

Comparing the Quality of Work Life among University Teachers in Punjab

Muhammad Akram* and Muhammad Amir**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare the quality of work life of public and private university faculty members in province Punjab, Pakistan. Quality of work life measures the extent to which employees of an organization can maintaining important demands by working in the institutions. Multistage sampling technique was used to collect data from 389 university teachers from eight public and private universities of Punjab. A validated questionnaire of Quality of Work Life (QWL) was used to collect data from the participants. The findings indicated a significant difference in QWL in faculty members based on their gender, age, designation, and type of university (public or private). No significant differences were found between faculty members on their QWL based on their experience. The findings led the researchers highlight that high quality of work life of faculty members in workplace is pivotal to maximize the productivity of educational outcomes. Limitations and recommendations have also been discussed in the study.

Keywords: Organizational Culture, interpersonal relationships, compensation, job satisfaction, job security.

*Associate Professor, Institute of Education & Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore.
Email: akram.ier@pu.edu.pk

**Junior Special Education Teacher, Government Special Education Centre, Okara.
Email: aamirspedu@gmail.com

Introduction

The study aimed to compare the Quality of Work Life (QWL) among university faculty members in Punjab on the basis of demographic variables such as gender, age, experience, designation, and type of university (public and private). The term QWL was coined in 1970's by Louis Davis, who described that Quality of Work Life focuses on various components of worker's life and it was a path by which an organization takes its responsibilities to set such working conditions that were beneficial for workers and the work. According to Schalock, Keith, Hoffman, and Karan (1989), the term QWL involves balanced and unbalanced conditions for workers at their job placement. It shows the extent to which employees of a working association are capable of maintaining important demands by working in the institutions (Chib, 2012).

Measuring QWL is important because it pays attention to the necessities of workers of an institution. QWL increases the interpersonal relationships among the stakeholders and institutions because they share their ideas, rules and regulations, and other matters with workers (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). QWL focuses on improving work, decreasing absenteeism of workers, and maximizing employees' performance (Robbins, 1989). QWL arranges such programs which attract highly qualified educational personnel for employment. The people prefer the job which is beneficial to them with respect to working hours, savings, and employers' attitude towards the workers. QWL improves the working lives of workers by reducing their work overloading, tension, and exhaustion. QWL develops the equilibrium between work and family life of workers; if the family life is disturbed, the worker loses his or her attention in the work which affects the society in return work (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, & Lee, 2001).

Historically, various studies around the globe have been conducted on measuring the impact of QWL on employees' performance. The previous studies found that QWL has impacted university faculty members' job contentment (Fatehi, Karimi, Pour, Pour, & Azizi, 2015), organizational commitment (Afsar, 2014; Nayak, Sahoo, & Mohanty, 2018), job satisfaction (Asmawi & Ramly, 2018), burnout (Schwartz, Adair, Bae, Rehder, Shanafelt, Profit, & Sexton, 2019; Yang, Li, Zhu, Li, & Wu, 2017; Wu, Wu, Li, & Dan, 2018), quality of service (Hamidi & Mohamadi, 2012), and decreased disputes, accidents, and work conflicts between the employees (Havlovic, 1991). Therefore, QWL of teachers at higher education level must be increased as these teachers are responsible for producing a generation who is directly involved in the upbringing of the nation (Jofreh, Yasini, Dehsorkhi, & Hayat, 2013; Lu, While, & Barriball, 2007). Teachers prepare future leaders, doctors, engineers, civil servants, and other remarkable professionals who play their significant role in social, educational, and moral development of the individuals.

University faculty members act as nation builders and career reformers by imparting knowledge and skills to the young generation which is ultimately responsible for the sustainable development of a country like Pakistan. It is generally perceived that university teachers lead low QWL due to certain reasons. Arif and Ilyas (2013) stated that work-life quality and balance are perhaps the greatest challenges in private universities in Pakistan. Teachers perhaps do not enjoy an environment that is conducive to learning and productivity and lose job involvement. The similar situation might be prevalent in public universities in Pakistan.

Measuring and comparing QWL of public and private university faculty members was of great importance as teaching at a higher level is affected by factors such as promotion, place of posting, and recruitment policies. Since a teacher's role is becoming more threatening and challenging due to increasing expectations of universal higher education, they deserve to receive great support by the university administration, as well as the policymakers. Perhaps only a couple of studies have been conducted on QWL of public and private university faculty members in Pakistan (Arif & Ilyas, 2013; Fatima & Sahibzada, 2012). Ilgan, Ozu-Cengiz, Ata, and Akram (2015) conducted a study to measure QWL of Pakistani school teachers. This study is an endeavor to compare QWL of university faculty members based on various demographic variables. The researchers hope this study would provide a vivid picture of the QWL of university faculty members; the comparison of QWL in public and private university teachers might give suitable recommendations to the administration of the universities and the policymakers.

Research Question

Is there a significant mean difference in the quality of work life of university faculty members based on their gender, teaching experiences, age, designations, and type of university (public or private)?

Review of the Related Literature

QWL is a wide-ranging concept that includes a bundle of objectives, institutional structures, and practices. QWL represents workers' perceptions that they are safe and enjoy healthy working conditions, receive sufficient and fair remuneration, and are capable of being developed as human beings (Chib, 2012; Narehan, Hairunnisa, Norfadzillah, & Freziamella, 2014; Swamy, 2013). QWL is the extent to which people are capable of fulfilling their significant personal desires while employed by an institution. Organizations are involved in increasing workers' QWL which try to instill in workers the feelings of safety, satisfaction, fairness, democracy, and autonomy. The management of organizations tries to treat workers in a safe and helpful manner and open new supportive channels at all higher to lower levels and offer workers the opportunity to take part in the decision-making process and give them power to carry on with their assignments (Martel & Dupuis, 2006; Robbins, 1989).

QWL is the presence of a specific set of specific terms and conditions or practices. This statement explains that higher level of quality of working life is present when democratic administrative skills are used, employees are enriched and treated with respect, and safety. At present, the term QWL is used to explain specific conditions related to environment and human beings rather than output and economic growth.

One of the initial models of QWL was presented by Walton in 1974. Walton recognized eight aspects of this construct as proper salaries and fair rewards, safe and secure working circumstances, the developed human capacities which are used to get opportunities, the opportunities for regular growth and safety, communal incorporation in the working institute, the laws which govern working organizations, work and whole life, and communal relationship of working life. This model has extensively and successfully been used for measuring QWL of employees in various organizations including educational organizations. The researchers of this study also used Walton's model for measuring teacher's QWL.

The research provides evidence that QWL has impacted employees' performance in various ways. QWL found significant impact on decreasing disputes and conflicts among employees (Havlovic, 1991), and increasing work safety, reward system, pay and opportunity for growth (Rossi, Perrewee, & Sauter, 2006). Harris, Staheli, LeClere, Anderson, and McCormick (2015) stated that QWL benefits consumer services, financial services, career counseling, retirement benefits, recreational services, and health safety measures.

Rossmiller (1992) measured QWL of secondary school staff members and head of the institutions and found positive impact of QWL on employee participation in their work, professional association and interface, and utilizing ability and understanding of working atmosphere. Kumar and Shanubhogue (1996) compared the present and estimated QWL in institutions and found a wide-ranging gap between teachers. Work life quality has also been found to influence worker's responses with respect to institutional recognition, work contentment, employment participation, job performance, organizational dedication, intention to quit, organizational income, individual hostility (Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway, & Ferris, (2006), institutional commitment (Jones, 2010), and created equilibrium between the needs of work place and individual's life (Baral & Bhargava, 2010).

Stress is one of the significant factors that have caused QWL of employees. Kumar and Deo (2011) determined the outcome of stress on quality of work life of college teachers and revealed that junior teachers had more stress than senior teachers, while female teachers felt more job stress than male teachers. Kusi, Mensah, and Gyaki (2014) found significant impact of stress on lecturers' performance in a university.

Adebiyi (2013) explored the work related stress to measure the impact of gender, staff, and experience on lecturers and showed that gender and years of experience did not influence stress on lecturers but the stress varied from staff to staff based on their teaching experience.

Various other factors have been found to affect the quality of work life of employees. Moghimi, Kazemi, and Samiie (2013), for example, identified four groups of factors organizational, environmental, nature of work related and individual that affected quality of work life. Akar (2018) also found that several factors - job contentment, self-respect, effort recognition and career progression, employee loyalty and growth, lower self-esteem, and employee development - which impacted the QWL of teachers of public and private universities include. Sinha (2012) found that organizational culture, career development, emotional supervisory support, flexible occupation arrangement, member of staff's motivation, organizational dedication, and job satisfaction were the most influential factors of QWL. Various other factors such as salary, human development, helpful leadership and structures, work environment and work life balance (Swarochi, Seema, & Sujatha, 2018), responsibility, health risk issues, stress, opportunities to learn, and collaboration have also been found to impact QWL of employees (Mogaddam & Azad, 2015).

The above literature provides in depth review of the QWL and the factors that impact it. Measuring QWL of university faculty members in Pakistan was, therefore, significant as it might provide evidence of the organizational culture and work environment, interpersonal relationships of employees, compensation, job satisfaction, and job security. The researchers have not been able to find any significant study that compared QWL of university teachers in Pakistan. This initial study might provide valid evidence of QWL of teachers in public and private universities of Pakistan.

Research Methodology

The purpose of this study was to compare QWL of university faculty in Pakistan. The researchers used multistage sampling method and sampled 389 academicians from 4 public and 4 private universities. The QWL questionnaire, previously validated by Ilgan, Ozu-Cengiz, Ata, and Akram (2015) was used to determine the quality of work life of university faculty members. The QWL scales consisted of 30 items with five dimensions such as organizational culture and work environment, interpersonal relationship, facilities, training and development, compensation and reward, and job satisfaction and job security. The sample items include: The University I work at has healthy working conditions; I am treated equally by my superiors, necessary opportunities are offered in order for me to do my job well; I do not think the salary I get is enough for what I do for work; and I can make a healthy balance between home and work. The scales

were represented as Never (1), Little (2), Somewhat (3), Much (4) and, A Great Deal (5) of QWL. The scale was content validated accordingly. The reliabilities of the subscales ranged from .71 to .82 with demonstrating good overall reliability as .88.

Data Collections

The data were collected through emails, and personal visits to the participants. The faculty members were requested to read the instructions carefully and respond accordingly. Each teacher was requested to answer all items of the instrument. All ethical considerations regarding data confidentiality and participant anonymity were strictly followed accordingly. Multistage sampling technique was used for data collection. Initially, 4 public and 4 private universities of Punjab province were randomly selected. Secondly, 389 faculty members with varying experience were randomly approached. The collected questionnaires were allotted serial numbers and the data were entered into the latest version of SPSS. Before running the analyses, data were cleaned, frequencies were checked, and minor errors were corrected.

Data Analysis

Initially, frequencies of the demographic variables were calculated. (See Table 1)

Table 1

Frequencies of Demographic variables (n=389).

Variables	Levels	n (%)
Gender	Male	139 (35.7)
	Female	250 (64.3)
University Type	Public	193 (49.6)
	Private	196 (50.4)
Position (Designation)	Lecturers	182 (46.8)
	Assistant Professor	186 (47.8)
	Associate Professor	21 (5.4)
Teaching Experience (in years)	1 to 5	184 (42.1)
	6 to10	135 (30.9)
	11 to 15	62 (14.2)
	Above 15	56 (12.8)
Teachers' Age (in years)	25-35 years	131 (33.7)
	36-45 years	241 (62.0)
	46-55 years and above	17 (4.4)

Table 1 describes that there were 139(35.7%) male and 250 (64.3%) female teachers; 193 (49.6%) respondents belonged to public universities and 196(50.4%) were affiliated with private universities; and 182(46.8%) were lecturers, 186(47.8%) assistant professors, and 21 (5.4%) associate professor were included in the study. The summary of the frequencies and other information about teaching experience and age can be seen in Table 1.

Descriptive statistics of the factors were calculated. Table 2 shows that interpersonal relationship showed highest mean score ($M=4.15$, $S.D.=.495$), followed by job satisfaction and job security ($M=3.98$, $S.D.=.543$), and organizational culture and work environment ($M=3.94$, $SD=.672$). The summary results are in Table 2.

Table 2*Descriptive Statistics of QWL (N=389)*

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Organizational culture and work environment	2.00	5.00	3.94	.672
Interpersonal relationship	1.60	5.00	4.15	.495
Facilities, training and development	1.67	5.00	3.78	.620
Compensation and reward	2.00	5.00	3.93	.552
Job satisfaction and job security	1.60	5.00	3.98	.543
Quality of Work life (Overall)	2.37	4.88	3.96	.434

After calculating descriptive statistics, various comparisons were made based on demographic variables. First, comparisons in teachers' QWL were made based on their gender. The results are given in Table 3.

Table 3*Difference in Mean Score of Male and Female Teachers' QWL*

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>Sig. (p)</i>
Organizational culture and work environment	Male	139	4.13	.629	387	4.083	.000*
	Female	250	3.84	.675			
Interpersonal relationship	Male	139	4.17	.441	387	.336	.002*
	Female	250	3.15	.524			
Facilities, training and development	Male	139	4.12	.626	387	.165	.022*
	Female	250	3.78	.618			
Compensation and reward	Male	139	3.97	.543	387	.977	.001*
	Female	250	3.11	.557			
Job satisfaction and job security	Male	139	4.88	.520	387	-2.866	.004*
	Female	250	4.04	.547			
Quality of work life(whole sample)	Male	139	4.39	.414	387	.903	.003*
	Female	250	3.94	.444			

*.p< 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 showed that male and female teachers significantly differed on quality of work life at university level $t(387) = 4.003$, $p = .003$. Factor-wise analysis showed that male teachers had better organizational culture and work environment ($M=4.13$, $S.D.=.629$) than female university teachers ($M=3.84$, $S.D.=.675$), $t(387)=4.083$, $p=.000$. The study further found that male teachers were better in interpersonal relationship ($M=4.17$, $S.D.=.441$) than female teachers ($M=3.15$, $S.D.=.524$), $t(387)=.336$, $p=.002$. Other results showed that male teachers demonstrated higher level of QWL than female teachers. The detailed results can be seen in Table 3.

Further, university teachers were compared on their QWL based on the location of their university as public or private. The results are given in Table 4.

Table 4
Difference in Public and Private University Teacher's QWL

Factors	Institution	N	M	SD	df	t	Sig. (p)
Organizational Culture and Work Environment	Private	193	3.74	.701	387	-6.231	.000*
	Public	196	4.14	.577			
Interpersonal Relationships	Private	193	4.08	.509	387	-2.988	.003*
	Public	196	4.23	.471			
Facilities, Training and Development	Private	193	3.65	.627	387	-4.254	.000*
	Public	196	3.91	.587			
Compensation and Reward	Private	193	3.81	.593	387	-4.433	.000*
	Public	196	4.05	.481			
Job Satisfaction and Job Security	Private	193	3.99	.523	387	.132	.895
	Public	196	3.98	.563			
Quality of Work Life (Overall)	Private	193	3.85	.460	387	-4.920	.000*
	Public	196	4.06	.379			

*.p< 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 showed that there was a significant difference in QWL of university teachers in public and private universities. Results indicated that public sector teachers (M=4.06, S.D.=.379) had better QWL than private university teachers (M=3.85, S.D.=.460), $t(387) = -4.920$, $p=.000$, effect size =0.501(Moderate level effect size). Factor-wise analysis showed that public sector teachers (M=4.14, S.D.=.577) had better organizational culture and work environment than private university teachers (M=3.74, S.D.=.702), $t(387)=-6.231$, $p=.000$ effect size (d)=0.634 (Moderate level effect size). Public sectors teachers (M=4.23, S.D.=.471) were better in interpersonal relationship than private sector teachers (M=4.08, S.D.=.509), $t(387)= -2.988$, $p=.003^*$ with moderate effect (d)=0.303. With respect to facilities, training and development, public sector teachers (M=3.91, S.D.=.587) were better than private sector teachers (M=3.65, S.D.=.627), $t(387)=-4.254$, $p=.000$, effect size (d) =0.431(moderate level effect size). The study also found that public sector teachers (M=4.05, S.D.=.481) were better in compensation and reward than private sector teachers (M=3.81, S.D.=.593), $t(387)=-4.433$, $p=.000$ with moderate effect size $d=0.452$ respectively. For the factor job satisfaction and job security difference in public and private institution was not significant, $t(387) = .132$, $p= .895 > 0.05$.

Table 5
ANOVA for Teachers' QWL Based on Teaching Experience

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational culture and work environment	Between Groups	1.223	4	.306	.674	.611
	Within Groups	174.321	384	.454		
	Total	175.545	388			
Interpersonal relationship	Between Groups	1.036	4	.259	1.054	.379
	Within Groups	94.339	384	.246		
	Total	95.374	388			
Facilities, training and development	Between Groups	.906	4	.227	.586	.673
	Within Groups	148.586	384	.387		
	Total	149.492	388			
Compensation and reward	Between Groups	3.426	4	.857	2.860	.023
	Within Groups	114.998	384	.299		
	Total	118.424	388			
Job satisfaction and job security	Between Groups	.294	4	.073	.247	.911
	Within Groups	114.116	384	.297		
	Total	114.409	388			
Quality of Work life (overall)	Between Groups	.529	4	.132	.700	.592
	Within Groups	72.569	384	.189		
	Total	73.098	388			

$p < 0.05$

Analysis of variance was conducted to find out the significant mean difference in the quality of work life of university teachers. It was found that there was no significant mean difference in QWL of teachers for different teaching experiences at university level, $F(4, 384) = .700, p = .592 > 0.05$. Analysis of sub-factors showed that for only factor Compensation and reward, the difference in teachers' teaching experience was significant, $F(4, 384) = 2.860, p = .023 < 0.05$. Further Post-hoc analysis depicted that teachers will 21 and above years ($M = 4.04, S.D. = 0.56$) were highly compensated and rewarded than 16-20 years ($M = 3.97, S.D. = 0.52$). No significant mean differences were found based on teaching experience for organizational culture and work environment, $F(4, 384) = .674, p = .611 > 0.05$, interpersonal relationship, $F(4, 384) = 1.290, p = .277$, facilities, training and development, $F(4, 384) = .586, p = .673$, job satisfaction and job security $F(4, 384) = .247, p = .911 > 0.05$.

ANOVA was run to measure the difference in QWL of teachers based on their age. The results and description of the results is given below.

Table 6
ANOVA for Teachers' Quality of Work Life Based on Age

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational culture and work environment	Between Groups	4.914	2	2.457	5.559	.004*
	Within Groups	170.630	386	.442		
	Total	175.545	388			
Interpersonal relationship	Between Groups	2.744	2	1.372	5.718	.004*
	Within Groups	92.630	386	.240		
	Total	95.374	388			
Facilities, training and development	Between Groups	2.677	2	1.338	3.519	.031*
	Within Groups	146.816	386	.380		
	Total	149.492	388			
Compensation and reward	Between Groups	2.465	2	1.233	4.103	.017*
	Within Groups	115.958	386	.300		
	Total	118.424	388			
Job satisfaction and job security	Between Groups	.296	2	.148	.501	.606
	Within Groups	114.113	386	.296		
	Total	114.409	388			
Quality of work life (Overall)	Between Groups	2.300	2	1.150	6.269	.002*
	Within Groups	70.798	386	.183		
	Total	73.098	388			

* $p < 0.05$

Teacher's overall QWL score was significantly different for teachers age, $F(2, 386) = 5.559$, $p = .004 < 0.05$. Post hoc analysis revealed that 36-45 years ($M=4.02$, $S.D.=0.40$) had better quality of work life than 46-55 years and above years ($M=3.86$, $S.D.=0.47$). Analysis for sub-factors shows that the factors interpersonal relationship also had significant difference for age levels of teachers at university level, $F(2, 386) = 5.718$, $p = .004 < 0.05$. Post hoc analysis showed that 35-45 years ($M=4.22$, $S.D.=0.47$) had better Interpersonal relationship than 46-55 and above years ($M=4.18$, $S.D.=0.64$). Significant mean difference for the factor organizational culture and work environment was also found on age at university level, $F(2, 386) = 5.559$, $p = .004 < 0.05$. Further post hoc analysis depicted that 35-45 years ($M=4.03$, $S.D.=0.63$) had better organizational culture and work environment than 46-55 and above years ($M=3.99$, $S.D.=0.67$).

For the factors facilities, training and development, $F(2, 386) = 3.519$, $p=.031>0.05$, post hoc analysis showed that 35-45 years ($M=3.85$, $S.D.=0.60$) had better facilities, training and development than 46-55 years and above ($M=3.82$, $S.D.=0.69$). With respect to compensation and reward, $F(2, 386) = 4.103$, $p=.017<0.05$, teachers with age levels 35-45 years ($M=4.00$, $S.D.=0.51$) were better than 46-55 years and above ($M=3.97$, $S.D.=0.48$).

Table 7
ANOVA for Teachers' QWL Based on Designation

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Analysis</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Organizational culture and work environment	Between Groups	6.891	2	3.446	7.886	.000
	Within Groups	168.653	386	.437		
	Total	175.545	388			
Interpersonal relationship	Between Groups	1.423	2	.711	2.923	.055
	Within Groups	93.952	386	.243		
	Total	95.374	388			
Facilities, training and development	Between Groups	5.438	2	2.719	7.286	.001
	Within Groups	144.054	386	.373		
	Total	149.492	388			
Compensation and reward	Between Groups	2.712	2	1.356	4.524	.011
	Within Groups	115.712	386	.300		
	Total	118.424	388			
Job satisfaction and job security	Between Groups	1.509	2	.755	2.580	.077
	Within Groups	112.900	386	.292		
	Total	114.409	388			
Quality of work life (overall)	Between Groups	3.126	2	1.563	8.621	.000
	Within Groups	69.972	386	.181		
	Total	73.098	388			

$p<0.05$

Teacher's mean score on QWL was significantly different for teachers' designation, $F(2, 386) = 8.621$, $p=.000<0.05$. Post hoc analysis revealed that assistant professors ($M=4.05$, $S.D.=0.40$) had better QWL than lecturers ($M=3.86$, $S.D.=0.46$) followed by associate professors ($M=3.75$, $S.D.=0.36$) and analysis for sub-factors shows that the factors organizational culture and work environment also had significant mean difference for designation of teachers at university level, $F(2, 386) = 7.886$, $p=.000<0.05$. Post hoc analysis showed that assistant professors ($M=4.07$, $S.D.=0.62$) had better organizational culture and work environment than lecturers ($M=4.04$, $S.D.=0.71$) followed by associate professors ($M=3.61$, $S.D.=0.56$), and for the factors Facilities, training and development, $F(2, 386) = 7.286$, $p=.007<0.05$, difference in

above said factor was also significant with respect to teachers' designation. Post hoc analysis showed that assistant professors ($M=3.90$, $S.D.=0.62$) had better facilities, training and development than lecturers ($M=3.71$, $S.D.=0.61$), followed by associate professors ($M=3.49$, $S.D.=0.46$). The factor compensation and reward was significantly different for teachers' designation at university level, $F(2, 386) = 4.524$, $p=.011 < 0.05$. Post hoc analysis revealed that assistant professors ($M=4.01$, $S.D.=0.51$) had better compensation and reward than lecturers ($M=3.89$, $S.D.=0.60$) followed by associate professors ($M=3.69$, $S.D.=0.45$). Significant mean differences on the basis of teacher's designation were not found for interpersonal relationship, $F(2, 386) = 2.923$, $p=.055 > 0.05$ and Job satisfaction and job security, $F(2, 386) = 2.580$, $p=.077 > 0.05$,

The study found the following overall findings:

1. Male and female university teachers significantly differ on their quality of work life on all the five dimensions.
2. Results indicated that public sector teachers had better QWL than private university teachers in all except Job satisfaction and job security dimension.
3. No significant mean differences in quality of work life of teachers for different teaching experiences were found.
4. Teachers significantly differed on their quality of work life based on their age. Post hoc analysis revealed that teachers with age between 36-45 years had better quality of work life than 46-55 years and above years in all dimensions.
5. It was found that teacher's QWL was significantly different for teachers based on their designation on all dimensions except for Job satisfaction and job security.

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to compare the quality of work life of teachers in public and private universities in Punjab, Pakistan. The study found significant mean difference in QWL based on demographic variables. Male and female faculty members significantly differed on QWL. The findings of this study were aligned with the findings of Ilgan et al. (2015) and Kara (2012) in Turkey, and Swami (2013) in India. The results found that public university faculty members had better QWL than teachers in private universities. Akar (2018) discovered that quality of work life is greater preferred by private sector university teachers than public sector in India. Bharathi, Umaselvi, and Kumar (2011) found no significant mean difference in overall QWL based on employees' sex, family, age, designation, income levels, and type of college, and native place of the respondents.

Recommendations

The mixed results of this study point out various implications. The study suggests that there should have equal chances and rights for all the affairs and aspects in universities as both have equally happy with the work life quality. The efforts of higher authorities in this regard are appreciable to minimize the gender bias and this is encouraging for both genders especially female faculty members to work in universities in Pakistan. This study determined that there is a considerable difference of quality of work life among university faculty members. It is recommended that higher authorities should take steps to improve the quality of work life of university teachers to equalize the standard of public and private universities.

The outcomes also suggested that there is a considerable mean difference in work life quality occurred among university faculty members on the basis of designation. The competent authorities should take necessary steps to improve the QWL of faculty members. Various strategies can be used to enhance quality of work life such as appropriate and fair compensation to human growth capabilities, physically healthy working conditions, the opportunities for regular growth (Moorhead & Griffin, 1998), employee's participation, and group work, and compensation (Shoeb, 2013). The study was limited to relatively smaller sample size (n=389) teachers of public and private universities of Pakistan; further studies might be conducted with larger sample size.

References

- Adebiyi, D. R. (2013). Occupational stress among academic staff of EKITI State University, Ado-Ekiti. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(4), 202-208.
- Afsar, S. T. (2014). Impact of the quality of work-life on organizational commitment: A comparative study on academicians working for state and foundation universities in Turkey. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(4), 124-152.
- Ahmad, S. (2013). Paradigms of quality of work life. *Journal of Human Values*, 19(1), 73-82.
- Anand, D. (2016). A perceptual analysis of workers and their quality of work life: A study of gender differences in the coffee plantations of Kodagu District of Karnataka. *PARIPEX-Indian Journal of Research*, 4(12), 116-119.
- Arif, S., & Ilyas, M. (2013). Quality of work-life model for teachers of private universities in Pakistan. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 21(3), 282-298.
- Asmawi, M., & Ramly, M. (2018). The effect of emotional intelligence, quality of work life, and stress on job satisfaction and turnover intention among the employees. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 6(5), 414-419.

- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2010). Work-family enrichment as a mediator between organizational interventions for work-life balance and job outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(3), 274-300.
- Bharathi, P. S., Umaseelvi, M., & Kumar, N. S. (2011). Quality of work life: Perception of college teachers. *Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*, 2(1), 47-65.
- Chib, S. (2012). Quality of work life and organizational performance parameters at the workplace. *SEGi Review*, 5(2), 36-47.
- Fatehi, B., Karimi, A., Pour, E. G., Pour, K. A., & Azizi, B. (2015). Impact of quality of work life on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Sports Studies*, 5(1), 79-86.
- Fatima, N., & Sahibzada, S. A. (2012). An empirical analysis of factors affecting work life balance among university teachers: the case of Pakistan. *Journal of International Academic Research*, 12(1), 16-29.
- Hamidi, F., & Mohamadi, B. (2012). Teachers' quality of work life in secondary schools. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 4(1), 1-5.
- Hans, A., Mubeen, S. A., Mishra, N., & Al-Badi, A. H. H. (2015). A study on occupational stress and quality of work life in private colleges of Oman (Muscat). *Global Business and Management Research*, 7(3), 55-68.
- Harris, J. D., Staheli, G., LeClere, L., Anderson, D., & McCormick, F. (2015). What effects have resident work-hour changes had on education, quality of life, and safety? A systematic review. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 473(5), 1600-1608.
- Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of work life and human resource outcomes. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 30(3), 469-479.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., Treadway, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). The interaction of social skill and organizational support on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 482-489.
- Ilgan, A., Ozu-Cengiz, O., Ata, A., & Akram, M. (2015). The relationship between teachers' psychological well-being and their quality of school work life. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(2), 159-181.
- Jofreh, M., Yasini, A., Dehsorkhi, H.F., & Hayat, A. (2013). The relationship between EFL teachers' quality of work life and job motivation. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 13(3), 338-346.
- Jones, W. A. (2010). The impact of social integration on subsequent institutional commitment conditional on gender. *Research in Higher Education*, 51(7), 687-700.

- Kara, D. (2012). Gender differences on perceptions of employee quality of working life in five star hotels in Turkey. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 20(10), 1383-1388.
- Akar, H. (2018). The Relationships between quality of work life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment and organizational citizenship: a study on teachers. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 7(2), 169-180.
- Kumar, D., & Deo, J. M. (2011). Stress and work life of college teachers. *Journal of The Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 37(1), 78-85.
- Kumar, H., & Shanubhogue, A. (1996). Quality of work life: An empirical approach. *Manpower Journal*, 32(3), 17-32.
- Kusi, H., Mensah, D. K. D., & Gyaki, E. (2014). Work related stress among the academic staff of the University of Education, Winneba campus, Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(13), 15-23.
- Lu, H., While, A.E., & Barriball, L. K. (2007). A model of job satisfaction of nurses: A reflection of nurses' working lives in mainland china. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 58(5), 468-479.
- Martel, J. P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of work life: Theoretical and methodological problems, and presentation of a new model and measuring instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77(2), 333-368.
- Mogaddam, A., & Azad, N. (2015). An empirical investigation on factors influencing on quality of work life. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 3(4), 375-380.
- Moghimi, S. M., Kazemi, M., & Samiie, S. (2013). Studying the relationship between organizational justice and employees' quality of work life in public organizations: A case study of Qom province. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 6(1), 117-143.
- Moorhead, G., & Griffin, W. (1999). *Managing people and organizations*. (6th ed.). NY: Houghton Mifflin.
- Narehan, H., Hairunnisa, M., Norfadzillah, R. A., & Freziamella, L. (2014). The effect of quality of work life (QWL) programs on quality of life (QOL) among employees at multinational companies in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 24-34.
- Nayak, T., Sahoo, C. K., & Mohanty, P. K. (2018). Workplace empowerment, quality of work life and employee commitment: A study on Indian healthcare sector. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 12(2), 117-136.

- Robbins, S.P. (1989). *Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rossi, A. M., Perrewee, P. L. & Sauter, S. L. (2006). *Stress and quality of working life*. Greenwich Information Age Publishing.
- Rossmiller, R. A. (1992). The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life. *Educational Management & Administration*, 20(3), 132-146.
- Schalock, R. L., Keith, K. D., Hoffman, K., & Karan, O. C. (1989). Quality of life: Its measurement and use. *Mental Retardation*, 27(1), 25-31.
- Schwartz, S. P., Adair, K. C., Bae, J., Rehder, K. J., Shanafelt, T. D., Profit, J., & Sexton, J. B. (2019). Work-life balance behaviours cluster in work settings and relate to burnout and safety culture: A cross-sectional survey analysis. *BMJ Quality and Safety*, 28(2), 142-150.
- Shoeb, A. (2013). Paradigms of quality of work life. *Journal of Human Values*, 19(1), 73-82.
- Sinha, C. (2012). Factors affecting quality of work life: Empirical evidence from Indian organizations. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(11), 31-40.
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241-302.
- Swamy, D. R. (2013). Quality of work life of employees in private technical institutions. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 7(3), 3-14.
- Swarochi, G., Seema, A., & Sujatha, S. (2018). An empirical research on quality of work-life-an employee perspective. *International Journal of Management Development*, 2(1), 34-80.
- Walton, R. E. (1974). Improving quality of work life. *Harvard Business Review*, 52(3), 12-15.
- Wu, G., Wu, Y., Li, H., & Dan, C. (2018). Job burnout, work-family conflict and project performance for construction professionals: The moderating role of organizational support. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(12), 1-20.
- Yang, F., Li, X., Zhu, Y., Li, Y., & Wu, C. (2017). Job burnout of construction project managers in China: A cross-sectional analysis. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(7), 1272-1287.