



COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN PERMANENT AND CONTRACTUAL TEACHERS' QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: A STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Pooja Gupta*

Rimpi Gupta**

Abstract: *Quality of Work Life (QWL) has become one of the most important issues these days in every institution whether private or government. Employees are the force that is behind every successful institution. No institution can become successful with technology only because for the use of technology also, institutions need to have strong work force. The purpose of the present study is to find out the difference between quality of work life of permanent teachers with contractual teachers in higher education. The data was collected from 608 govt. degree college teachers selected from Jammu city colleges i.e. 399 permanent and 209 contractual teachers. Census method was used to collect the data. Results indicate that there is a meaningful difference between permanent and contractual quality of work life. Permanent teachers are satisfied with all aspects of QWL viz. contractual teachers are least satisfied with all aspects of quality of work life.*

*Lecturer in Commerce, Govt. Hr.Sec.School Jammu

**Assist. Professor, Govt. SPMR College of Commerce, Jammu



INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the greatest services provided by the teachers. They are the pillars of the society, who help students to grow to shoulder the responsibility of taking their nation ahead of others. Teachers desire security, recognition, new experience and independence. When these needs are not fulfilled they become tense. A dissatisfied teacher does not make any positive contribution towards growth of students and becomes a source of great tension for the nation. So we have to find out the factors which affects there stay in this profession and QWL is one of the most important factor affecting the satisfaction of teachers as they are motivated to perform at high levels and are more willing to stay with an organization if they are experiencing a high quality of work life (Darling, 2003). A high quality level of “quality of work life” (QWL) is vital for organizations to continue to attract and retain their employees. Quality of work life is a comprehensive, department- wide program designated to enhance employee satisfaction, improving workplace learning and helping employees had better manage change and transition. Dissatisfaction with quality work of life is a problem that affects almost all workers regardless of position or status. Many managers seek to reduce dissatisfaction in all organizational levels. This is a complex problem, however, because it is difficult to isolate and identify all of attributes, which affect the quality of work life (Saraji and Dargahi, 2006)

QWL - CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Quality of Work Life is not a unitary concept (Danna & Griffin, 1999), it is also concerned with a part of life it helps to balance personal life with his or her job and reduces the stress level and increase job satisfaction which mutually benefits the individual and the organisation but has been seen as incorporating a hierarchy of perspectives that not only include work-based factors such as, satisfaction with pay and relationships with work colleagues, but also factors that broadly reflect life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being (Morin and Morin, 2000).

Programs of QWL usually deal with the work itself- its design and its requirements, the working environment, the decision making processes and supervisory behaviour, and the working conditions, including the work and non-work balance. Sirgy et al (2001) suggested that the key factors in quality of working life are: on job requirements, Work environment, Supervisory Behaviour, Ancillary programmes & Organizational commitment. They viewed



quality of work life as satisfaction of these key needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace. Moreover Quality of work life is all about the conducive and congenial environment created at the work place as it is one of the main reasons for better performance and productivity. Only when the right ambience is provided to the employees they will be able to deliver their goods effectively and efficiently (Rao, 2010).

From the above discussion it has been concluded that Quality of work life is a multidimensional phenomenon that includes the task, the physical work environment, social environment within the organisation, administrative system and work-life satisfaction (Cunningham and Eberte, 1990). It also tends to include job security, reward system, pay and opportunity for growth (Rossi et al., 2006) and active involvement in group working arrangements or problem solving that are of mutual benefit to employees or employers, autonomy, job enrichment, high-involvement aimed at boosting the satisfaction and productivity of employees (Feuer, 1989). Overall it can be summed up that QWL has direct impact on human outcomes and it significantly decreases disputes, accidents and work conflict (Havlovic, 1991). Enhanced QWL leads to improved employee satisfaction and fulfillment, increased mutual trust, job security enhanced superior-colleagues relationships, better utilization of human resources, deeper sense of worker responsibility, reduce stress and strengthened position of organization (Steers and Porter, 1983). It provides a wide range of benefits and social security which makes improvement in efficiency, reduction in turnover, sick leave, alienation, etc. QWL benefits also include financial services, consumer services, career counseling, employee information reports, retirement benefits, recreational services and health safety measures which influences higher quality and quantity of output of services (Dewivedi, 1995) Organizations are enjoying the fruits of implementing QWL programs in the form of increased productivity, and an efficient, satisfied, and committed workforce which aims to achieve the organizational objectives.

RESEARCH GAP

There exists a lot of research on QWL but few authors measured the Quality of Work life of college teachers and with few dimensions. This study proposes to study all the dimensions of QWL. Further the earlier studies have not explored the perception of contractual teachers about the QWL in higher education institutions, which will be undertaken in this study.



HYPOTHESES

Within the broader scope of research gap as emerged from the aforesaid review of literature, the core studies lead to the formulation of following hypotheses for the present study:

Virtanen et al (2002) indicated that employees with a permanent contract perceived a high level of employment security than contractual employees. While Wilson et al (2008) indicated that the employees in casual jobs perceived that they had lower job quality than employees in permanent work. Further Kompier et al (2009) in their study found differences between contract types in quality of working life: generally permanent employees had better jobs; where as temporary workers had more work characteristics. Temporary workers had lower autonomy and more work load than permanent work group. Hence the second hypothesis is:-

Hypo(1) There is difference in quality of work life of permanent and contractual teachers.

Object(1) To find out the gap between permanent and contractual teachers regarding their quality of work life.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

To make the study accurate the following steps were taken:

Sample Size & Design

Teachers working in various Govt. Degree colleges in Jammu district i.e. M.A.M College, G.C.W. Parade, G.C.W. Gandhi Nagar, G.G.M. Science College, S.P.M.R. College of Commerce and Govt. College of Education have been selected as respondents for the study. There are 608 teachers working in these colleges and all of them were approached for data collection. Only 305 questionnaires were returned back (50 % response rate) that have been utilized to analyse and draw interpretations.

Generation of Scale Items

The generation of the questionnaire was finalized after reviewing the existing literature and detailed discussion with the subject experts. The questionnaire comprised two sections the first section was concerned about the demographic profile of the college teachers.

The second section comprised 70 statements related to Quality of Work Life (QWL). The Quality of Work Life of teachers has been measured with the help of Quality of Work Life Scale (QWLS) which comprised 10 dimensions viz. Physical environment, Remuneration,



Social orientation), Work life balance, Growth and Recognition , Quality of Job itself, Participation in Decision making, Stress, Grievance Handling and Student behaviour.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha value, which is related in part to the total number of items in the scale, for all of the 57 items of the scale as arrived 0.944 which is excellent. The alpha values of subscales reliabilities for each of the 10 QWL subscales is also high (above 0.80) indicating that the 10 QWL sub scales have good internal consistency (Table 1)

Split half reliability the difference between the mean values of two halves is insignificant which represents the data is valid through (Table 2)

Validity

Content/Face validity has been established by discussion with the subject experts and discussion with college teachers.

Measurement of Quality of Work Life

The degree of quality of work life enjoyed by teachers has arrived at 4.71, which is moderate on 7-point likert scale. Application of one sample t-test revealed significant difference between the test value (3) and the observed value revealed there by rejecting the first hypothesis (Table3). QWL is a multidimensional phenomenon and to measure overall degree of QWL, the satisfaction obtained from all the dimensions were calculated separately which is as under:

Remuneration (Factor 1)

The factorial mean derived from this factor of Quality of work life has arrived at 4.11. Most of the college teachers (67%) are satisfied with the salary they receive (M=4.58) & they can avail earned leave (M=4.15). Despite of these facts nearly half of the respondents are dissatisfied with their pay. They were also dissatisfied with medical (M=3.43) and housing allowances (M=3.62). Teachers participates in academic activities (M=4.27). The coefficient of correlation (r), and the coefficient of determination (r^2) for this factor of Quality of work life have arrived at 0.454 (sig. < 0.01), and 0.206 respectively indicating a significant association between the two.

Grievance handling (Factor 2)

The total mean derived from different items of grievance handling came to 4.65. The college teachers are satisfied with the grievance handling procedure (M=4.73) because it is flexible



($r=0.782$ at 0.01 sig. level). They (70%) revealed that complaints and problems are handled fairly ($M=4.70$), and accepted wholly ($M=4.55$) in the college. The relationship between grievance handling and Quality of work life was figured out at 0.593 (sig. < 0.01) and the coefficient of determination (r^2) has arrived at 0.352.

Quality of Job itself (Factor 3)

The mean satisfaction derived from this factor came to 5.60. Most of the college teachers (90%) are satisfied with their job as they find their job appropriate ($M=5.56$) ($r=0.600$ at 0.01 sig. level). Further it is much better than others ($M=5.65$) due to creativity in their job ($r=0.671$ at 0.01 sig. level). It is opined that interesting and appropriate job makes them happy. About ninety percent teachers agreed that they know their working hours ($M=5.73$) and they are able to conduct the classes properly throughout the period ($M=5.68$). The association between this factor and Quality of work life is 0.412 (sig. < 0.01) and seventeen percent variation (r^2) in the QWL is being caused by this factor.

Student behaviour (Factor 4)

The mean from this factor has arrived at 5.42. Teachers (88%) are highly satisfied with the behaviour of their students ($M=5.54$) as they neither disturb the class ($r=0.736$ at 0.01 sig. level) nor insult their teachers ($r=0.598$ at 0.01 sig. level)). The students actively respond to their lecture ($M=5.52$) and they are cheerful in the classroom ($M=5.56$). Further, they visit the library/laboratory ($M=5.20$) regularly.

Stress (Factor 5)

The factorial mean of this factor has arrived at 2.96 which shows that the teachers' are not stressed. They (75%) are never under pressure at work ($M=2.92$) as they have adequate knowledge of subject matter ($M=2.86$) ($r=0.673$ at 0.01 sig. level), and there is no complexity in their job ($r=0.815$ at 0.01 sig. level). Moreover they (71%) are not overloaded ($M=3.25$) and perceived time schedule is also not hectic ($M=3.06$). There is absence of chaos in the class ($M=2.69$). Hence it can be concluded that absence of complexity and hectic work schedule reduces the stress level. The correlation (r) between stress and Quality of work life has arrived at -0.195 (sig. < 0.01).

Work-life balance (Factor 6)

The mean satisfaction derived from the factor Work life balance came to 5.18. Majority of the college teachers (93%) reported balanced work life relationship ($M=5.52$). They (87%)



felt that their current working hours suits their personal life (M=5.20) and they have enough time to pursuing their hobbies (M=5.13) ($r=0.674$ at 0.01 sig. level). Further the results revealed that they have enough time for social obligations (M=5.28) and opportunities to attend their family (M=5.27).

Participation in decision making (Factor 7)

The mean score of Participation in decision making has arrived at 4.67. The college teachers are satisfied with the process of Participation in decision making (M=4.86). They (61%) are able to impress upon the process of decision making due to delegation of decision making authority ($r=0.777$ at 0.01 sig. level) to them by management. Besides this teachers are always consulted about change at work. (M=4.73). The administration provides opportunity for participation in the decision making (M=4.58). There is significant relationship between this factor and QWL ($r=0.542$; sig. <0.01) and twenty nine percent variation ($r^2=0.294$) in the QWL is being caused by the participation in the decision making. Extensive study of factor reveals that teachers are being involved in decision making process of college activities and they are able to get their suggestions incorporated.

Physical environment (Factor 8)

The factorial mean for Physical environment was figured at 4.50. Majority of the respondents (76%) revealed that the rooms are properly illuminated and ventilated (M=4.60) and the furniture is also adequate and comfortable for them (M=4.70). They (45%) further reported that there is no provision for recreational facilities (M=4.22).

Social orientation (Factor 9)

The mean of this factor has arrived at 5.43 which is highest among all the dimensions. Majority of the college teachers (90%) are happy with their colleagues and superiors (M=5.52). They (93%) indicated that their colleagues are friendly (M=5.57), helpful and supporting (5.56). It leads to conclusion that qualities of colleagues enhance the quality of work life ($r=0.307$ sig. <0.01). About eighty eight percent college teachers are satisfied with their H.O.D due to his guiding approach and ($r=0.506$ sig. <0.01). Further he/she believes in team work (M=5.42).

Growth and recognition (Factor 10)

The mean satisfaction derived from this factor was figured at 4.89. Most of the college teachers (82%) indicated that the job allows them to sharpen their professional skills



(M=5.02) as skills and abilities are fully explored here (M=4.76). They (75%) are also appreciated for good work (M=4.95). Overall teachers are satisfied with all aspects of growth and recognition (M=5.01).

COMPARISON OF QWL BETWEEN PERMANENT AND CONTRACTUAL TEACHERS

The degree of quality of work life is higher for the permanent teachers (M=4.99) than contractual teachers (M=4.15). The detailed analysis of permanent and contractual teachers is as under:-

Permanent teachers: They (90%) are satisfied with all aspects of QWL viz. interesting & appropriate job (M=5.85), social orientation (M=5.54), students behaviour (M=5.54), remuneration (M=5.04) and growth & recognition (M=5.11). About eighty nine teachers viewed that they have enough time for family and social obligations (M=5.35). Majority of them (77%) opined that they have opportunity to participate in decision making process (M=4.97) and are not stressed at their work place (M=2.89).

Contractual teachers: Contractual teachers are less satisfied with their QWL. About eighty five percent teachers reported that they are dissatisfied with the income (M=2.23) and twenty one percent teachers reported that teachers problem is not handled equally. They (26%) also opined that career opportunities are not satisfactory. They (83%) are satisfied with the quality of their job (M=5.11), colleagues and superiors (M=5.22) and with students' behaviour (M=5.19.).

Overall analysis reported that the perception towards the QWL of permanent teachers are stronger than the contractual teachers as they have greater opportunity to participate in decision making, better remuneration, high quality of job itself and higher chances of growth and recognition. Independent t-Test revealed significant difference regarding QWL of two groups (Table4). Hence, hypothesis stands accepted.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The above discussion revealed that quality of work life is a multidimensional phenomenon and the teachers working in the govt. degree colleges in Jammu district are satisfied with their quality of work life though the level of quality of work life is not very high but it is above the average (inconsistent with Edwards et al.,2009). Teachers have high perception



about quality of job itself, social orientation (inconsistent with Saraji and Dargahi 2006) and the students' behaviour (results matched with Sharma and Jyoti, 2006). Teachers are satisfied with the growth and recognition in their profession in the form of due praise and provide them career opportunities which increases their ability to perform better (consistent with Beasley et al., 2005). They are also satisfied with the participation in decision making process and grievance handling procedure in colleges because their problems are fairly handled and solved moreover provides opportunity to give valuable suggestions. Teachers are moderately satisfied with the physical environment because working conditions are not highly satisfied like adequate & comfortable furniture, lighting & ventilation in rooms etc. moreover teachers are satisfied with the work-life balance (consistent with Azril et al., 2010) as they have enough time away from work to attend their family and social obligations. But on the other hand compared to other dimensions teachers are least satisfied with remuneration and related factors. They found that their salary is inadequate as it is less than what they deserve (inconsistent with Saraji and Dargahi 2006). Housing, Medical allowances are also not sufficient. The dissatisfaction level regarding remuneration & related factors is very high among contractual teachers than the permanent teachers.

Strategic Actions for Improving Quality of work life

Although the college teachers are average satisfied with all the aspects of quality of work life but we want to optimally explore their talent we shall provide them such quality of work life which makes them highly contented with their work environment. Following suggestions have been extended for this purpose:

In order to increase their satisfaction level the foremost requirement is to enhance their pay, allowances etc.

Grievance handling mechanism should be strengthened.

To make teachers fully satisfied Colleges' administration should enrich their job by providing them more autonomy, exciting and challenging work.

Teachers stress must be reduce by allotment of subjects to their own choice,

Contractual teachers should also be given the opportunity to **participate in decision making**.

Moreover administration should give importance to teachers' opinion, suggestions etc, which can make them feel important for the organisation.

Flexible work hours in the college help to maintain a **balanced work-life** relationship.



Appropriate **physical environment** makes the work place comfortable. So better working conditions such as increase size of staff rooms, facility of clean drinking water, comfortable furniture, clean toilets with in staff rooms etc should be provided to them.

The positive attitude of the **superiors and colleagues** helps a lot in improving the quality of work life of teachers. So, HOD should adopt a guiding approach; always consult faculty members regarding any change in the subject matter or time schedule etc which makes feel that they are member of one group.

Equal opportunities should be provided to contractual and permanent teachers.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations are discussed as under:

1. The study has measured teachers' quality of work life on the basis of the teachers' responses which might have been guided by their likes and dislikes.
2. The data was collected only from the government college teachers.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Comparative study between different private Vs public degree colleges can be undertaken.

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Remuneration	0.952
Grievance	0.925
Job quality	0.910
Student behavior	0.924
Stress	0.929
Work life	0.918
Decision making	0.943
Physical environment	0.803
Social orientation	0.918
Growth & recognition	0.884

		QWL	F	Sig. level
Mean	Part1	4.68	1.86	0.535
	Part2	4.73		



Table 3: Summary of Results From Scale Purification of Quality of work life Data: Factor Loadings, Variance Explained, Mean, S.D., KMO Values and Eigen Values						
Factors	Mean	S.D	F.L	V.E	KMO	E.V
F1 Remuneration & related factors	4.11	0.66				
Paid fairly	4.49	2.12	0.86	12.195	0.925	7.07
Steady employment	4.42	1.98	0.85			
Housing allowance	3.62	1.81	0.83			
Satisfied with pay	4.58	2.24	0.82			
Medical allowance	3.43	1.77	0.79			
Resources are appropriate	4.27	1.85	0.78			
Avail earned leave	4.15	2.04	0.78			
Adequate reward system	3.86	2.04	0.75			
F2 grievance handling	4.65	0.47				
Redressal procedure	4.64	1.30	0.78			
Flexible procedure	4.59	1.24	0.77			
Problems are handled equally	4.55	1.26	0.76			
Acceptance of Complaint	4.55	1.19	0.75			
Fairly handles Complaints & problems	4.70	1.25	0.72			
Principal Directly handles	4.79	1.22	0.69			
Teacher union role	4.78	1.25	0.60			
F3 Quality of job itself	5.60	0.47		9.006	0.925	5.22
Know working hours	5.73	0.88	0.73			
Able to conduct the class	5.68	1.05	0.72			
Appropriate job	5.56	1.77	0.68			
Job is interesting	5.56	1.04	0.68			
Services are must for college	5.61	1.05	0.67			
Job is better than others	5.64	1.05	0.61			
Creativity in job	5.42	1.87	0.55			
F4 Student behavior	5.42	0.50		8.37	0.925	4.85
Actively respond	5.52	1.14	0.86			
Cheerful faces	5.56	1.11	0.83			
Interact with faculty	5.48	1.13	0.83			
Do not disturb the class	5.45	1.34	0.82			
Do not insult the teacher	5.30	1.46	0.73			
Visit laboratory/library	5.20	1.24	0.70			
F5 Stress	2.96	0.68		7.95	0.925	4.61
Hectic time schedule	3.06	1.74	0.89			
Feel tired	2.95	1.81	0.88			
Lack of knowledge	2.85	1.89	0.87			
Workload in job	4.64	1.30	0.83			
Difficult and complex job	3.00	1.75	0.82			
Chaos in class	2.69	1.85	0.75			
F6 Work life balance	5.18	0.45		7.46		4.32



Time for hobbies	5.13	1.15	0.85			
Enjoy other things	5.03	1.24	0.81			
Time for family & social obligations	5.28	1.14	0.80			
Suitability of Working hours	5.19	1.18	0.78			
Job provides time	5.26	1.13	0.74			
F7 participation in decision making	4.67	0.41				
Opportunity	4.58	1.29	0.72	7.09	4.11	
Impress upon process of D-M	4.66	1.25	0.71			
Due thought given	4.69	1.19	0.71			
Involvement of teachers	4.67	1.25	0.71			
Delegation of D-M authority	4.69	1.22	0.70			
Teachers are consulted	4.73	1.15	0.64			
F8 Physical Environment	4.50	0.66		4.91	2.84	
Working conditions are satisfactory	4.68	1.29	0.772			
Lighting & ventilation	4.60	1.46	0.74			
Adequate furniture	4.70	1.26	0.71			
Recreational facilities	4.21	1.51	0.58	4.68	2.71	
F9 Social orientation	5.44	0.54				
HOD encourages	5.36	1.21	0.81			
Teamwork	5.42	1.25	0.77			
Guiding approach	5.38	1.16	0.77	3.62	2.10	
Friendly colleagues	5.57	0.98	0.66			
F10 Growth	4.90	0.54				
Sharpen profession	5.02	1.22	0.63			
Skills & abilities are explored	4.76	1.29	0.61	3.62	2.10	
Satisfied with career opportunities	4.85	1.34	0.60			
Appreciation	4.95	1.27	0.58			
Grand mean	4.71	0.39		74.634		

s.no	variables	group	number	Mean	t-test	df	sig	result
1	Nature of job	permanent	204	4.97	11.09	303	.000	accepted
		contractual	101	4.16	11.21	204	.000	

REFERENCES

1. Cunningham, J. B. & Eberle, T. (1990). A Guide to Job Enrichment and redesign. Personnel, 67, 56-61.
2. Danna, K. & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Management*, 25, 357-384.



3. Darling. H. L. & McLaughlin, M. W. (2003). Investing in teaching as a learning profession: Policy problems and prospects. *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice*. 376-411. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
4. Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes. *Industrial Relations*, 30(3), 469-479.
5. Morin, E. M & Morin, W. (2000). QWL and Firm Performance at Canada. *ICFAI*. 13(2),30-34
6. Rossi, A. M., Perrewee, P. L. & Sauter, S. L. (2006). *Stress and Quality of Working Life*, Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.
7. Saraji, G. N. & Dargahi, H. (2006). Study of Quality of Work Life, *Iranian journal of public health*, 35(4) 63-71.
8. Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. & Lee, D. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QoWL) Based On Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55, 241-302
9. Steers, R. M. & Porter, L.W. (1983). *Motivation and Work Behaviour* (3rd edition), New Delhi: McGraw Hill.
10. Azril, M. S. H., Jegak. U., Asiah, M., Azman, A. N., Bahaman, A. S., Jamilah, O. & Thomas, K. (2010). Can Quality of Work Life Affect Work Performance among Government Agriculture Extension Officers. *Journal of social sciences*, 6(1), 64-73.
11. Beasley, J. W., Karsh, B. T., Hagenauer, M. E., Marchand, L. & Sainfort, F. (2005). Quality of Work Life of Impendent Vs Employed Family. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 3(6), 500-506.
12. Edwards, J. A., Laar, D. V., Easton, S. & Kinman, G. (2009). The Work Related Quality of Life Scale for Higher Education Employees. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3), 207-219.
13. Virtanen M., Kivimaki M., Joensuu M., Virtanen P., Elovainio M. & Vahtera J. (2005). Temporary employment and health: a review. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 34, 610-622.
14. Dwivedi, R. S. (1995). *Human Relations and Organisational Behaviour: A Global Perspective*. New Delhi: Macmillan India.



15. Kompier, M., Ybema, J. F., JANSEEN, J. & TARIS, T. (2009). Employment Contracts: A Cross - Sectional and Longitudinal Relations with Quality of Work Life, Health and Well Being. *Journal of Occupational Health*. 51, 193-203.
16. Feuer, D., (1989). Quality of Work Life: A Cure for All Ills? *Training: The Magazine of Human Resources Development*, 26, 65-66.
17. Rossi, A. M., Perrewee, P. L. & Sauter, S. L. (2006). *Stress and Quality of Working Life*, Greenwich, Information Age Publishing.
18. Rao, P. S. (1996). *Essentials of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relation*. (1st ed.) Himalaya Publishing House. 473-475.
19. Sharma, R. D. & Jyoti, J. (2008). Job Satisfaction among Academicians: Effect of Gender, Status and Age. *Optimization Journal of Research in Management*, 1(2), 3-16.
20. Steers, R. M. & Porter, L.W. (1983). *Motivation and Work Behaviour* (3rd edition), New Delhi: McGraw Hill.