quality of Work Life	Type of Family	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' Value
Quality of Work Life	Joint	145.1212	16.66432	237	.895
	Nuclear	143.2714	14.34861		p>0.05

There is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with respect to number of dimensions of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

**Difference between the Respondents Type of Family and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total
 Table No: 5**

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Type of Family	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	't' Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Joint	144.424	28.43578	237	4.083
	Nuclear	158.892	24.79287		p>0.05

There is a significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with respect to number of dimensions of quality of work life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

‘t’ TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS DEPARTMENT WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Table No: 6

Quality of Work Life	Departments	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Work Life	Arts	140.706	13.15131	237	2.823
	Science	146.122	16.26657		p>0.05

There is a significant difference between Departments of the respondents with respect to Quality of Work Life Total

Difference between the Respondents Department and their perceived Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total

Table No:7

Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Departments	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment	Arts	151.3043	28.19506	237	.706
	Science	153.8980	26.70250		p>0.05

It is inferred from the above table that, there is no significant difference between joint and nuclear family of the respondents with respect to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

‘t’ TEST BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP WITH REGARD TO QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT
Difference between the Respondents Professional Membership and their perceived Quality of work life Total

Table No: 8

Quality of Work Life	Professional Member ship	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Work Life	Yes	136.3529	13.13594	237	4.544
	No	146.1223	15.26490		p>0.05

There is a significant difference between Professional Membership of the respondents with respect to Quality of Work life total.

Difference Between The Respondents Professional Membership And Their Perceived Quality Of Work Life In Teaching Environment

Table No: 9

Quality of Work Life	Professional Member ship	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	‘t’ Value
Quality of Work Life	Yes	148.352	27.49969	237	1.335
	No	154.133	27.13323		p>0.05

There is no significant difference between professional memberships of the respondents with respect to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

**ONE WAY A OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED AGE AND THEIR
 PERCEIVED
 QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL
 Table No: 10**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	146.7083	G1=14.62338	1636.738	4	409.185	1.760
Within Groups	143.1158	G2=19.01504	54393.923	234	232.453	P>0.05
	139.7857	G3=7.33031				
	148.0000	G4=13.13728				
	144.2500	G5=2.80016				

There is no significant difference among various age groups of the respondents with respect to QWL Total.

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED AGE AND
 THEIR
 PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL
 Table No:11**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	166.8750	G1=24.07964	23987.738	4	5996.935	9.182
Within Groups	148.7684	G2=29.72693	15285.85	234	653.145	P>0.05
	139.2143	G3=23.72766				
	148.6667	G4=13.50381				
	156.0000	G5=14.82627				

G1=21-25, G2=26-30, G3=31-35, G4=36-40, G5=41 – 45

It is found from the above table that there is a significant difference between age groups of the respondents with respect to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED DESIGNATION
 AND
 THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE
 Table No: 12**

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	143.5738	G1=15.67751	1421.475	3	473.825	2.039
Within Groups	143.3864	G2=15.10770	54609.186	235	232.380	P>0.05
	150.6667	G3=2.78388				
	162.0000	G4=0.0000				

G1= Lecturer, G2= Senior Lecturer, G3= Assistant Professor, G4= Professor

There is no significant difference between various designations of the respondents with respect to QWL Total.

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED DESIGNATION
 AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT**
Table No:13

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	151.4590	G1=29.34874	3117.602	3	1039.201	1.406
Within Groups	155.1818	G2=19.12781	173705.988	235	739.174	P>0.05
	163.6667	G3=12.28821				
	175.0000	G4=0.0000				

G1= Lecturer, G2= Senior Lecturer, G3= Assistant Professor, G4= Professor
 There is no significant difference between numerous designations of the respondents with respect Quality of work Life in Teaching Environment Total.

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED INCOME AND
 THEIR
 PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE**
Table No:14

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	140.7857	G1=19.41653	5800.123	3	1933.374	9.045
Within Groups	144.4426	G2=14.87804	50230.538	235	213.747	P>0.05
	149.8947	G3=10.93436				
	130.3333	G4=8.72454				

G1= 1000-3000, G2=3001-6000, G3= 60001-9000, G4= 9001-12000
 There is a significant difference between varied incomes of the respondents with respect to QWL Total.

**ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED INCOME AND
 THEIR
 PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL**
Table No: 15

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	153.5714	G1=26.84022	3310.570	3	1103.525	1.495
Within Groups	159.1579	G2=30.81311	173513.020	235	738.353	P>0.05
	159.1579	G3=20.84962				
	153.3333	G4=16.71561				

G1= 1000-3000, G2=3001-6000, G3= 60001-9000, G4= 9001-12000
 There is no significant difference between various incomes of the respondents with respect to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED TYPE OF COLLEGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL
Table No:16

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	141.8571	G1=17.88210	3321.301	3	1107.100	4.936
Within Groups	141.3333	G2=12.70688	52709.360	235	224.295	P>0.05
	144.0500	G3=14.87396				
	151.5682	G4=13.94907				

G1= Self Financing, G2= Autonomous, G3= Government, G4= Government Aided
 There is a significant difference between various incomes of the respondents with respect to Quality of Work Life Total.

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AMONG THE RESPONDENTS WITH VARIED NATURE OF COLLEGE AND THEIR PERCEIVED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL
Table No: 17

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	SS	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	159.4286	G1=27.78356	807.475	3	6449.183	9.624
Within Groups	146.1250	G2=25.59046	15269.463	235	670.111	P>0.05
	143.9500	G3=23.65101				
	166.8409	G4=26.46537				

G1= Self Financing, G2= Autonomous, G3= Government, G4= Government Aided
 There is a significant difference between various incomes of the respondents with respect to Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS NATIVE PLACE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL
Table No: 18

Native Place	Quality of Work Life		2x
	Low	High	
Rural	42	30	0.953
Urban	60	57	Df=2
Semi Urban	26	24	p>0.05

There is no significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS NATIVE PLACE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL
Table No: 19

Native Place	Quality of Work Life		2x
	Low	High	
Rural	51	21	30.318
Urban	45	72	Df=2
Semi Urban	12	38	p>0.05

There is a significant association between the native place of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS LENGTH OF SERVICE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL
Table No:20

Length of service	Quality of Work Life		2x
	Low	High	
1-5	84	72	8.037
6-10	41	27	Df=2

There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life and Quality of Work Life Total.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS LENGTH OF SERVICE AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL
Table No:21

Length of service	Quality of Work Life		2x
	Low	High	
1-5	60	96	8.241
6-10	39	29	Df=2
11-15	09	06	p>0.05

There is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their perceived levels of quality of work life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

KARL PEARSON'S COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE TOTAL
Table No: 22

Variables	Correlation Value	Significance
Quality of Work Life Total	-.033	p>0.05 Not Significant

There is no significant relationship between the age of the respondents with respect to Quality of Work Life and Quality of Work Life Total

KARL PEARSON'S COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR PERCEIVED LEVELS OF QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEACHING ENVIRONMENT TOTAL
Table No:23

Variables	Correlation Value	Significance
Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	-.195	P<0.01

There is a significant relationship between the age of the respondents with regard to Quality of Work Life in teaching environment and Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total.

RELIABILITY OF THE TOOL
Split Half Reliability Test For Quality of Work Life Scale(1) Table No:24

Variables	Significance
Scale(Second Half)	.879**

** Significant at 0.01 Level

The reliability of Quality of Work Life Questionnaire is found to be .879 by using split half reliability test.

Split Half Reliability Test for Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Scale(2) Table No:25

Variables	Scale(First Half)
Scale(Second Half)	.0960**

** Significant at 0.01 Level

The reliability of Quality of Work Life in Teaching Environment Questionnaire is found to be .960 by using split half reliability test.

Inter correlation between the Major Variables of the study
Table No:26

Variables	Quality of Life in Teaching Environment Total	Significance
Quality of Work Life Total	0.547	P<0.01

There is a significant association between quality of work life total and quality of life in teaching environment total.

FINDINGS

- By means of overall quality of work life 59.0% of the respondents have high level of quality of work life and 41.0% of the respondents have low level of quality of work life.
- By means of overall quality of work life in teaching environment 54.8% of the respondents have high level of quality of work life and 45.2% of the respondents have low level of quality of work life in teaching background.

- Presently there is no significant difference between sex of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- Here is a significant difference between the department of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- Here is a significant difference between the professional membership of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the type of family of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. ('t'-test)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the age of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the designation of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the various income levels of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the type of college of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (One way - ANOVA)
- Presently there is no significant association between the native place of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (Chi-square test)
- Here is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life. (Chi-square test)
- Here is a significant difference between Sex of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background.('t'-test)
- Presently There is no significant difference between the department of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background.('t'-test)
- Here is a significant difference between the professional membership and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background.('t'-test)
- Presently There is no significant difference between the type of family of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background.('t'-test)
- Here is a significant difference between the age of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (One way - ANOVA)

- Presently there is no significant difference between the designation of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (One way - ANOVA)
- Presently there is no significant difference between the various income levels of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (One way - ANOVA)
- Here is a significant difference between the type of college of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (One way - ANOVA)
- Here is a significant association between the native place of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (Chi-square - test)
- Here is a significant association between the length of service of the respondents and their observed levels of overall quality of work life in teaching background. (Chi-square - test)

CONCLUSION

Quality of work life (QWL) is the collective accountability not only of the organisation and employees, but also by the humanity. To improve the Quality of work life, first to find and then try to content of the employee's vital needs through their involvement in their working background. Contingent upon the situational requirements, management and organisation may choice the relevant needs of the employee's to improve them with a short term plan. There is a weighty association between quality of work life total and quality of life in teaching background total. It shows QWL of college teachers is in low level. Affording to a report, improved flexible working background was found to be successful in Europe, Japan, United States and Canada. Affording to traditional teachings, the workplace is a temple and work is worship. A planned adjustment in the working background is the need of the hour to improve QWL in India. Springy working background can be an answer to the assorted roles of the Indian employees. This study is to develop the QWL of the college teachers by assimilating the task role and social role, such that the combined effect are effectively achieved.

Reference:

Ali, Ashraf, Quality of Work Life – Organizational Management 19 (3) October – December 2003, Page (22 – 26)

Arun Monappa, Industrial Relations, Ninth print (1995), Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd., Quality Control – Tool for Worker Development, Page (351 to 355)

Arun Monappa, Personnel Management, Second edition (2000), Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company, New Delhi, Page (373 – 387)

Aswathappa. K, Human Resource and Personnel Management, Second edition (2002), Tata McGraw 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, 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, Personnel Management Text and Cases, Twenty Second Edition (2002), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (599 – 604)

C.S. VenkataRathnam, B.K. Srivastava, Personnel Management and Human Resources, Eleventh reprint (1999), Page (236 – 239)

Choudhury and Giri, D.V. Quality of Work life: A study in NALCO – Excellence in Supervision 11 (2) March – April 1995, Page (37-44)

Cohem, and Susan G, 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, 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), McGraw – Hill International Editions, Management Series, Page (416,421)

Gani .A and 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. and SathishPai, 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, ShyamLal, 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 work life: 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 labourmarket in Delhi, Labour and Development 1 (1) 1995 Page (31)

Mirza S. Saiyadain, Human Resource Management (2003), Tata McGraw 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.

P. Subba Rao, Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations, Text Cases and Games (2001), Himalaya Publishing House, Page (657 - 663)

P. Subba Rao, Personnel and Human Resource Management Text and Cases (2002), Himalya Publishing House, Page (403 – 409)

P. Subbarao, Personnel/Human Resource Management, Text, Cases and Games (2000), Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Page (482 – 506)

Pandiya, D., Industrial democracy and Quality of Work Life : An empirical stury of its dimension in North Eastern 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, and 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)