

Antecedents of Job Atonement among Faculty Members of Higher Educational Institutions

*Kawaljit Kaur Bhatia, **Dhiraj Sharma

ABSTRACT

Today's job complexities and abundant supply of teachers has made the teaching environment competitive. The lack of growth opportunities, lack of recognition, too much work load and organizational politics has led to job dissatisfaction among the faculty members of higher educational institutions in Punjab. The aim of this study is to examine the variables which contribute towards satisfaction and dis-satisfaction (aversion) among faculty members. The study is confined to Six universities of Punjab State (Three Government and Three Private Universities). The faculty members teaching in these universities were the sampling units for present study. The findings of the study reveal that the faculty members teaching in Government universities are more attracted towards promotion and leave plans as compared to private university teachers. The private universities follow very strict rules regarding leaves and only those teachers get promoted who prove their worth to their employer. The work load in private universities is higher as compared to public universities but at the same time private university teachers get rewards and recognition accordingly.

Keywords: Motivation, University, Job Satisfaction, Work Load, Compensation

1. Introduction

The Employment or a full time Job is an integral part of a man's life. Job brings creativity, grants certain status, power, dignity and feeling of achievement. It is a source to fulfill one's physical, security, social, ego needs etc. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory laid the foundation for job satisfaction. This theory explains that there are five basic needs in life-physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs and self-actualization needs. The Hierarchy of need theory developed by Maslow (1954) was one of the most popular widely used theories of human motivation. Porter (1967) defines satisfaction as the gap between what the employee experiences in actual conditions and what he thinks should be there. More the gap, more is the level of dissatisfaction and lesser the gap or no gap leads to satisfaction.

In teaching sector, emotional fatigue, depression and less individual achievement are due to long term occupational stress and affects the academic growth of the students (Jennett, Harris and Mesibov 2003). The most contented teachers are the ones who feel their jobs are secure and they are treated as experts by the community. This is one of the key factors as this ensures that they are capable of delivering the student requirement and they are capable of utilizing their overall skills (Walton et al., 2003). Teachers whose jobs are secure are more likely to have prospects for professional development, interact cohesively with peers and greater parental involvement in their schools and to their students (Gupta & Sharma, 2010). Rewards and Benefits serves as a motivating factor for teachers to perform well in the colleges. This also creates a healthy competition between teachers in using their overall skills in their performance and strives to increase the overall standard of the college (Kaur, 2012). Compensation plays a pivotal role in effectiveness of the university. Lesser compensation would not attract skilled and experienced people with great performance and would not help in achieving the quality in imparting education, while higher compensation

* Assistant Professor, Khalsa College, Amritsar

** Assistant Professor, Punjabi University, Patiala

might be an overhead with costs running more than the desired (Malarvizhi, 2012; Islam, 2012).

2. Literature Review and Research Gap

The empirical literature available on the impact of various factors on employee's job satisfaction level is very vast. The Impact of determinants which affect faculty's level of satisfaction have been studied by many researchers (Anitha and Rao 1998; Cummings and Worley, 2009; Sirgy, 2001; Cascio and Nambudiri, 2010; Sheel, 2012). Zakari, Khamis & Hamadi, (2010) also suggested that University should strive to provide opportunity for every team member to showcase their talent, proficiency, skills, capacity and abilities. Utilizing teacher's capacities in areas other than their present position will help them to understand that management appreciates and identifies that what the staff could provide to the university. This can also provide work variety and helps to break up the everyday grind of work and also helps to get free from the stress of the routine work (Gupta & Sharma, 2011). Faculties feel that university has made commitment with them offering good pay and welfare package and assisting in compensating for teacher's higher training fee, following a systematic schedule and keeping the tutors updated with current trend of teaching methodology and developing their knowledge with the latest technologies. When the universities are keeping their promise with faculties, the faculties in turn fixed to their commitment. Commitment shown by university is returned in the form of commitment from faculties like putting their full capabilities in their work for the development of the university (Al-Ahmadi, 2009; Schalk et al. eds. 2010). 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. Zingheim and Schuster (2001); Brewer, (2005); Charu, 2012; Jungblut, (2010); suggested that while rewards and benefits help the university in motivating the teachers to perform better, compensation pays a vital role in attracting more talent into the university and retaining them. Occupational mental-health programmes dealing with stress is a new concept and an important function of quality of work life and these programmes are conducted in the way to reduce the stress faced by a person in her / his occupation (Oxford research, 2011). This is significant as an individual with high occupational stress will not be able to concentrate his personal life which would eventually hit his performance at work and also his physical and mental health. This stress can be caused due to too much of work at home or at college and too much pressure to complete the work and unable to manage time effectively thereby missing deadlines. Shalla S.A. and Iqbal (2014) investigated in his study that sustainability of organizational success is primarily based upon the satisfaction level and quality of life of an organization. The study concluded that there is strong association between quality of life and job satisfaction level. There is also strong association in the perception of employees towards quality of work life and job satisfaction across the gender and nature of job. There is difference in the perception of males and females with regard to different dimensions like working conditions, work life balance, opportunities of growth and social relevance of job. Productivity decreases when the workers are not satisfied by the organization. The workers should be sufficiently paid and appreciated for what they work. The quality of work improves when employees are stress free and are able to balance their official and personal work. The expectation from employees is that the employers would help them in achieving their work life balance, to be able to do their job efficiently.

3. Objectives and Research Methodology of the Study

In the light of above discussion, the specific objective of the paper are:1) to examine the perception of faculty members towards different determinants which affect their level of satisfaction and 2) to compare various determinants which create job satisfaction and/or create aversion among Government and Private University faculty members.

The purpose of this research is to analyze and describe various determinants which affect the performance of university’s faculty members (both Public and Private Universities) with regard to the overall work environment and also to make comparison of both types of universities. The present study is an empirical one primarily based on primary survey. The primary data was collected with the help of structured questionnaire. The population of the study is all the faculty members teaching in Universities in the Punjab state. Out of these, Six universities were selected - 3 Public and 3 Private Universities. Further, a sample of 500 faculty members (250 each) has been interviewed.

4. Results and Analysis

There are different methods to assess how different variables bring job satisfaction and also positively contribute towards work environment. Respondents were asked to rank the statements on the basis of their own perception. Ranks were allotted from 1 to 10; Rank 1 was allotted to highly satisfactory variable and so on. Mann Whitney statistic was applied to compare the ranks. List of variables which motivate the teachers as well as create job satisfaction among them is given below.

Table 1
List of Variables that creates Job Satisfaction among Teachers

Variable Labels	Variables
C ₁	Salary and Benefits
C ₂	Promotion
C ₃	Leave Plans
C ₄	Rewards and recognitions
C ₅	Acknowledgement
C ₆	Scope for career growth
C ₇	Job Security
C ₈	Friendly superiors
C ₉	Interactive and well-behaved students
C ₁₀	Reasonable working hours

Table 2
Mann-Whitney Test of Comparison of Means and Mean Rank among University Teachers working in Public and Private Sector universities

Variables	Sector Type	Ranks		
		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
C ₁	Public	250	270.19	67547.5
	Private	250	230.81	57702.5
	Total	500		
C ₂	Public	250	262.3	65575
	Private	250	238.7	59675
	Total	500		
C ₃	Public	250	251.76	62941
	Private	250	249.24	62309
	Total	500		
C ₄	Public	250	249.34	62334.5
	Private	250	251.66	62915.5
	Total	500		
C ₅	Public	250	249.13	62281.5
	Private	250	251.87	62968.5
	Total	500		

C ₆	Public	250	243.67	60917.5
	Private	250	257.33	64332.5
	Total	500		
C ₇	Public	250	272.48	68121
	Private	250	228.52	57129
	Total	500		
C ₈	Public	250	231.29	57823.5
	Private	250	269.71	67426.5
	Total	500		
C ₉	Public	250	239.16	59789
	Private	250	261.84	65461
	Total	500		
C ₁₀	Public	250	232.91	58228
	Private	250	268.09	67022
	Total	500		

In the Mann Whitney U test, the two samples are combined and the cases are ranked in order of increasing size. The test statistic, U is computed as the number of times a score from sample 1 or group 1 precedes a score from group 2. Ranks are assigned from smallest observation to the largest. Table 2 describes higher mean rank in case of variable 1 (C₁) shows that public sector employees are more satisfied with salary and benefits provided to them followed by 2nd variable (Promotion) & 3rd variable (Leave Plans) both scored greater by public sector university teachers. They are more attracted towards promotion and leave plans as compared to private university teachers. Being an employee of private university there are strict rules regarding leave and those employees are promoted who prove their caliber to the University. There is no such rule that each & every employee will be promoted on the basis of experience. As we move to 4th variable and 5th variable labeled as “Rewards and Recognition” and “Acknowledgment”; Private university teachers are more satisfied with these variables. No doubt work load in private universities is higher as compared to public universities. However, private university teachers are provided rewards and recognition accordingly and their work is also acknowledged by the management. The 6th variable “Scope for career growth” scored higher mean value in Private Universities followed by 7th variable “Job Security” which scored higher value in Public Sector Universities. As mean values of 8th, 9th and 10th variable are higher in case of private university teachers, this indicates that Friendly superiors; Interactive Students and Reasonable working hours are given the lowest ranks by university teachers.

Table 3
Mann-Whitney U-Wilcoxon Rank Sum W Test

Test Statistics										
	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃	C ₄	C ₅	C ₆	C ₇	C ₈	C ₉	C ₁₀
Mann-Whitney U	26330.00	28300.00	30930.00	30960.00	30910.00	29540.00	25750.00	26450.00	28410.00	26850.00
Wilcoxon W	57700.00	59680.00	62310.00	62330.00	62280.00	60920.00	57130.00	57820.00	59790.00	58230.00
Z	-3.10	-1.84	-0.20	-0.18	-0.21	-1.06	-3.42	-2.99	-1.77	-2.74
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.07	0.84	0.86	0.83	0.29	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.01
Grouping Variable: Sector Type										

Table 3 showing a test of significant difference in proportions obtained from two independent samples. The obtained p value indicates that there are few variables which score p value less than

0.05. As the obtained value of $C_1=0.00$ was found to be significant at 0.05 level of confidence, it could be attributed to the fact that salary & benefits being more dominant factor for teachers of both the sectors. Teachers of both universities differ in their opinion regarding the (C_1) variable “Salary & Benefits”. Handsome salary for their services towards their respective university followed by higher job satisfaction level and better standard of living. As per mean scores teachers of public sector being satisfied more from job security as compared to private university teachers. The obtained p value of C_7 (Job Security) =0.000 which is found to be significant as less than 0.05 level of significance followed by two more factors C_8 (Friendly Superiors)=0.000 and C_{10} (Reasonable Working Hours)=0.001 also found to be significant. The extent of preference differ among both university teachers but for other variables which score value greater than 0.05 are considered as there is no significant difference in opinion of teachers among both the sectors.

Job stress has become inevitable these days. Due to increase in job complexities and more supply of teachers has made the environment competitive. Generally due to lack of administrative understanding, role ambiguity and role conflicts, job stress arises. There are various factors which create aversion among university teachers; these are listed in the following table.

Table 4
List of Variables which Create Aversion among Teachers

Variables Labels	Variables
D ₁	Too much of work load
D ₂	Very long travelling time
D ₃	Increased stress
D ₄	No time to meet personal commitments
D ₅	Very bad superiors and top management
D ₆	Attitude of students
D ₇	Lack of growth opportunities
D ₈	Partiality in promotions
D ₉	Institutional politics
D ₁₀	No proper recognition

Table 5
Mann-Whitney Test of Comparison of Means and Mean Rank among University Teachers working in Public and Private Sector Universities

Ranks				
Variables	Sector Type	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
D ₁	Public	250	272.8	68199
	Private	250	228.2	57051
	Total	500		
D ₂	Public	250	246.39	61598
	Private	250	254.61	63652
	Total	500		
D ₃	Public	250	255.87	63967.5
	Private	250	245.13	61282.5
	Total	500		
D ₄	Public	250	248.52	62130.5
	Private	250	252.48	63119.5
	Total	500		
D ₅	Public	250	240.23	60058
	Private	250	260.77	65192
	Total	500		
D ₆	Public	250	240.85	60212
	Private	250	260.15	65038
	Total	500		

D ₇	Public	250	251.31	62827
	Private	250	249.69	62423
	Total	500		
D ₈	Public	250	246.41	61601.5
	Private	250	254.59	63648.5
	Total	500		
D ₉	Public	250	260.3	65075.5
	Private	250	240.7	60174.5
	Total	500		
D ₁₀	Public	250	243.78	60945.5
	Private	250	257.22	64304.5
	Total	500		

In the Mann Whitney U test, the two samples are combined and the cases are ranked in order of increasing size. The test statistic, U is computed as the number of times a score from sample 1 or group 1 precedes a score from group 2. Ranks are assigned from smallest observation to the largest. The Table 5 reveals that higher mean rank in case of variable 1st (D₁) shows that public sector employees do not like if more work load is assigned to them. 2nd variable's mean rank does not show any significant difference among the opinion of both sector's faculty members. Both are equally stressed with long travelling hours. In Public sector, 3rd variable is labeled as increased stress; it might be due to politics in university, non-cooperation among peer group, role ambiguity whereas mean score is comparatively low from public sector faculty members. In case of 4th, 5th & 6th variables labeled as "No time to meet personal commitments", "Bad Superiors & top management" and "Attitude of students" respectively; private sector teachers have more job stress regarding these variables than teachers in public sector. There are less chances of growth in case of public sector universities whereas private university teachers are comparatively less stressed by this variable (7th Variable -Lack of growth opportunities). In private sector university teachers are more stressed by (D₈) "Partiality in promotions" and (D₁₀) "No proper Recognition" whereas public sector teachers are more stressed by (D₉) "Institutional politics."

Table 6
Mann-Whitney U-Wilcoxon Rank Sum W Test

Test Statistics										
	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃	D ₄	D ₅	D ₆	D ₇	D ₈	D ₉	D ₁₀
Mann-Whitney U	25680.00	30220.00	29910.00	30760.00	28680.00	28840.00	31050.00	30230.00	28800.00	29570.00
Wilcoxon W	57050.00	61600.00	61280.00	62130.00	60060.00	60210.00	62420.00	61600.00	60170.00	60950.00
Z	-3.53	-0.64	-0.84	-0.31	-1.60	-1.50	-0.13	-0.64	-1.53	-1.05
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	0.52	0.40	0.76	0.11	0.13	0.90	0.52	0.13	0.29
Grouping Variable: Sector Type										

The results presented in table 6 reveals overall variables which create stress among university teachers. The results showing a test of significant difference in proportions obtained from two independent samples. The obtained p value indicates that there are few variables which score p value less than 0.05. As the obtained value of D₁=0.00 was found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. It could be attributed that there is significant difference in the opinion of

both the sectors in case of D₁. The p values obtained by other 9 variables reveals that there is no significant difference between their stress levels.

5. Conclusion

The present study concludes that salary and benefits are more dominating factors for university teachers. The extent of preference differs among Public and Private University teachers with regard to reasonable working hours and friendly superiors. Private university faculty is ready to work for longer hours provided they are compensated equally with rewards and recognition. Job security is also a major factor which affects their level of satisfaction. Findings reveal that this study has theoretical and practical implications for the academicians and top management of educational institutions. In order to utilize employees' skills and abilities properly, the management must provide satisfactory compensation, job security and pleasant working environment.

REFERENCES

- Al-Ahmadi, H (2009), "Factors Affecting Performance of Hospital Nurses in Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia", *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, Vol.22 (1), pp.40-54.
- 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.
- Bix, 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.
- Brewer, D. (2005), "Why Elephants Gallop: Assessing and Predicting Organizational Performance in Federal Agencies", *Journal of Public Administration Research Theory*, Vol.10 (4), pp. 685-711.
- Brown, F. (1972), "Need Satisfaction of Educational Administrators", American Educational Research Association, *ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED*, pp.561-584.
- Carr, Jennifer Z, Schmidt, Aaron M, Ford J K, Deshon and Richard P (2003), "Climate Perceptions Matter: A Meta-Analytic Path Analysis Relating Molar Climate, Cognitive and Affective States and Individual Level Work Outcomes", *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Cascio F. W, Nambudiri (2010), *Managing Human Resource*, eighth edition, Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.
- 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.
- Charu M, (2012), "Occupational Stress and its impact on QWL with specific reference to Hotel Industry", retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from http://www.managein.net/pdf_Articles/September_2012/50-54=Article_Sept_2012.pdf
- Chelte A F (1983), "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life", U. M. I Dissertation Information Service.
- Cummings G T, Worley G C (2009), "Organization Development and Change", *South Western Cengage Learning*, Canada.
- Cunningham, W.G. (1983), "Teacher Burnout-Solutions for the 1980s", *The Urban Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 37-51.
- 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).
- 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.
- Jenkinsons, R. and Chapman, W. (1990), "Job Satisfaction of Jamaican Elementary School Teachers" *International Review of Education*, Vol. 36(3), pp. 299-313.
- Jungblut, JM (2010), EF0272-Ad-hoc paper "Innovative workplace practices and company outcomes". *Eurofound*, 2010.
- 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.
- Knoop, R. (1980), "Job Involvement of Teachers", Toledo, OH: Mid Western Educational Research Association, *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 208-508*.
- Kumar and Kalaisel (2012), "Quality of work life-A Overview", *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Series and Management Research*, Vol. 1(10).
- 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.
- Malarvizhi (2012), "A Study on Quality Of Work Life In Jeppiaar Cements Private Limited, MelaMathur, Perambalur-District", retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from <http://www.isrj.net/publishArticles/736.pdf>
- Man (2011), "A Theoretical Approach to the Job Satisfaction", *Journal of Management Studies*, retrieved on 23rd January, 2013 from http://www.pjms.zim.pcz.pl/A_theoretical_approach_to_the_job_satisfaction.pdf
- 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.
- Moen, P (2000), "Effective Work Life Strategies: Working Couples, Work Conditions, Gender and Life Quality" *Social Problems*, Vol.47 (3).
- 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.
- Schalk D, Bijl M, Halfens R, Hollands L, Cummings G (2010), "Interventions aimed at improving the nursing work environment: A systematic review". *Implementation Science*, Vol.5 (34).
- 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.
- Shalla S.A. and Asif Iqbal fazili (2014), "Quality of Work Life and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Dimensional Analysis", *ABHINAV, International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology*, Special Issue ISSN-2320-0073.
- Sirgy J (2001), "Quality of Life Research: An Ethical Marketing Perspective", *Kluwer Academic publishers*, The Netherlands.
- Skaalvik M E and Skaalvik S (2010), "Teacher Self-Efficacy and Teacher Burnout: A Study of Relations", *Norwegian University of Science and Technology*, 7491 Trondheim, Norway.
- 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 Freelancers", *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), Stress Management in V.S.P Rao and Srilatha, *Organisation studies*, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi, pp.263.
- Sweeney, P. (1981), "Human Needs and Job satisfaction", *Professional Journal*, Vol. 32(1), pp. 42-55.
- Walton (1982), "International Labour Organization: Recommended from the National Seminar on improving Quality of Work Life", *Productivity*, Vol.22 (4), pp. 79-83.
- Walton, R. (1973), "Quality of Work Life Indicators- Prospects and Problems", A Portugal Measuring the Quality of Working Life, pp.57-70, Ottawa
- Warr P B (1987), "Job Characteristics and Mental Health in War," *Psychology at Work*, London: Penguin Books.
- Zakari NM, Al Khamis NI, Hamadi HY (2010), "Conflict and Professionalism: Perceptions among Nurses in Saudi Arabia" *International Nurses Review*, Vol. 57(3) pp.297-304.
- 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.
- Zingheim K P and Schuster R J (2008), "Managing Total Compensation to achieve Multiple Objectives", Article published in *M World*, spring 2008, Vol. 7 (1).
- Zohir, S. C., (2007), "Role of Dhaka Export Processing Zone: Employment and Empowerment", *Research Report, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, Dhaka*.

About the Authors:

Kawaljit Kaur Bhatia, (Ph.D.) is M.Com, MBA, M.Phil, and Ph.D. She has thirteen years of rich teaching and research experience. Presently, she is teaching at DIPS Co Educational College, Dhilwan. She has more than a dozen of research publications to her credit in the journals of repute.

Dhiraj Sharma, (Ph.D.) is currently working in the School of Management Studies at Punjabi University, Patiala. He holds three masters in the area of Finance, Commerce and Business Administration respectively. He is a doctorate in the area of Banking Technology and has successfully supervised Six Ph.Ds. He has fourteen books and more than forty published research papers to his credit. He has independently developed many course books for several institutions notably among them are: Punjab University, Chandigarh; All India Management Association (AIMA), New Delhi; Indian Institute of Materials Management (IIMM), Mumbai; Bangalore University, Bengaluru.