



## A STUDY ON QUALITY WORK LIFE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS IN COIMBATORE DISTRICT

C. Karthick\* & Dr. N. Raja\*\*

\* Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Dr. N. G. P College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamilnadu

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Chikkanna Government Arts College, Tirupur, Tamilnadu

**Cite This Article:** C. Karthick & Dr. N. Raja, "A Study on Quality Work Life of School Teachers in Coimbatore District", International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities, Volume 3, Issue 1, Page Number 292-299, 2018.

### **Abstract:**

The research study was taken to investigate the quality of work life of school teachers. The sample of 1012 School Teachers from Coimbatore City was selected through adopting Stratified random sampling technique. Teachers' quality of work life was accessed with the help of Teacher's Quality of Work Life Scale constructed by the investigator. Specific objective formulated is: 1. To assess the level of quality of Work Life of Secondary School teachers. 2. To find whether there is any significant difference in quality of Work Life of Secondary School Teachers with high and low experience. 3. To find whether there is any significant difference in Quality of Work Life of Secondary School teachers belonging to Government, Private aided and Private un-aided Schools.

**Key Words:** Quality of Work Life, Government, Private, Stratified, Aided & Un-Aided

### **Introduction:**

Effective schools emphasize and reinforce the value of human resources and other internal morale issues among their members while being sensitive to external demands (Cameron, 1984). For school operation, teachers are one of the most important human resources. The success of any educational system depends largely on quality teachers. The strengths and quality of any educational system depends largely upon their teacher's work. Work is an integral part of everyday life as it is the livelihood or career. On an average, people spend around twelve hours per day in the work place which forms one third of their entire life. Hence work should yield satisfaction, give peace of mind, fulfillment of having done a task and having spent time fruitfully, constrictively and purposefully. Even if it is a small step towards the life time goal, at the end of the day it should give satisfaction, eagerness to look forward to the next day. This has lead to the quest for improvement in quality of work life. Thus the quest for quality has been the characteristics of the entire history of human civilization. It has been the driving force behind all human endeavors, Quality and quality of work is apparently related to the nature of educational organization. The organizational climate of educational institutions should enhance quality of work life of its teachers.

### **Review of Literature:**

The Quality of work life is based on performance. QWL has positive relations with performance and developing human capabilities and constitutionalism in the work organization. The department chairpersons in the Esfahan medical university are in the high level concerning quality of work life dimension (Behzad Shabbazi and Sadegh Shokrzad 2011 ).

Quality of work life can be explained by four factors (i). work life balance (ii). Social factors (iii). Economic factors and (iv). Job content. From the above expositions two conclusions are arrived. Quality of Work Life is a multi dimensional concept and due to its multi dimensional nature, it is a relative concept which cannot be precisely defined and measured. (Zare, Ha mid, Haghgooyan, Zolfa and Asl, Zahra Karimi 2012).

Quality of Work Life – Linkage with Job Satisfaction and Performance is indeed a difficult task. The objective physical and structural design factors provide work place setting and intervening policy factors that affect work process of employees. It is possible to study the relationship between the immediate effects psychology of employees (positive attitude, commitment and satisfaction) and ultimate effects on performance of organization are being considered. (R. Gayathiri and Dr. Lalitha Ramakrishnan 2013)

### **Objectives of the Study:**

- ✓ To assess the level of quality of Work Life of Secondary School teachers.
- ✓ To find whether there is any association among socio-economic characteristics with respect to their Quality of Work Life.

### **Hypotheses of the Study:**

- ✓ There is no significant association among socio-economic characteristics of school Teachers with respect to their Quality of Work Life.

### **Methodology:**

The present study was taken up to investigate the Quality of Work Life of school teachers and to find whether there is any association in these variables with respect to socio-economic variables. There were 40 variables related to Quality of Work Life which is analysed through Factor analysis, Cluster analysis,

discriminant analysis and finally Chi-square test is used to find the association of QWL factors with socio-economic characteristics of school teachers.

**Analysis and Interpretation:**

The QWL include 40 variables which explains about dimensions Quality work life regarding School Teachers in Coimbatore district.

**Priorities of QWL Factors:**

The opinion from the respondents surveyed about various QWL have been obtained in a five point scale, and the priority of each of the QWL factors have been ranked according to the mean values assigned to them. This has been displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Priorities of QWL Factors

S.No	QWL Factors	Mean Value	Rank
1	Organisation Culture	3.5507	IV
2	Compensation and rewards	3.9912	I
3	Facilities	2.8977	V
4	Relation and Co-operation	2.2846	VII
5	Work Environment	3.7879	III
6	Autonomy of work	3.9038	II
7	Adequacy of resources	2.7767	VI

The above table reveals that Compensation and rewards ranked as the topmost QWL dimension. This implies that the main QWL dimension is the compensation and rewards.

**Factorisation of QWL Factors:**

Factor analysis was applied to condense the variables or items into minimum number of manageable items or variables. Factor Analysis has been done with the two statistical tests of Bartlett’s test and KMO test. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy signifies the proportionate variance of variables or items which may be caused through new factors. KMO value in excess of 0.50 reveals that factor analysis is absolutely apt for the particular data set. KMO and Bartlett’s Test results are depicted in Table 2.

Table 2: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.927
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	30973.180
	df	780
	Sig.	0.000

The KMO value of 0.927 implies that the factor analysis applied for this data is valid. The significance value being less than 0.01 implies that the value is significant at 99 % level of confidence. The chi square value for Bartlett’s test of Sphericity is 30973.180. High Chi-square value denotes that the variables have been aptly factored. Principal Component Analysis was used for extraction purpose, and varimax rotation is used as the standard rotation. Factors having greater than one as Eigen value are taken as reduced factors which now use as new factors for future analysis. Hence the resultant seven factors are extracted from forty QWL variables. Variables have been grouped into seven factors namely, “Organisation culture”, “Compensation and rewards”, “Facilities”, “Relation and Co-operation”, “Work Environment”, “Autonomy of work” and “Adequacy of resources”.

Table 3: Communalities

Description of Variables		Initial	Extraction
QWL1	Motivating environment	1.000	.531
QWL2	Involvement in decision making	1.000	.770
QWL3	Relationship with colleagues	1.000	.653
QWL4	Objective of training program	1.000	.658
QWL5	Fair compensation	1.000	.732
QWL6	Fringe benefits	1.000	.773
QWL7	Comfortableness in work	1.000	.566
QWL8	Ability to work	1.000	.658
QWL9	Communication channel facilities	1.000	.684
QWL10	Own style and pace of work	1.000	.659
QWL11	Proud to work	1.000	.630
QWL12	Relationship with subordinates	1.000	.726
QWL13	Frequency of training programme	1.000	.788
QWL14	Rewards for good work	1.000	.842
QWL15	Welfare activity	1.000	.799
QWL16	Work freedom	1.000	.801
QWL17	Balanced objectives and facilities	1.000	.421

QWL18	Communication system in the school	1.000	.774
QWL19	Additional responsibility	1.000	.799
QWL20	Fair job rotation	1.000	.845
QWL21	Safety measures	1.000	.748
QWL22	Fair promotion	1.000	.685
QWL23	Sufficiency of training program	1.000	.632
QWL24	Relationship with head miss/master	1.000	.623
QWL25	Comments and suggestion	1.000	.778
QWL26	Information's related to work	1.000	.742
QWL27	Time for personal care	1.000	.784
QWL28	Co-operation from other staff	1.000	.743
QWL29	Work demand stress	1.000	.724
QWL30	Training regarding interpersonal skills	1.000	.781
QWL31	Pay based on responsibility	1.000	.659
QWL32	Social security	1.000	.651
QWL33	productivity	1.000	.655
QWL34	Job stress	1.000	.664
QWL35	Home work	1.000	.500
QWL36	Trade union activity	1.000	.608
QWL37	Transportation	1.000	.739
QWL38	Support for self development	1.000	.814
QWL39	Time for personal care	1.000	.708
QWL40	Relationship with immediate superior	1.000	.739
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.			

The variance and eigen value extracted through each factor of QWL factors are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	13.244	33.110	33.110	13.244	33.110	33.110	5.132	12.831	12.831
2	4.349	10.873	43.984	4.349	10.873	43.984	4.960	12.400	25.230
3	3.216	8.041	52.025	3.216	8.041	52.025	4.778	11.944	37.175
4	2.340	5.851	57.876	2.340	5.851	57.876	4.002	10.005	47.180
5	1.988	4.970	62.846	1.988	4.970	62.846	3.694	9.234	56.414
6	1.840	4.600	67.446	1.840	4.600	67.446	2.918	7.296	63.710
7	1.108	2.770	70.216	1.108	2.770	70.216	2.602	6.506	70.216
8	.822	2.056	72.272						
9	.771	1.927	74.199						
10	.669	1.673	75.872						
11	.649	1.622	77.494						
12	.606	1.514	79.008						
13	.555	1.387	80.395						
14	.528	1.321	81.716						
15	.524	1.310	83.025						
16	.474	1.186	84.211						
17	.456	1.139	85.350						
18	.442	1.106	86.456						
19	.403	1.007	87.463						
20	.388	.969	88.432						
21	.377	.943	89.375						
22	.355	.889	90.264						
23	.344	.860	91.124						
24	.339	.846	91.970						
25	.310	.775	92.745						
26	.285	.712	93.457						
27	.283	.707	94.164						
28	.257	.642	94.806						

29	.239	.598	95.404						
30	.235	.587	95.991						
31	.230	.576	96.567						
32	.201	.503	97.070						
33	.187	.467	97.537						
34	.167	.417	97.955						
35	.163	.408	98.362						
36	.156	.390	98.752						
37	.151	.378	99.130						
38	.132	.329	99.459						
39	.118	.296	99.755						
40	.098	.245	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Only those components are considered as principal components which have an eigen value greater than 1. Here, the first seven components have an eigen value of more than 1, which explains 70.216% of total variance, and the remaining components explain 29.784% of total variance. The below table presents the total variance of the observed variables explained by each of the principal components / factors. For arriving at possible factors from total 40 variables, rotation was converged in 6 iterations through Varimax Rotation Technique.

Table 5: Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>

Short Description of Variables		Component							Labeled as
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
QWL30	Training regarding interpersonal skills	.832							Organisation culture
QWL25	Comments and suggestion	.823							
QWL27	Time for personal care	.808							
QWL28	Co-operation from other staff	.803							
QWL26	Information's related to work	.775							
QWL29	Work demand stress	.773							
QWL24	Relationship with head miss/master	.681							
QWL20	Fair job rotation		.846						Compensation and Rewards
QWL21	Safety measures		.821						
QWL19	Additional responsibility		.820						
QWL22	Fair promotion		.770						
QWL18	Communication system in the school		.756						
QWL23	Sufficiency of training program		.723						
QWL17	Balanced objectives and facilities		.612						
QWL6	Fringe benefits			.831					Facilities
QWL2	Involvement in decision making			.824					
QWL5	Fair compensation			.812					
QWL3	Relationship with colleagues			.752					
QWL4	Objective of training program			.719					
QWL1	Motivating environment			.672					
QWL7	Comfortableness in work			.668					
QWL14	Rewards for good work				.888				Relation and Co-operation
QWL16	Work freedom				.867				
QWL15	Welfare activity				.860				
QWL13	Frequency of training programme				.849				
QWL12	Relationship with subordinates				.793				
QWL38	Support for self development					.823			Work Environment
QWL39	Time for personal care					.783			

QWL37	Transportation		.767		
QWL40	Relationship with immediate superior		.761		
QWL36	Trade union activity		.586		
QWL33	Productivity		.715	Autonomy of work	
QWL31	Pay based on responsibility		.696		
QWL32	Social security		.695		
QWL34	Job stress		.619		
QWL35	Home work		.566		
QWL10	Own style and pace of work		.779	Adequacy of resources	
QWL9	Communication channel facilities		.776		
QWL8	Ability to work		.763		
QWL11	Proud to work		.722		
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.					

**Factor 1: Organisation Culture**

The variables QWL30 - Training regarding interpersonal skills, QWL25 - Comments and suggestion , QWL27 - Time for personal care, QWL28 - Co-operation from other staff, QWL26 - Information's related to work, QWL29 - Work demand stress and QWL24 - Relationship with head miss/master constitute factor I which accounts for 33.110% of variance.

**Factor 2: Compensation and Rewards**

The variables QWL20 - Fair job rotation, QWL21 - Safety measures , QWL19 - Additional responsibility , QWL22 - Fair promotion , QWL 18 - Communication system in the school , QWL23 - Sufficiency of training program , QWL 17 - Balanced objectives and facilities constitute factor II which accounts for 10.873% of variance.

**Factor 3: Facilities**

The variables QWL6 - Fringe benefits, QWL2 - Involvement in decision making, QWL5 - Fair compensation, QWL3 - Relationship with colleagues, QWL4 - Objective of training program, QWL1 - Motivating environment, and QWL7 - Comfortableness in work constitute factor III which accounts for 8.041% of variance.

**Factor 4: Relation and Co-operation**

The variables QWL14 - Rewards for good work, QWL16- Work freedom, QWL15 - Welfare activity, QWL13 - Frequency of training programme, and QWL12 - Relationship with subordinates constitute factor IV which accounts for 5.851% of variance.

**Factor 5: Work Environment**

The variables QWL38 - Support for self-development, QWL39 - Time for personal care, QWL37 - Transportation, QWL40 – Relationship with immediate superior and QWL36 - Trade union activity constitute factor V which accounts for 4.970% of variance.

**Factor 6: Autonomy of work**

The variables QWL33 - Productivity, QWL31 - Pay based on responsibility, QWL32 - Social security, QWL34 - Job stress, and QWL35 - Home work constitute factor VI which accounts for 4.600% of variance.

**Factor 7: Adequacy of resources**

The variables QWL10 - Own style and pace of work , QWL9 – Communication channel facilities, QWL8 – Ability to work and QWL11 - Proud to work constitute factor VII which accounts for 2.770% of variance.

**Segmentation of Quality Work Life Factors:**

Cluster Analysis has been employed to group Quality work life studied into clusters based on their resemblance to the seven factors of Organisation culture, Compensation and rewards, Facilities, Relation and co-operation, Work environment, Autonomy of work, Adequacy of resources.

Final Cluster centers have been displayed in Table 6

Table 6: Final Cluster Centers

Quality Work Life Factors	Cluster		
	1	2	3
Organisation culture	2.75 (III)	3.82 (II)	3.96 (I)
Compensation and rewards	3.47 (III)	4.13 (II)	4.31 (I)
Facilities	2.24 (III)	2.94 (II)	3.46 (I)
Relation and co-operation	1.86 (III)	2.04 (II)	3.01 (I)
Work environment	3.27 (III)	3.97 (II)	4.05 (I)

Autonomy of work	3.48 (III)	3.99 (II)	4.20 (I)
Adequacy of resources	2.36 (III)	2.52 (II)	3.50 (I)
Average	2.78	3.34	3.78

Based on the data displayed in the above table, Work related factors have been clustered into three groups. The first cluster may be designated as “Less important group” as the mean value of the components of this cluster is less when compared to the other cluster. The second cluster can be labeled as “Moderate important group” as the mean value indicating the Quality work life of this group is moderate on a five point scale. The third cluster can be labeled as “High important group” as the mean value indicating the Quality work life of this group is high on a five point scale.

The ANOVA values in respect of the three clusters of Quality work life regarding the seven Quality work life factors have been shown in Table 7.

Table 7: ANOVA

Quality Work Life	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Mean Square	df	Mean Square	df		
Organisation culture	134.958	2	.318	1009	424.353	.000
Compensation and Rewards	59.080	2	.254	1009	232.407	.000
Facilities	113.680	2	.316	1009	359.849	.000
Relation and co-operation	119.840	2	.399	1009	300.583	.000
Work Environment	57.503	2	.286	1009	200.896	.000
Autonomy of work	42.016	2	.211	1009	199.077	.000
Adequacy of resources	119.079	2	.393	1009	302.841	.000

The ANOVA value suggests that the seven Quality work life factors play a significant role in bifurcating the Quality work life into three clusters. The mean values of these three groups of importance in respect of Quality work life factors differ significantly. The three clusters are “Less important groups”, “Moderate important groups” and “High important groups” clusters.

Number of respondents constituting each cluster are displayed in Table 8

Cluster	1	296.000	29.25%
	2	405.000	40.02%
	3	311.000	30.73%
Valid		1012.000	100%

The above table displays the number of respondents priority present in each cluster. It is worthy to note that both the groups consist of almost identical number of respondents.

**Testing Suitability of Quality Work Life Segmentation Using Discriminant Analysis:**

The respondents are grouped into three clusters based on their level of importance towards Quality work life factors. The three identified clusters are “Less important groups”, “Moderate important groups” and “High important groups”. 29.25 percent of the respondents constitute less important group, 40.02 percent of the respondents constitute moderate important groups and 30.73 percent of the respondents constitute the average important groups.

The next important issue is to assess whether the segmentation is valid, and whether each of the clusters significantly vary among each other, and whether the seven Quality work life factors play a role in segregating respondents into three clusters. For this purpose, sample stability and cluster classification reliability has to be verified by Discriminant analysis. The equality of group means in respect of Quality work life factors can be inferred from Table 9.

Table 9: Tests of Equality of Group Means

Quality Work Life Factors	Wilks' Lambda	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Organisation culture	.543	424.353	2	1009	.000
Compensation and Rewards	.685	232.407	2	1009	.000
Facilities	.584	359.849	2	1009	.000
Relation and co-operation	.627	300.583	2	1009	.000
Work Environment	.715	200.896	2	1009	.000
Autonomy of work	.717	199.077	2	1009	.000
Adequacy of resources	.625	302.841	2	1009	.000

It can be observed from the above table that Wilks' lambda is very low for Organisation culture factor. This implies that there is high difference in the clusters in respect of Organisation culture factor. Mean values in respect of Organisation culture differ significantly among the three segments. Wilks' Lambda for Facilities factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of Facilities factor. Wilks' Lambda for Hiring, Training & career development factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of Adequacy of

resources factor. Wilks' Lambda for Relation and co-operation factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of Relation and co-operation factor.

Wilks' Lambda for Compensation and rewards factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of compensation and rewards factor. Wilks' Lambda for Work environment factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of work environment factor. Wilks' Lambda for Autonomy of work factor is high as there is no significant difference among the first and third segments with respect to the average values of Autonomy of work factor.

The value of F ratio in accordance to the degrees of freedom is very significant. Low significance value implies prevalence of significant difference in Quality of work life factors among the seven groups. Based on the above two facts, it can be concluded that the process of grouping has been completed aptly. Eigen values and canonical correlation coefficient have been displayed in Table 10

Table 10: Eigen Values

Function	Eigen value	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Canonical Correlation
1	2.547 <sup>a</sup>	85.4	85.4	.847
2	.436 <sup>a</sup>	14.6	100.0	.551

a. First 2 canonical discriminant functions were used in the analysis.

Large Eigen value implies that the mean values are largely dispersed while small Eigen values implies low spread of the mean values. The Eigen value in respect of the discriminant function is more. For the two clusters, canonical correlation is formed along with discriminant function. The canonical correlation gives the measure of association between discriminant functions and the seven quality of work life factors is high with 0.847.

Table 9 display results of the Wilk's Lambda values in respect of the seven quality of work life factors. It can be observed from the Table 11 that the Wilk's Lambda value is significant.

Eigen value in respect of the first discriminant function is very high. For the two clusters, one canonical correlation is formed along with the discriminant function. The canonical correlation gives the measure of association between discriminant functions and the seven quality of work life factors. The canonical correlation among the function and seven quality of work life factors is very high (0.847).

From Table 4.29, it can be inferred that canonical correlation for first and second function are significant.

Table 11: Wilks' Lambda

Test of Function(s)	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1 through 2	.196	1637.441	14	.000
2	.697	363.802	6	.000

It can be observed from the above table that the Wilk's Lambda value is significant. Wilk's Lambda value in respect of the first discriminant function formed is 0.196 which shows that means of the groups is different regarding Facilities, Compensation and rewards and Autonomy of work. Wilk's Lambda value in respect of the second discriminant function formed is 0.697 which shows that means of the groups is different regarding Organisation culture, Adequacy of work, Relation and co-operation and Work environment.

The Chi-square value of Wilk's lambda and the df value and the corresponding significance value of 0.000 suggest that the process of clustering the respondents into three groups has been done aptly and all the Quality of work life factors have contributed ideally to the grouping of respondents into three clusters.

The Standardized beta values are depicted in Table 12.

Table 12: Structure Matrix

Quality Work Life	Function	
	1	2
Facilities	.528*	-.070
Compensation and rewards	.405*	-.315
Autonomy of work	.384*	-.212
Organisation culture	.526	-.559*
Adequacy of resources	.434	.524*
Relation and co-operation	.436	.507*
Work Environment	.359	-.400*

The above matrix table shows that a solitary function have been formed from the three clusters. The characteristics of the respondents comprising the groups can be explained through this solitary function. The function derived from discriminant analysis along with standardized beta value is

Z1 = 0.528\* Facilities + 0.405\* Compensation and rewards + 0.384\* Autonomy of work.

Z2 = - 0.559\* Organisation culture + 0.524\* Adequacy of resources + 0.507\* Relation and co-operation - 0.400\* Work Environment.

The extent of correct classification of the respondents has been displayed in the below table Table13.

Quality of work life factors		Predicted Group Membership			Total
		Less Important Group	Moderate Important Group	High Important Group	
Count	Less important group	287	9	0	296
	Moderate important group	0	398	7	405
	High important group	0	10	301	311
%	Less important group	97.0	3.0	.0	100.0
	Moderate important group	.0	98.3	1.7	100.0
	High important group	.0	3.2	96.8	100.0

a. 97.4% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

The above table displays the number of cases constituting each cluster and the percentage of proper classification and unclassification of the items. It can be observed that 97 percent of less important groups is precisely classified, 98.3 percent of the moderate important groups have been exactly classified and 96.8 percent of the high important groups have been classified with 301 cases. The classification of Quality of work life is 97.4 percent accurate.

#### Characteristics of Quality Work Life Factors:

In the previous section, the respondents have been classified based on importance of Quality of work life factors into three categories namely “Less important group”, “Moderate important groups” and “High important group”. It is obvious that those respondents who give high priority will have a very high importance. The characteristics of the importance of Quality of work life factors clusters are studied using chi-square test. The chi-square test values along with their level of significance have been portrayed in Table 4.25

Table 14: Chi-Square Test for Profile of respondents

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant association between profile of the respondents and Quality of work life factors.

S.No	Variable	Chi-Square Value	Sig. Value	Significance or Not
1	Age	162.830	0.816	Not Significant
2	Nature of school	174.933	0.593	Not Significant
3	Number of family members	159.843	0.858	Not Significant
4	Marital status	168.588	0.719	Not Significant
5	Pattern of family	70.684	0.934	Not Significant
6	Profession of husband	73.457	0.897	Not Significant
7	Number of issues	81.577	0.725	Not Significant
8	Status of degree	277.143	0.369	Not Significant

To understand the characteristics of these seven quality of work life factor segments, association among the segments with various profile of the respondents related variables are analyzed. The chi-square test is applied to test the significance of association. The chi-square values displayed in Table 14 revealed that respondents opinion towards quality of work life factors is grouped on the basis of Age, Nature of school, Number of family members, marital status, pattern of family, profession of husband, number of issues and status of degree have no significant association with Quality of work life factors based segments.

#### Conclusion:

The quality of work life of teachers is completely depended upon the factors viz., the facilities provided in the schools, compensation and rewards, autonomy of works, organisation culture, adequacy of resources, relation and co-operation and the work environment. The chi square results revealed that the age group of the teachers, nature of the school they work, number of family members, marital status, pattern of family, profession of husband, number of issues, and the status of degree has showed no significance, hence it was found that all the school teachers were having similar opinion towards the aspect of quality of work life.

#### References:

- Behzad Shabhazi, Sadegh Shokrzadeh (2011) “A survey of relationship between the quality of work life and performance of department Chairpersons of Esfahan University and Esfahan Medical University” Elsevier – Social and Behavioral Sciences 30. PP 1555 – 1560.
- Zare, Hamid, Haghgooyan, Zolfa and Asl, Zahra Karimi (2012) Determining and Prioritizing the Criteria and Scales of Quality of Work Life (QWF) by AHP Method, European Journal of Social Sciences, 27( 3), 2012, 346-359.
- R. Gayathiri and Dr. Lalitha Ramakrishnan (2013) “Quality of Work Life – Linkage with Job Satisfaction and Performance” International Journal of Business and Management Invention ISSN (Online): 2319 – 8028, ISSN: 2319 – 801, Volume 2 Issue 1 January. 2013 PP.01-08