

Quality of Work Life and its Impact on Behavioural Outcomes of Teaching Faculty: An Empirical Study in Oman Higher Education Context

Sathya Narayanan. S, Umaseelvi. M, & Mohammed Ibrahim Hussein

Abstract:

This empirical study focuses at the role of Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions in determining the behavioural dimensions of teaching faculty in Oman Higher Education institutions. A nationwide study across the public and private higher education institutions in the Sultanate of Oman revealed that work-time pressure and job security (QWL factors) are significantly affecting the behavioural outcomes (satisfaction and performance) of teaching faculty in the Sultanate. Further, the teaching faculty in Public higher education institutions differs significantly in terms of QWL factors namely perceived supervisory support, job security and skills discretion, in comparison to the Private higher education institutions. This study provides a platform for policy makers and administration of higher educational institutions in the gulf region to create necessary infrastructure so as to retain and develop their teaching talents.

Keywords: *Quality of Work Life, Sultanate of Oman, Higher Education, Teacher Performance, Job Satisfaction.*

1. Introduction

The psychological contract of individuals with their organization seems to have changed in congruence with the changes in employees' needs in recent years. Thus, quality of work life has gained recognition, as employees want to feel respected at work for what they do and who they are. Modern organizations operate in a hyper dynamic environment characterized by technological changes which impact employee opportunities, skill requirement, management policies, strategies and styles, expectations and aspirations of employees and the physical working conditions. These factors manifest a crucial challenge on 'Quality' and how to nurture a 'Quality culture'.

Quality of human input is the greatest asset to any Academic Institution. Maintaining the quality of such human input rises from maintaining the quality of work life perfectly and an attempt to capitalize the human assets of the organization. Research has shown a significant correlation between organizational work climate and employee productivity and job satisfaction (Bartels et al 1998). A study by Al-Neizi and Amzat (2012) on the job satisfaction of teachers in Al-Dahirah, Al- Dakelya and Muscat regions of the Sultanate of Oman reveals that teaching overload and its incompatibility with the salary structure is the main reason for job dissatisfaction and the resulting high turnover of the teachers. Similarly Al-Belushi (2004) in her study on Gender roles and career choice as teacher has identified the need to establish special work structures which could accommodate the multiple roles played by women in the society so as to achieve real commitment and intrinsic motivation to the teaching job. With the increasing necessity to create a quality work life for the teachers, the policy makers in the Sultanate of Oman need specific identified factors to focus in order to create a conducive working climate for teachers.

The necessity to improve the quality of work life for teachers in the schools of Sultanate of Oman is emphasized through previous research. What could be the plight of lecturers in higher education institutions in the Sultanate of Oman? No previous research has explored the quality of work life of lecturers and if their work climate has any impact on performance levels? The question triggered this research. Moreover, the study also intends to find out the differences in quality of work life (QWL) between the public and private higher education institutions in the Sultanate of Oman. This

research paper is attempting to answer the above questions through a well established methodology which addresses the sampling, reliability and validity issues of the constructs used for the study. Interestingly, the analysis brings out a clear relationship between the QWL factors and their impact on the performance level of lecturers.

Literature Review

Quality of work life is a broad and comprehensive concept which measures the work related well being of an individual and sets a scale for any job's satisfying, fulfilling and stress free design and work climate. It is defined as the employee feeling towards their work place ambience, colleagues and the job itself in initiating a series of outcomes and behaviour resulting in overall profitability and growth of an organisation (Shamir & Saloman, 1985). Lawler (1982) explains the QWL on the basis of working conditions and job characteristics. He further suggests that the basic operating premise of the QWL in an organisation is to encourage the productivity levels and the general well being of the employees. In an organization with positive ethical climate, employees hold the view that "the right thing to do is the only thing to do" Verbos et al (2007) p.17. Similarly, Schminke, et al (2007) describe that the ethical work climate includes the prevalent ethical values, norms, attitudes, feelings, and behaviors of the members (employees) that make up the social organization. Cullen et al (2003) further explain that the ethical work climates are not simply based on an individual's ethical standards or level of moral development. They instead represent components of the employees' work environment as perceived by its members.

In Organisational research, Job satisfaction is considered as one of the most widely and intensely studied variables (McCue & Gianakis, 1997). The worker's cognitive, affective, and evaluative response and behaviour toward their work is considered as job satisfaction (Greenberg & Baron, 1997). In line with that, Newstrom and Davis (2000) opined that the positive and negative emotions and feelings that employees experience at their work place is viewed as job satisfaction. In similarity to job satisfaction, Job involvement refers to the degree to which a person is showing interest and commitment to the assigned job (Steers and Black, 1994). Thus, employees who demonstrate job involvement and job satisfaction are more likely to accept the work ethics prescribed in the organisation. Such employees also show higher levels of

motivation towards growth and willingly participate and take relevant tasks in their job (Newstrom & Davis, 2000).

In any organisation, the quality of work life and ethics are coupled and entwined together. The perceptions of the ability of the organisational climate in providing a wider range of well being for employees determines the QWL. Whereas, ethics is considered to be the governing standards or rules of professional conduct for the members or individuals of any group or organisation (Cascio, 1998; Sirgy et al., 2001). As a result of plaguing ethical problems confronting modern day organisations, ethical standards are introduced in recent years to discourage unethical practices among employees. (Chonko et al., 2003; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Fleischman, 2008). An ethical work environment can be nurtured only when the employees feel trust and confidence in the actions of the managers (e.g., Cascio, 1998; Shaw, 2005; Walker, 1992). Guest (1980) opines that the prevalence of such an environment can influence the quality of work life of employees in a significant way. As reviewed by Vitell and Singhapakdi (2008), various studies demonstrate how work attitudes of employees positively influence the ethical work climate of organisations.

Elci and Alpan (2009) discovered a significant positive relationship between the egoistic work climate and low levels of work satisfaction. The study specifically showed that a self-interest climate type proved to have a negative influence on job satisfaction, whereas team interest, social responsibility, and principled climates positively impact work satisfaction. A principled work climate proposes that the decisions are made in accordance with the established rules and codes. Deshpande (1996) concludes that in a principled climate, law and professional codes lead to a positive overall satisfaction. Further, it is discovered that climate types did not significantly influence satisfaction with pay, but it did influence employee's satisfaction with other job facets such as, promotions, supervisors, and workload.

Cascio (1998) emphasises that organisations which display high QWL characteristics will make their employees feel that the work is fulfilling and satisfying their needs. The research findings from Louis (1998) reported that QWL is strongly related to work commitment and sense of efficacy. Lee et al. (2007) revealed that QWL generally has a positive influence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and esprit de corps. A set of similar studies by Valentine et al. (2002) and Valentine and Fleischman (2008) showed that once an organisation incorporates ethical values in its work culture it can easily generate employee's commitment and job satisfaction. It will make the employees feel like an integral part of the organisation.

Gap in the Literature: Based on the literature in this review, it is identified that there are many studies on the relationships between QWL and organizational productivity or performance. But, there are only a very few studies which relate to the ethical work climate, quality of work life and the resultant work outcomes and behaviours. Also, based on this literature review, it is understood that there are no relevant published studies on these variables in Gulf countries. Given the increasing importance of both quality of work life and ethics in academic institutions in the recent years and the fact that there are not many studies on quality of work life in higher educational institutions in the Sultanate of Oman, this study addresses the gap in the literature. Moreover, the outcomes of this study will contribute to all the higher education institutions in the Gulf area and particularly in the Sultanate of Oman.

Objectives of The Study

- To measure the teaching faculty perceptions on the Quality of Work Life (QWL) and its impact on the job satisfaction and performance level of teaching faculty in Higher Education institutions in the Sultanate of Oman.
- To identify the significant differences in the Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Ethical Work Climate dimensions amongst private and public higher education institutions in the Sultanate of Oman.

Methodology

Sampling Procedure: Cluster sampling is used to effectively attain the desired sample size of at least 100 which will give reliable estimates while undergoing statistical analysis. For multi-variate analysis the minimum sample size required is calculated based on the number of parameters to be estimated. For each parameter it requires at least 10 samples (Nunnally, 1978). Initially clusters of sample are created for teaching faculty based on private and public higher education institutions through access to email databases of faculty. Then a census approach is followed to send the questionnaires to all the selected clusters.

Data Collection Procedure: The QWL perceptions of the teaching faculty in Oman is collected as primary data using a questionnaire which was designed and uploaded in the survey website "Survey monkey". The web link to the questionnaire is sent to more than 2000 teaching faculty members in Oman higher education institutions through e-mails. The process yielded 143 completely filled in responses with a response rate of 7%.

Validation of the Questionnaire: The Quality of Work Life questionnaire's content validity is ensured by initially developing a list of 157 statements on quality of work life by referring to the QWL questionnaire used by Umaselvi et al (2010) to study the teaching faculty QWL perceptions and the Leiden Quality of Work Life measure. Apart from that, variables reflecting the local context are also added to the list. This process ensured the content validity of the measurement scale. All the statements are subject to a face validity process involving five judges and a list of 40 relevant items are shortlisted by the judges to be included in the final questionnaire. The ethical work climate questionnaire is adapted from the Victor and Cullen's ethical climate instrument. It originally had 28 items which after the face validity process its shortlisted to 17 items. The teaching faculty's performance instrument consists of 7 items. As there are no extant scales available to measure the performance of teachers, the items were developed by the researchers which emphasized the performance standards of the academic fraternity in general. Job commitment and job satisfaction are measured through a three item scale respectively.

Reliability of the Measurement Scales: The reliability of the instruments was measured using Cronbach's alpha (refer Table 1). It is a coefficient of reliability which ensures that the instruments are internally consistent. The alpha values for the test should ideally be above 0.7 to be acceptable and the values over 0.8 are considered to have good reliability (George & Mallery, 2003). The analysis reveals that all the scales have reliability co-efficients of above 0.8 except for the job satisfaction measure which is on the weaker side with a value of 0.658. As job satisfaction measure is very sensitive in nature, socially desirable bias might have affected the results.

Analysis and Interpretation

The individual variables of each factor are added together to represent a single score for each factor (Trochim, 2000). This is based on Likert's summated scale principle. This led to a total of eight factor scores for Quality of Work Life (QWL) scale and five factor scores for Ethical Work Climate (EWC) scale. Similarly, the performance measures are not summated and each variable is individually analysed to identify the variations in each variable. The job satisfaction and job commitments measures are obtained by adding together the three variables respectively for each scale. The data are initially subject to hierarchical regression analysis to identify the effect of independent variables over that of the dependent variables. The advantage of this model is that the additional variance shown by an independent variable over and above a control or intervening variable can be measured (Cohen and Cohen, 1983). Further, the data is subject to percentage analysis, where the summated scores are converted into percentage scores to facilitate comparison between the perceptions of teaching faculty in the public and private higher education institutions in Oman. The significant differences in percentage between the two groups are established using independent two- sample t-test (two groups with un-equal variances- Welch's test) (Fadem, 2008). This will ascertain whether the means of the two groups are statistically different.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis (Public Institutions): Initially, the perceptions of the teaching faculty at the public higher education institutions are taken for analysis. Job satisfaction and performance of the teaching faculty are treated as dependent variables and two regression models are used keeping the demographics and Quality of Work Life (QWL) perceptions as independent variables. Hierarchically, the demographic variables (Gender, Nationality, Current Experience and Total Teaching Experience) are entered in step 1 as control variables and the QWL variables (Skill Discretion, Decision Authority, Task Control, Work Time Comfort, Role Clarity, Job Security, Manager Support and Peer Support) in the step 2. Both the models turned out to be significant and their Durbin-Watson scores are within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.5, indicating lack of auto-correlation (refer Table 2). The quality of work life has a significant impact on Job Satisfaction of the teaching faculty in Public institutions with an additional variance of 29.1 % over and above the effect of demographic variables on Job Satisfaction ($p < .01$). The demographics also show significance in variance on the quality of work life of teachers. A closer look at the contribution of the individual QWL variables towards the impact on Job Satisfaction reveals that (refer Table 3) the work-time comfort variable is having a significant impact on the Job Satisfaction of the teachers with $\beta = 0.229$, $t(80) = 2.981$ and $p < .01$. The Beta (β) value represents standardised regression coefficient of dependent variable. It measures the resultant change in dependent variable for every single unit change in independent variable. The Manager Support variable also significantly predicts the Job Satisfaction of the teachers in public institutions with $\beta = 0.21$, $t(80) = 1.992$ and $p < .05$. All other variables do not have any say in the variance of the job satisfaction factor. Amongst the demographic variables, the nationality of the teachers have a significant say in their Job Satisfaction with $\beta = -.331$, $t(88) = -2.708$ and $p < .01$.

The impact of QWL on the performance of the teachers in public institutions is significant and it explains a significant variance in performance scores, $R^2 = .435$, $F(8, 80) = 5.660$ and $p < .01$. R^2 is an indicator of how well the model fits the data. The closer the value is to 1, better is the model fit. This variance is over and above the reported variance

of demographic variables on the performance of teachers. Analysis of the contribution of the individual QWL variables on the performance of teachers (refer Table 3) reveals that skill discretion and role clarity variables have a significant say on the performance level of the teachers.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis (Private Institutions): Similarly, the impact of the QWL variables on the job satisfaction and performance of teachers in private institutions is tested with two models of hierarchical regression. The order of building the variables in the model is similar to that of the model built for public institutions. The QWL variables explained a significant proportion of variance in the job satisfaction of the teachers after controlling for the demographic variables, with $R^2 = .529$, $F(8, 37) = 5.516$ and $p < .01$ (refer Table 4). Equally, the QWL variables have a significant impact on the performance level of the teachers in private institutions after controlling for the demographic variables with $R^2 = .411$, $F(8, 37) = 3.870$ and $p < .01$. For both the models Durbin - Watson measures are within the accepted range (Montgomery et al, 2001).

Verification of the individual contribution of the QWL variables on the job satisfaction of the teachers in private higher education institutions reveals that work - time comfort variable has a more significant impact on job satisfaction of teachers in private institutions than any other QWL variable. The performance of the teachers in private institutions is again determined strongly by the skill discretion in the job. These results are very similar to that of the teacher perceptions in public institutions. All other QWL variables do not have any significant impact on job satisfaction and performance.

Welch's Test (t-test) of significant difference between Public and Private Institutions: This study strives mainly to identify the differences in the perceptions of the teaching faculty between public and private institutions, on their quality of work life (QWL), ethical work climate (EWC), and performance levels. As the sample size and variances of the two groups are different (Public $n = 93$ and Private $n = 50$) and the purpose of the test is to highlight only the significant differences (how far the mean is different) and not the repeat measures where the samples overlap, Welch's test is applied on the data sets (Sawilowski, 2002). The factor scores are converted into percentages for easy and lucid understanding of the perceptual differences between the teachers from the two groups of institutions. The analyses are carried out in an in-depth fashion by segregating the data into various subgroups based on the demographics of the teaching faculty from both the group of institutions respectively.

Perceptual Differences between Female Faculty in Public and Private Institutions: Amongst the female employees in both the group of institutions, there are no reported differences on their perceptions on the quality of work life and their performance levels in the respective institutions (refer Table 6). There is a significant difference between the female faculty in private and public institutions on their perceptions on a caring and efficient work climate.

Perceptual Differences between Male Faculty in Public and Private Institutions: Male faculty in the private and public institutions differ significantly in the Quality of Work Life variable Skill Discretion (refer Table 6). In the Ethical Work Climate dimensions, there is a significant effect on the rules and regulations existing in the organization (refer Table 7). The perception of male faculty on the rules and orderliness in the public institutions is significantly different than the

climate in private institutions . Among the Performance level dimensions, the male faculty's performance levels in Private institutions are significantly different in terms of academic research, realization of potential talents and achieving better student results in comparison to the public institutions (refer Table 8).

Perceptual Differences between Less Experienced Faculty in Public and Private Institutions: Teaching faculty with less than two years (new teachers) of current experience in the public and private institutions are treated demographically as Less Experienced faculty. When Welch's test of differences is applied to the two groups, significant effect is observed where Quality of Work Life dimensions, Ethical Work Climate Dimensions and the Performance levels of the less experienced faculty in Private institutions are significantly different than in Public institutions (refer Tables 6, 7 & 8). In Private institutions, the new faculty members feel that there are more opportunities to exhibit diverse skills, high managerial support and improved job security. These are significantly different than the perceptions of the new faculty members at public institutions. But, the test did not reveal any significant difference in perceptions for more experienced employees (faculty with more than 2 years experience in the current institution), along the QWL, EWC and performance levels (refer Tables 6, 7 & 8).

Perceptual Differences between Omani Faculty in Public and Private Institutions: The test of differences revealed that there is no significant point of differences between the two groups in QWL dimensions. Omani Faculty feels significant difference in independent work climate of Private institutions and Public institutions. In Performance dimensions the Omani faculty in Public institutions significantly differ in engagement in professional academic associations and publication in peer reviewed journals in comparison to private institutions (refer Table 8).

Perceptual Differences between Expatriate Faculty in Public and Private Institutions: The Expatriate faculty members do not feel any significant difference in Ethical Work Climate dimensions between a private and public institution. But they feel a significantly different levels of Job Security and Skill Discretion between Private institution and Public institution (refer Table 6). Similarly the Performance levels of expatriate faculty in Private institutions are significantly different in terms of involvement in academic research, realization of their talents and obtaining better student results in comparison to their performance in Public institutions (refer Table 8).

Discussion

Summary of Findings and Implications:

- Quality of Work Life (QWL) is having a significant impact on the Job Satisfaction and Performance of the teaching faculty in both the public and private higher education institutions in Oman. An in-depth analysis reveals that QWL variable 'Work and Time Pressure' is having a significant impact on the Job Satisfaction of teaching faculty in both public and private institutions. Additionally, in public colleges, the QWL variable, the Supervisor's Care and Support is considered to be important to achieve job satisfaction. Similarly, the QWL variable Skill Discretion plays a major role in both public and private institutions in determining the Performance levels of the teachers. This emphasizes the fact that, if more the opportunities are given to the faculty in exhibiting

their skills, then their performance will be better. The academic setting should be invigorating enough to give more room for innovations and opportunities for displaying special abilities of the teacher.

- While comparing the QWL, Ethical Work Climate (EWC) and Performance levels of Female faculty members in public and private institutions, significant differences are reported in the caring and efficient environment which has to be evened out. The Male faculty members feel that Private colleges significantly differ in giving opportunities to display their variety skills than Public institutions.
- New faculty members (with less than 2 years experience in the current work place) in Private institutions feel significant difference in Quality of Work Life than in comparison to Public institutions in terms of choice given to express their variety skills, increased Job Security and Line Manager Support.
- Omani teaching faculty in Private Institutions perceive significant difference on the perception of independence in work climate in comparison to Public institutions. However, their Performance in terms of Research publications and academic associations are significantly different in Public institutions and Private institutions. There is no perceived difference in terms of their QWL in both the institutions.
- Expatriate teaching faculty in Private colleges feels significant difference in Quality of Work Life (QWL) in terms of Skill Discretion and Job Security in comparison to Expatriate faculty in Public institutions.

Limitations and Future Directions:

The study is purely cross-sectional in nature which necessitates the requirement for a longitudinal research in the future which can measure the QWL effects over a longer period of time. Here, the role of other influencing factors on the QWL of teaching faculty can be studied in a more thorough manner. Such a study also warrants a study to measure cause and effect relationship using Structural Equation Models. The sample size may not be adequate for external validation of the results as the response rate from the data collection procedure yielded only a limited set of responses, even though they are collected through a random process. As the data entry by respondents is not controlled, and the typical weaknesses of online data collection with inherent bias towards socially desirable answers, measurement errors may be higher.

Future studies should aim at a problem solving approach to look deeper into the cause and effect of the quality of work life of teaching faculty in the Sultanate of Oman. This will allow the policy makers and top management of the institutions to pursue their commitment towards quality not just with student community, but also with the teaching community which is fulcrum of the academic growth. More studies can be initiated to measure the retention levels of teaching faculty in higher education institutions and the factors that promote the retention level of faculty members in those institutions. Such studies will give a better ground for the stakeholders in higher education, to make strategic plans for the academic community in the Sultanate of Oman.

Conclusion

This study revealed that the quality of work life of the teaching community in higher education institutions of Oman seems to significantly differ between private and public institutions. The institutions have to prioritise and sensitise

their strategic plans towards providing a work climate which is ethically sound and providing adequate work life comfort to the teaching fraternity. This further stresses the need to establish quality of work life standards for teaching faculty in the Sultanate of Oman. This will ensure that the long range plans towards quality commitment and enhancement in higher education institutions are catalysed through the effective performance of the teaching faculty.

References

Al-Belushi, A. (2004). Gender Issues in Teacher Development: Career Choice and Commitment in Oman. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 8(1), 16-27.

Al-Neimi, R. K. R. & Amzat, I. H. (2012). Teachers' Perceptions of Their Job Satisfaction and Turnover: A Case Study of Some Schools in Sultanate of Oman. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3 (9), 93-104. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2035614>

Bartels, K. K., Harrick, E., Martell, K., & Strickland, D. (1998). The Relationship between Ethical Climate and Ethical Problems within Human Resource Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(7), 799-804. doi: 10.1023/A:1005817401688

Cascio, W.F. (1998) *Managing human resources: productivity, quality of work life, profits*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill
Chonko L.B., Wotruba T.R. & Loe T.W. (2003). Ethics code familiarity and usefulness: views on idealist and relativist managers under varying conditions of turbulence. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2003; 42:237–52. doi: 10.1023/A:1022261006692

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cullen, J. B., Parboteeah, K. P., & Victor, B. (2003). The effects of ethical climates on organizational commitment: A two-study analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46, 127-141. doi: 10.1023/A:1025089819456

Deshpande, S. P. (1996). The impact of ethical climate types on facets of job satisfaction: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(6), 655-660.

Elci, M., & Alpkın, L. (2008). The impact of perceived organizational ethical climate on work satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(3), 297-310. doi: 10.1007/s10551-008-9709-0

Fadem, B. (2008). *High-Yield Behavioral Science (High-Yield Series)*. Hagerstown, MD: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (1997). *Behavior in Organization* (6th ed.). Prentice-Hall Inc. pp. 178, 190.

Guest R. H. (1980) Quality of work life: prospects for the 80s. *Vital Speeches of the Day* 46(10):310–3.

Hofstede G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
Lawler, E.E.III., (1982). *Strategies for improving the quality*

of work life. *American Psychologist*, 37: 486-493. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.37.5.486

Lee, D.J., Singhapakdi, A & Sirgy M.J. (2007). Further validation of a need-based quality-of-work-life (QWL) measure: evidence from marketing practitioners. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2:273–87. doi: 10.1007/s11482-008-9042-x

Louis KS. (1998). Effects of quality of work life in secondary schools on commitment and sense of efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(1):1-27. doi: 10.1080/0924345980090101

McCue, Clifford P., & Gianakis, Gerasimos A., (1997). The Relationship between job satisfaction and performance: The case of local government finance officers in Ohio. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 170-91.

Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. A. and Vining, G. G. (2001). *Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis*. 3rd Edition, New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons

Newstrom, J. W., & Davis, K. (2000). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work* (10th ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company. pp. 83, 103-11.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schminke, M., Arnaud, A., & Kuenzi, M. (2007). The power of ethical work climates. *Organizational Dynamics*, 36(2), 171-186. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2007.03.005

Sawilowsky, S. S. (2002). Fermat, Schubert, Einstein, and Behrens–Fisher: The Probable Difference Between Two Means When $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$. *Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods*, 1(2).

Shamir, B. and I. Salomon, (1985). Work-at-home and the quality of working life. *Academy of Management*, 10: 455-64. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1985.4278957

Shaw W.H. (2005). *Business ethics*. Belmont, CA: 2005. Thomson Wadsworth;

Sirgy M.J., Efraty D., Siegel P. & Lee D.J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theory. *Social Indicators Research* 2001; 55:241–302. doi: 10.1023/A:1010986923468

Somers M.J. (2001). Ethical codes of conduct and organizational context: a study of the relationship between codes of conduct, employee behavior and organizational values. *Journal of Business Ethics*; 30:185–95.

Steers, R. M. & Black, S. J. (1994). *Organizational Behavior*. (7th ed.). Harper Collins College Publications. pp. 86-88.

Trochim, W. (2000). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*, 2nd Edition. Atomic Dog Publishing, Cincinnati, OH.

Umaselvi, M. and Bharathi, Subbu Rethina (2010), A Study on Quality of Work Life as Perceived by the College Teachers in Trichy City (June 27, 2010). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1631051>

Valentine S. & Fleischman, G. (2008). *Ethics programs*,

perceived corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction. Journal of Business Ethics. 2008;77:159–72. doi: 10.1007A10551-006-9306-Z

Valentine S., Godkin L. & Lucero M. (2002). Ethical context, organizational commitment, and Person-organization fit. Journal of Business Ethics;41(4):349–60. doi: 10.1023/A:1021203017316

Vitell S.J. & Singhapakdi A. (2008). The role of ethics institutionalization in influencing organizational commitment, job Satisfaction and esprit de corps. Journal of Business Ethics; 81:343–53. doi; 10.1007/s10551-007-9498-x

Verbos, A. K., Gerard, J. A., Forshey, P. R., Harding, C. S., & Miller, J. S. (2007). The positive ethical organization: Enacting a living code of ethics and ethical organizational identity. Journal of Business Ethics, 76(1), 17-33. doi: 10.1007A10551-006-9275-2

Walker J.W. (1992). Human Resource Strategy. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix

Table 1: Reliability Scores of Measurement Scales

| Measurement Tools | Cronbach's Alpha | Scale Mean | Scale Variance |
|----------------------|------------------|------------|----------------|
| Quality of Work Life | 0.908 | 3.56 | .157 |
| Ethical Work Climate | 0.859 | 3.10 | .067 |
| Performance | 0.836 | 3.67 | .091 |
| Job Commitment | 0.836 | 3.53 | .041 |
| Job Satisfaction | 0.658 | 3.44 | .236 |

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression for Public Institutions

| PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS QWL Vs Job Satisfaction and Performance | Job Satisfaction | | | Performance | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| | R ² | Change | F | R ² | Change | F |
| Step I: Demographics | .146 | .146 | .007** | .115 | .115 | .028* |
| Step II: Quality of Work Life (QWL) | .436 | .291 | .000** | .435 | .320 | .000** |
| Durbin – Watson Measure | 2.057 [#] | | | 1.730 [#] | | |

** p<.01 *p<.05 # Durbin-Watson statistic within acceptable range

Table 3: Individual Beta values for Public Institutions

| PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS QWL FACTORS | Job Satisfaction | | | Performance | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | Beta | t-value | p-value | Beta | t-value | p-value |
| Skill Discretion | 0.196 | 1.634 | 0.106 | 0.316 | 2.629 | 0.010* |
| Decision Authority | 0.17 | 1.375 | 0.173 | -0.152 | -1.223 | 0.225 |
| Task Control | -0.017 | -0.159 | 0.874 | 0.202 | 1.839 | 0.070 |
| Work Time Comfort | 0.299 | 2.981 | 0.004** | -0.01 | -0.103 | 0.918 |
| Role Clarity | 0.025 | 0.236 | 0.814 | 0.357 | 3.402 | 0.001** |
| Job Security | 0.026 | 0.193 | 0.847 | -0.224 | -1.676 | 0.098 |
| Manager Support | 0.21 | 1.992 | 0.050* | 0.109 | 1.035 | 0.304 |
| Peer Support | 0.069 | 0.677 | 0.500 | 0.146 | 1.421 | 0.159 |

** p<.01 *p<.05

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression for Private Institutions

| PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS QWL Vs Job Satisfaction and Performance | Job Satisfaction | | | Performance | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
| | R ² | Change | F | R ² | Change | F |
| Step I: Demographics | .027 | .027 | .867 | .097 | .097 | .319 |
| Step II: Quality of Work Life (QWL) | .556 | .529 | .000** | .508 | .411 | .002** |
| Durbin – Watson Measure | 2.401 [#] | | | 2.467 [#] | | |

** p<.01 # Durbin-Watson statistic within acceptable range

Table 5: Individual Beta values for Private Institutions

| PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS QWL FACTORS | Job Satisfaction | | | Performance | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | Beta | t-value | p-value | Beta | t-value | p-value |
| Skill Discretion | 0.001 | 0.009 | 0.993 | 0.455 | 2.768 | 0.009** |
| Decision Authority | 0.168 | 1.261 | 0.215 | 0.212 | 1.51 | 0.139 |
| Task Control | -0.25 | -1.929 | 0.061 | -0.049 | -0.361 | 0.721 |
| Work Time Comfort | 0.339 | 2.393 | 0.022* | -0.199 | -1.332 | 0.191 |
| Role Clarity | 0.309 | 1.563 | 0.127 | 0.045 | 0.218 | 0.828 |
| Job Security | 0.289 | 1.99 | 0.054 | 0.26 | 1.702 | 0.097 |
| Manager Support | -0.187 | -0.91 | 0.369 | -0.237 | -1.094 | 0.281 |
| Peer Support | 0.097 | 0.497 | 0.622 | -0.256 | -1.244 | 0.221 |

** p<.01 *p<.05

Table 6: Quality of Work Life differences between Public and Private Institutions

| Quality of Work Life | Female | | Male | | More Experienced | | Less Experienced | | Locals | | Expats | |
|----------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| Skill Discretion | 67.8 | 67.0 | 66.8* | 73.9* | 69.2 | 70.0 | 63.5* | 74.9* | 72.9 | 75.7 | 65.4* | 70.7* |
| Decision Authority | 51.3 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 50.5 | 52.2 | 50.7 | 44.2 | 45.6 | 54.5 | 57.5 | 47.9 | 49.5 |
| Task Control | 44.5 | 45.5 | 48.5 | 49.6 | 50.3 | 48.4 | 41.8 | 45.0 | 55.0 | 45.0 | 45.1 | 47.9 |
| Work Time Comfort | 41.1 | 47.7 | 45.9 | 48.4 | 44.1 | 48.7 | 45.0 | 45.6 | 40.0 | 45.0 | 45.7 | 48.2 |
| Role Clarity | 68.3 | 70.3 | 74.7 | 74.2 | 73.5 | 71.7 | 71.5 | 75.9 | 73.7 | 75.0 | 72.6 | 72.3 |
| Job Security | 59.8 | 62.9 | 60.2 | 59.8 | 62.3 | 60.5 | 55.8* | 64.1* | 71.4 | 63.3 | 56.7* | 61.1* |
| Manager Support | 66.3 | 65.4 | 68.8 | 69.4 | 68.9 | 66.1 | 66.6* | 74.7* | 68.9 | 72.0 | 67.8 | 67.4 |
| Peer Support | 71.3 | 73.9 | 76.7 | 77.7 | 75.8 | 75.9 | 73.7 | 76.7 | 82.4 | 85.0 | 72.9 | 75.7 |

*p<.05

Table 7: Ethical Work Climate differences between Public and Private Institutions

| Ethical Work Climate | Female | | Male | | More Experienced | | Less Experienced | | Locals | | Expats | |
|-----------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| Rules and Regulations | 47.32 | 49.85 | 53.90* | 48.68* | 51.80 | 47.68 | 52.14 | 56.11 | 49.79 | 47.50 | 52.54 | 49.27 |
| Caring Environment | 52.62* | 60.61* | 60.70 | 59.73 | 59.92 | 60.30 | 55.26 | 59.26 | 59.86 | 66.67 | 57.80 | 59.84 |
| Efficiency | 61.19 | 60.26 | 64.47 | 67.18 | 64.77 | 64.72 | 61.14 | 61.48 | 61.79* | 80.00* | 63.97 | 63.47 |
| Trust | 51.67* | 68.41* | 66.36 | 59.79 | 63.31 | 61.77 | 59.43* | 71.85* | 61.65 | 66.67 | 62.02 | 63.46 |
| | 71.67 | 80.72 | 86.95 | 83.50 | 85.41 | 81.64 | 76.78 | 85.19 | 82.24 | 86.67 | 82.38 | 82.09 |

*p<.05

Table 8: Performance Level differences between Public and Private Institutions

| Performance | Female | | Male | | More Experienced | | Less Experienced | | Locals | | Expats | |
|------------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private | Public | Private |
| Academic Research | 67.86 | 69.91 | 74.06* | 84.01* | 76.36 | 77.32 | 64.61* | 80.00* | 83.44 | 60.00 | 68.91* | 78.55* |
| Realize full potential | 61.43 | 71.38 | 69.28* | 77.26* | 70.71 | 73.50 | 60.02* | 80.00* | 80.03 | 90.00 | 63.09* | 74.04* |
| Innovations | 79.29 | 77.16 | 80.54 | 83.67 | 82.49 | 81.47 | 75.94 | 77.78 | 85.25 | 90.00 | 78.68 | 80.42 |
| Student results | 72.14 | 79.20 | 74.49* | 80.62* | 73.51 | 80.97 | 74.28 | 75.56 | 81.60 | 70.00 | 71.51* | 80.41* |
| Academic associations | 70.00 | 69.21 | 75.38 | 73.37 | 76.04 | 71.64 | 69.62 | 71.11 | 72.15* | 60.00* | 74.23 | 72.02 |
| Student Rating | 77.14 | 78.29 | 77.52 | 83.29 | 76.66 | 81.82 | 78.77 | 77.78 | 80.08 | 70.00 | 76.63 | 81.56 |
| Peer reviewed journals | 54.29 | 61.84 | 64.38 | 66.41 | 63.66 | 62.93 | 57.14 | 71.11 | 63.01* | 40.00* | 60.86 | 65.42 |

*p<.05

Dr. S. Sathya Narayanan
 Faculty in Business Management
 P.O. Box: 710, PC 112, RUWI
 Majan College (University College)
 Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
 promisenarayanan@yahoo.co.uk

Dr. M.Umaselvi
 Faculty in Business Management
 P.O. Box: 710, PC 112, RUWI
 Majan College (University College)
 Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
 umaselvia@yahoo.co.in

Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim Hussein
 Faculty in Business Management
 P.O. Box: 710, PC 112, RUWI
 Majan College (University College)
 Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
 mabubilal@gmail.com

