

## A STUDY ON THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE PERCEPTIONS AMONG SELF-FINANCING ENGINEERING COLLEGE TEACHERS IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT

### Article Particulars

Received: 24.7.2017

Accepted: 26.7.2017

Published: 28.7.2017



#### S.SHANMUGAM

Research Scholar,  
Bharathiar University,  
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

#### Dr. P.SUBBURETHINA BHARATHI

Research Supervisor,  
Bharathiar University,  
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India



### Abstract

**Purpose** -The purpose of this paper is to provide insights on the Quality of Work Life perceptions among Self Financing Engineering Colleges Teachers in Tiruchirappalli District.

**Design/methodology/approach** - Descriptive research design was adopted for this research study. Self-financing Engineering College Teachers were chosen as samples for study. Sample frame consisted of all the teachers working in 28 Engineering Colleges in Tiruchirappalli District, Tamil Nadu, India. Simple random sampling method was adopted to derive 146 samples from the Universe.

A self administered structured Questionnaire was used to collect primary data. The collected data was then analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and AMOS to draw inferences for this research study. **Findings** -Significant differences in Quality of Work Life Perceptions were observed and majority of the Teachers belong to the Generation Y. The findings also revealed that there is a moderate level of satisfaction on Quality of Work life among Teachers in Self Financing Engineering Colleges in Tiruchirappalli District.

**Research Limitations/implications**- A cross-sectional design was used to study the Socio Economic Factors and Quality of Work Life Perceptions. Understanding the Quality of Work Life Perceptions has theoretical, practical and social implications.

The differences in Quality of Work Life perceptions provide inputs in identifying and understanding the significant factors of Quality of Work Life and the dynamics of perceptual differences of the workforce in academic institutions. **Originality/value** - This is one of the first studies that identifies Quality of Work Life Perceptions of Self-Financing Engineering College Teachers in Tiruchirappalli District. This research study would contribute to the existing body of knowledge/literature by advancing the understanding of perceptions of QWL in Academic Institutions. Practically this research would aid educational administrators / educational leaders / policy makers to identify, conceptualize, and develop strategies to enhance QWL of Teachers.

**Keywords** - Quality of Work life (QWL), Generation X, Generation Y, Generational Differences

**Abbreviations:** QWL ,Quality of Work Life, Teachers, Generations, Self-Financing Engineering College Teachers, Gen Y

### Introduction

India's Higher education system is the third largest in the world, next to U.S and China. Education plays a significant role in human resource development of the country by creating skilled manpower, enhancing industrial productivity and improving the quality of life of its people. The Vision of Higher education department under Ministry of Human Resource Development is to realize India's human resource potential to its fullest in the Higher Education sector, with equity and inclusion. The major human resource challenge facing Higher education in India is attracting, developing and retaining competent Teachers. Exploring and enriching Quality of Work life of Teachers helps in attracting, developing and retaining competent Faculty.

According to Harrison, "Quality of Work Life (QWL) is the degree to which the work of an organization contributes to material & psychological well-being of its members". Walton (1973) proposed an ideal quality of work life programme that includes practices in eight major areas such as adequate and fair compensation, safe and healthy working conditions, immediate opportunity of use and develop human capacities, opportunity for continued growth and security, social integration in the work organization, constitutionalism in the work organization, work and the total life space, and social relevance of work life. Regardless of the growing complexity of work life, Walton's eight-part typology of the dimensions of QWL remains a useful analytical tool (Normala Daud, 2010).

The term 'generational differences' imply some level of shared traditions and culture by a group of people that is different than that of other generations and that will lead to differences in behaviour (Arsenault, 2004). According to Hansen and Leuty (2012), the term generation typically refers to a group of individuals (employees) who share common work experiences or life experiences. The unique life experiences introduced during formative years predictably contribute to the values of the individuals of each generational group. Current generations in the academic workforce are composed of three distinct generations Baby-boomers (Boomers), Generation X (Gen X), Generation Y (Gen Y). Evidence suggests that there are differences in the expectations and motivators across these generational groups. According to Messarra, Karkoulian and El-Kassar (2016), the differences between the four generations are likely to have arisen between individuals or groups because of differences in values, expectations, needs, workplace practices, and personalities, which, in turn, could produce conflicting actions and preferences. The poor management of such differences or conflicts in the workplace can have adverse effects on the level and frequency of future conflicts and can therefore negatively affect productivity, job performance, and organizational commitment.

According to the Deloitte Millennial Survey (2016), two-thirds of Millennials (Generation Y) expressed desire to leave their current organizations by 2020. This confirms the opinions of the HR professionals who took part in this research. They also consistently pointed to the low level of loyalty of Generation Y. This evidence shows

that companies must therefore adjust how they nurture loyalty among Generation Y or risk losing a large percentage of their workforces.

Organizations are now faced with the challenges of integrating different generations in the workplace, as well as with the complexity of creating environments to attract and satisfy these workers (Hansen and Leuty 2012). This research aims at understanding these generational differences of Teachers and their Quality of work life perceptions and aid in creating environments that attracts, satisfies and retains Teachers. This study assumes significance due to the fact that a contended teacher leads to an enlightened student community and society.

## **Literature Review**

### **Quality of Work Life**

The term Quality of work life (QWL) was first introduced by Louis Davis at the forty-third American Assembly on the Changing World of Work at Columbia University's Arden House in 1970's. According to Nadler and Lawler III (1982), QWL refers to an individual's perception of, and attitudes towards, his or her work and the total working environment. In simpler words, QWL can be defined as an individual's evaluative reactions to, and satisfaction with, his/her work and the total working environment. The evolution of QWL began in late 1960s emphasizing the human dimension of work that was focussed on the quality of the relationship between the worker and the working environment (Rose et. al, 2006: Tabassum et. al, 2011). A planned change in the working environment is the need of the hour to improve QWL in India. QWL of the college teachers could be enhanced by integrating the task role and social role (Subburethina Bharathi, Umaseelvi, 2011).

QWL is a combination of strategies, procedures and ambience related to workplace that altogether, enhance and sustain the employee satisfaction by aiming at work conditions for the employees of the organizations (Nazir et. al, 2011). It is difficult to best conceptualize the QWL elements (Seashore 1975). For review of literature, the most QWL studies preferred the concept of QWL by Walton's definitions (Timmosi, et. al, 2008: Boonrod, 2009).

Walton (1973), proposed eight major conceptual categories to QWL (1) adequate and fair compensation, (2) Safe and healthy working conditions, (3) Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities, (4) Opportunity for continued growth and security, (5) Social integration in the work organization, (6) Constitutionalism in the work organization, (7) Work and total life space and (8) Social relevance of work life capacities. Regardless of the growing complexity of working life, Walton's eight-part typology of the dimensions of QWL remains a useful analytical tool (Daud, 2010).

## **Generations**

### **Traditionalists (Silent Generation)**

Traditionalists refer to those people who were born between 1925 and 1946. These individuals are described as being very loyal (loyal and patriotic employees), with a lot of faith in institutions, and often with the plan of serving one organization for a long time. Most value earning money and saving money and as a result, they have become a wealthy generation. They view work as a duty and an obligation (Adams 1998; Eisner 2005; Hansen and Leuty 2012; Knight 2014; Zemke, Raines and Filipczak 2000). Most came from homes with the father as the only breadwinner while the mother stayed at home (Hill, 2004).

### **Baby-boomers (Boomers)**

Baby-boomers refer to those people born between 1946– 1964. Unlike their Traditionalist parents who held jobs for life, Boomers wanted to find their own way and willingly changed jobs or created new businesses (Marconi, 2001). Unlike their Traditionalist parents who held jobs for life, Boomers wanted to find their own way and willingly changed jobs or created new businesses (Marconi, 2001). They are characterized as loyal to their employers, dedicated and workaholics, who accept direction (Kupperschmidt 2000; Wieck 2005; Apostolidis and Polifroni 2006). Boomers tend to be individualistic, self-absorbed, cynical, and focused on social causes; they have strong social skills, are excellent networkers, but lack technical skills (Adams 1998; Eisner 2005; Beutell and Wittig-Berman 2008). Many equate work with self-worth but may also be “shifting their value of money and things to the value of time” (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002, p. 83). Some may fear technology and need strong encouragement and clear instructions to learn new skills (Hendrick, 2005).

### **Generation X (Xers)**

Generation X refer to those people born between 1965 -1980. Generation X (Xers) are the first generation of workers who are computer literate, most having used technology since grade school (Losyk, 1997). Brought up with MTV and video games, these latchkey children of hard-working Boomer parents were independent at an early age (Tapscott, 1999). This may have affected their desire for freedom and autonomy in the workplace (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002) and flexible work schedules (Cordeniz, 2002). Xers became resourceful and independent. They tend to seek balance between their work and personal lives and are motivated by consistent work values (Lancaster and Stillman 2005; Stuenkel, de la Cuesta and Cohen 2005). Xers are characterized as being independent, seeking emotional security, preferring informality, and having more entrepreneurial skills than baby-boomers (Howe and Strauss 2007). Xers appear to value their work-life balance, growth opportunities, and positive work relationships more highly than boomers or Generation Y; they love freedom and room to grow (Eisner 2005; Beutell and Wittig-Berman 2008; Shen Kian, Wan Yusoff and Rajah 2013)

### **Generation Y (Millenials or Next Generation)**

Generation Y refer to those people born between 1981 -2000. Generation Y is the first "global" generation. The people from Generation Y have similar characteristics and attributes irrespective of their country of origin. Martin (2005) suggests that Generation Y employees may be prepared to make long-term commitments to companies, however, that can mean one year. In a cross-cultural study, Murphy, Gordon and Anderson (2004), found similarities across generations, but noted that members of Generation Y are not prepared to work as many hours as baby-boomers or traditionalists do, irrespective of their cultural origin. The following is said of Generation Y (Smola and Sutton 2002; Eisner 2005; Morrison, Erickson and Dychtwald 2006; Shaw and Fairhurst 2008; Cugin 2012; Shen Kian, Wan Yusoff and Rajah 2013): (1) 'connected' 24 hours a day; (2) work is just one priority in life, not the priority; (3) want minimal rules and bureaucracy; (4) prefer openness and transparency; (5) favours an inclusive style of management, team orientation; (6) expect to be empowered; (7) want daily feedback and thrive on a rush of new challenges, opportunities and being pushed to the limits; (8) seek a portable career and greater degrees of personal flexibility; (9) want education and development, but it needs to be relevant, interactive, personalized and entertaining; (10) want a positive work climate; (11) positive, polite and energetic.

### **Generation Z (iGeneration or as Post-Millennials)**

Generation Z are those people born between 2000 and 2010. The following ideas have been put forward to attract and retain this next generation of employees. They include: (1) having advanced manufacturing technology in the company that is less than five years old, leveraging big data, having older workers with experience, and digitizing everything; (2) installing the latest versions and subscribing to interim maintenance updates of all software packages; (3) being socially responsible – culturally, philanthropically and environmentally; (4) refreshing the company brand and marketing techniques (Knight 2014; West 2014; Zemke, Raines and Filipczak 2000). Those members of Generation Z, who are about to join the workforce, mostly born after 2000, are also referred to in literature as the mobile generation. They have grown up with technology, the world-wide web, mp3 players, short messages, mobile phones, PDAs, YouTube, iPads, and other media technologies (Kapil and Roy 2014). Generation Z are self-confident, happy, fit into the team spirit and are more interested in social activities than the previous generations (Ozkan and Solmaz 2015). Generation Z are also (West 2014): (1) well-integrated with technology; they are often referred to as "digital natives"; (2) social media savvy; (3) multitaskers; (4) concerned about the environment; (5) influenced by their friends about products and brands; (6) smart, with the ability to process a lot of information quickly.

### **Generation Alpha**

Generation Z are those people born between 2010 and 2025. Five predictions have been made for Generation Alpha (Schawbel 2014): (1) they will be the most entrepreneurial generation so far; (2) they will be the most tech savvy generation ever and will never have known a world without social networking; (3) they will primarily shop online and have less human contact than previous generations; (4) they will be extremely coddled and influenced by their Generation X and Generation Y parents; (5) they will be more self-sufficient, better educated and prepared for big challenges. Sorting individuals into different generations may vary with different researchers. The Researcher has to devise a threshold based on the review of literature and it is important to see to that the grouping do not overlap.

## **Methods**

### **Objective of the Study**

1. To Study the influence of Selected Socio-Economic Factors on Quality of Work Life
2. To identify the generational distribution of workforce in Self-Financing Engineering Colleges.
3. To Study the level of Satisfaction of Quality of Work Life of Self-Financing Engineering College Teachers.

### **Scope of the Study**

The study is proposed to study the Quality of Work Life perceptions among Teachers of engineering colleges in Tiruchirappalli District. The researcher limited his study to faculty of engineering colleges in Tiruchirappalli District. More comprehensive research is required for generalizations. Research may be devised to Teachers belonging to other institutions such as primary schools, Higher Secondary Schools, Nursing Education etc and more geographical areas such as other districts, states etc. Thus this research leaves the scope of conducting future studies.

### **Research Design**

Descriptive research design was adopted for this research study. Self-financing Engineering College Teachers were chosen as samples for study. Sample frame consisted of all the teachers working in 28 Engineering Colleges in Tiruchirappalli District, Tamil Nadu, India. Simple random sampling method was adopted to derive 146 samples from the Universe. A self administered structured Questionnaire using Waltons dimensions (Adequate and Fair Compensation, Safe and Healthy Working Conditions, Use and Development of Capacities, Opportunity for Continued Growth and Security, Social Integration, Constitutionalism, Work and Total Life Space, Social Relevance of Work Life capacities) was used to collect primary data. The collected data was then analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and AMOS to draw inferences for this research study.

## **Results and Discussion**

**Table: 1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Sl.No	Demographic Variable	Demographic Profile	Respondents	Percentage
01	Age	>37 Years / Generation Y	104	71.2
		>37-<52 Generation X	26	17.8
		>52 years Baby Boomers	16	11
02	Gender	Male	87	59.6
		Female	59	40.4
03	Designation	Asst. Professor	114	78.0
		Assoc. Professor	24	16.4
		Professor	8	5.5
04	Department	Science and Humanities Dept.	12	8.2
		Mechanical	74	50.7
		Civil	23	15.8
		ECE	12	8.2
		EEE	8	5.5
		CSE	2	1.4
		IT	2	1.4
		MBA	13	8.9
05	Qualification	Ph.D	17	11.6
		PG	129	88.4
06	Marital Status	Single	74	50.7
		Married	72	49.3
07	Family Size	1-2 members	13	8.9
		3-4 members	99	67.8
		5-6 members	30	20.5
		Above 6 Members	4	2.7
08	Number of Dependants	No member	36	24.7
		1-2 members	71	48.6
		3-4 members	26	17.8
		5-6 members	13	8.9
09	Individual Income	Less 3 Lakh	103	70.5
		3-5 lakh	43	29.5
10	Family Income	Below 3 Lakh	84	57.5
		3-5 L:akh	47	32.2
		6-10 Lakh	13	8.9
		Above 10 Laks	2	1.4
11	Length of Service	Below 2 years	64	43.8
		2-5 Years	66	45.2
		6-10years	16	11
12	Total Service	Below 2 years	24	16.4
		2-5 Years	72	49.3
		6-10years	34	23.3
		Above 10 Years	16	11
13	Residential Area	Rural	67	45.9
		Urban	61	41.8
		Semi Urban	18	12.3

**Source:** Primary Data ( N=146 )

The Table 1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents portrays that the majority of the respondents (71.2 percent) belong to the Generation Y in the age group of less than 37 years , 17.8 percent represents Generation X in the age group between 37 and 52 years and 11 percent belongs to Baby Boomers in the age group above 52 years , 59.6 percent of the respondents were Male , 40.4 percent belongs to female, 50.7 percent of the respondents are unmarried, 88.4 percent of them have completed post graduation, 78 percent of them are working as an assistant professors, 51 percent of them belong to the Mechanical department, 45.2 percent of them have an experience between 2 to 5 years in the prevailing institution, 70.5 percent of them are earning below Rs. 3 Lakh as an annual income and 57.5 percent of their family monthly income is between 2 to 5 Lakh , Urban and Rural area respondents were in the percentage of 41.8 and 45.9 respectively .

**Table-2: Significance test (F , t, Test and  $\chi^2$  Goodness of fit Test) for Quality of Work Life based on Demographic Variables**

Demographic Variables	Test	Value	Result
Designation and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=17.27 (p=0.000043)	Significant
Department and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=11.27 (p=.000891)	Significant
Gender and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=5.64 (p=0.0182)	Significant
Age and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=619.17 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Marital status and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=1.75 (p=0.18573)	Not Significant
Family size and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=12.36 (p=0.000507)	Significant
No of dependants and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=4.64 (p=0.03195)	Significant
Individual Annual Income and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=9.33 (p=0.002452)	Significant
Family Annual Income and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=4.03 (p=0.04536)	Significant
Length of present service and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=0.71 (p=0.3976)	Not Significant
Total service and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=12.09 (p=0.000584)	Significant
Residential Area and Quality of Work Life	F-Test	F=2.17 (p=0.14164)	Not Significant
Marital status and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=3.51 (p=0.000253)	Significant
Age and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=18.20 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Designation and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=21.19 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Department and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=3.29 (p=.00106)	Significant
Gender and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=27.34 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Qualification and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=15.35 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Individual Income and Quality of Work Life	t- Test	t=21.79 (p=0.00001)	Significant
Gender and Quality of Work Life	$\chi^2$ Test	$\chi^2=24.36$ (p=0.000)	Significant
Total Service and Quality of Work Life	$\chi^2$ Test	$\chi^2=17.14$ (p=0.046)	Significant
Qualification and Quality of Work Life	$\chi^2$ Test	$\chi^2=30.52$ (p=0.000)	Significant
Age and Quality of Work Life	$\chi^2$ Test	$\chi^2=4.53$ (p=0.605)	Not Significant

**Source:** Primary Data

The above table 2 reveals the significance test (F, t, Test and  $\chi^2$  Goodness of fit Test) for Quality of Work Life on Demographic Variables. The F test values shows that there is a significant difference in the Quality of Work Life based on the demographic variables namely age, department, Designation , Gender , Family Size , Individual Annual income and family Annual income of the respondents at 0.05 level of significance except length of present service and marital status . The t-values in the table shows that there is a significant difference in the level of Quality of Work Life based on the



demographic variables namely Age, gender, Department, Designation of the respondents at 0.05 level of significance.

**Table 3: Relationship between the Demographic Variables and Quality of Work Life**

Variable	Test	Value	Result
Age and Quality of Work Life	r - test	r = 0.0789 (p=0.179)	Not-Significant to 0.05
Qualification and Quality of Work Life	r – test	r =0.243 (p=0.000)	Significant to 0.01
Individual Annual Income and Quality of Work Life	r – test	r = 0.168 (p=0.004)	Significant to 0.01
Designation and Quality of Work Life	r – test	r=0.176 (p=0.003)	Significant to 0.01
Length of Service and Quality of Work Life	r – test	r = 0.066 (p=0.264)	Not-Significant to 0.05
Family income and Quality of Work Life	r – test	r = 0.180 (p=0.002)	Significant to 0.01

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 shows the relationship between the demographic variables and Quality of Work Life of the respondents. The coefficient of the correlation value shows that there is a significant relationship between the Qualification, Individual and Family annual income, Designation and Quality of Work Life at 0.01 level of significance. The coefficient of correlation value shows that there is no significant relationship between the demographic variables namely total length of service, Age of the respondents with Quality of Work Life at 0.05 level of significance.

**Table: 4 : Quality of Work Life Level**

Quality of Work Life	Number of Respondents	Percentage
Low	13	8.90
Moderate	84	57.53
High	26	17.80
Very High	23	15.75
Total	146	100.0

Source : Primary Data

The above table 4 portrays that 57.53 percent of the respondents have a moderate level of the Quality of Work Life, 17.80 percent of them have high level of the Quality of Work Life, 15.75 percent of them have Very high level of the Quality of Work Life and 8.90 percent of them have low level of the Quality of Work Life.

**Conclusion**

The results of the study provide a promising insight into the Quality of Work Life of Teachers serving in the Self Financing Engineering Colleges in Tiruchirappalli District and make a theoretical contribution as to the relationship between Socio-Economic Factors and Quality of Work Life Factors through this study process. Majority of the Teachers belong to the Generation Y. The Findings also revealed that there is a moderate level

of satisfaction on Quality of Work life. If Self Financing Engineering Colleges begin to foster and encourage the use of QWL in the workplace then Teachers wellbeing may be increased and thereby quality of teaching learning process can enhance which results in reducing higher education gap and promotes enhanced society.

### References

1. Adams, M., 1998. *Sex in the Snow: Canadian Social Values at the End of the Millennium*. 1st edition. Toronto, Canada: Penguin Books. ISBN 978-0140261028.
2. Apostolidis, B. M. and E. C. Polifroni, 2006. Nurse work satisfaction and generational differences. *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 36(01), 506–509. ISSN 0002-0443.
3. Arsenault, P. (2004), 'Validating Generational Differences: A Legitimate Diversity and Leadership Issue', *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25 (2): 124-141.
4. Beutell, N. J. and U. Wittig-Berman, 2008. Work-family conflict and work-family synergy for generation X, baby boomers, and matures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 23(05), 507 – 523. ISSN 0268-3946.
5. Boonrod, W., (2009). Quality of Working Life: Perceptions of Professional Nurses at Phramongkutklao Hospital. *J Med Assoc Thai*, 92(1), 7-15. in press
6. Cogin, J., 2012. Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 23(11), 2268 – 2294. ISSN 0958-5192.
7. Cordeniz, J. A. (2002). Recruitment, retention, and management of Generation X: A focus on nursing professionals. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 47 (4), 237-249.
8. Dan Schawbel., (2014), 5 Predictions for generation alpha. [Accessed :2016-04-16]. Available at : <http://danschawbel.com/blog/5-predictions-for-generation-alpha/>
9. Deloitte © 2016. The Deloitte Millennial Survey 2016. Winning over the next generation of leaders. In: *Deloitte.com* [online]. [accessed 2016-09-28]. Available at: <http://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/millennialsurvey.html>. [Accessed: 28 September 2016].
10. Eisner, S. P., 2005. Managing Generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*. 70(01), 4 – 12. ISSN 0749-7075.
11. Hansen, J. C. and M. E. Leuty, 2012. Work Values Across Generations. *Journal of Career Assessment*. 20(01), 34 – 52. ISSN 1069-0727.
12. Harrison, T.M., (1985), "Communication and Participative Decision Making: An exploratory study", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. (1), pp.97-116.
13. Hendrick, B. (Feb. 2005). "High tech intimidates many baby boomers as they move into midlife." *The Pulse Journal*
14. Hill, K.S. (2004). "Defy the decades with multigenerational teams." *Nursing Management*, 35(1), 32-35
15. Howe, N. and W. Strauss, 2007. The next 20 years: how customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. *Harvard Business Review*., 85(07/08), 41 – 52. ISSN 0017-8012

16. Kapil, Y. and A. Roy, 2014. Critical Evaluation of Generation Z at Workplaces. *International Journal of Social Relevance & Concern*. 02(01), 10 – 14. ISSN 2347-9698.
17. Knight, R., 2014. Managing people from 5 generations. *Harvard Business Review* [online]. [Accessed: 2016-06-28]. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2014/09/managing-people-from-5-generations>. ISSN 0017-8012.
18. Kupperschmidt, B. R., 2000. Multigeneration employees: strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*. 19(01), 65 – 76. ISSN 1525-5794.
19. Lancaster, L. C. and D. Stillman, 2005. *When Generations Collide: Who They Are. Why They Clash. How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work*. 1st edition. New York: HarperBusiness. ISBN 978-0066621074.
20. Losyk, B. (1997). Generation X: What they think and what they plan to do. *The Futurist*, 31 (2), 39-44.
21. Marconi, J. (2001). *Future marketing: Targeting seniors, boomers, and generations X and Y*. Chicago, IL: NTC Contemporary Publishing Group Inc.
22. Martin, C. A., 2005. From High Maintenance to High Productivity: What Managers Need to Know About Generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training*. 37(01), 39 – 44. ISSN 0019-7858.
23. Messarra, L. C., S. Karkoulian and A. N. El-Kassar, 2016. Conflict resolution styles and personality: The moderating effect of generation X and Y in a non-Western context. *International journal of productivity and performance management*. 65(06), 792 – 810. ISSN 1741-0401.
24. Morrison, R., T. Erickson and K. Dychtwald, 2006. Managing Middlecence. *Harvard Business Review*. March, 1 – 11. ISSN 0017-8012.
25. Murphy, E. F., J. D. Gordon and T. L. Anderson, 2004. Cross-Cultural, Cross-Cultural Age and Cross-Cultural Generational Differences Between the United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*. 09(01), 21 – 48. ISSN 1077-1158.
26. Nadler, D.A., and Lawler, E.E. (1983), Quality of work life: Perceptions and Direction, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 11(3), pp. 20-30.
27. Nazir, U., Qureshi, T.M., Shafaat, T., & I. A., (2011). Office harassment: A negative influence on quality of work life. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(25), 10276-10285
28. Normala and Daud (2010), –Investigating the Relationship Between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment Amongst Employees in Malaysian Firms, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol: 5, No. 10.
29. Ozkan, M. and B. Solmaz, 2015. The Changing Face of the Employees – Generation Z and Their Perceptions of Work (A Study Applied to University Students). *Procedia Economics and Finance*. 26(01), 476 – 483. ISSN 2212-5671.

30. Rose, R.C., Beh, L., Uli, J., & Idris, K., (2006). Quality Of Work Life: Implications Of Career Dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 61-67.
31. Seashore, S.E. (1975). Defining and measuring the quality of working life. In Davis, L.E. and Cherns, A.B. (eds.). *The quality of working life*, vol. 1: Problems, prospects and the state of the art. New York: The Free Press.
32. Shaw, S. and D. Fairhurst, 2008. Engaging a New Generation of Graduates. *Education and Training*. 50(01), 366 – 378. ISSN 2330-9709.
33. Shen, J. et al., 2009. Managing Diversity through Human Resources: An International Perspective and Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 20(02), 235 –251. ISSN 0958-5192.
34. Shen Kian, T., W. F. Wan Yusoff and S. Rajah, 2013. Relationship between Motivations and Citizenship Performance among Generation X and Generation Y. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 03(11), 53 – 68. ISSN 2222-6990.
35. Smola, K. W. and C. D. Sutton, 2002. Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23(01), 363 – 382. ISSN 1099-1379.
36. Stuenkel, D. L., K. Dela Cuesta and J. Cohen, 2005. The multi-generational nursing work force; essential differences in perception of work environment. *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 35(06), 283 – 285. ISSN 0002-0443.
37. Subburethina Bharathi and M, Umaseelvi and Nakkeeran, Senthil, Quality of work life: Perception of College teachers , *Indian journal of commerce & Management studies*, 2(1) 2011. 47-65
38. Tabassum, A., Rahman, T., & Jahan, K., (2011). A Comparative Analysis of Quality of Work Life among the Employees of Local Private and Foreign Commercial Banks in Bangladesh. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 17-33.
39. Tapscott, D. (1999). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation*. New York: McGraw Hill.
40. Timossi, L.S., Pedroso, B., Francisco, A.C., & Pilatti, L.A., (2008). Evaluation Of Quality Of Work Life: An Adaptation From The Walton's QWL Model. XIV. *International Conference On Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
41. Walton, R.E., (1973) "Quality of working life: what is it?" *Sloan Management Review*, pp 11-21.
42. West, M., 2014. What Manufacturers Need to Know About Generation Z. *Manufacturing Engineering*. 153(01), 168 – 168. ISSN 0361-0853.
43. Wieck, K. L., 2005. Generational approaches to current nursing issues: how younger and older nurses can coexist. *The Oklahoma Nurse*. 50(01), 16 – 19. ISSN 0030-1787.
44. Zemke, R., C. Raines and B. Filipczak, 2000. *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in Your Workplace*. 1st ed. New York: Amacom. 288 p. ISBN 978-0-8144-0480-5.