International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

To cite this article: Ms. K. ANITHA and Dr. S. AMUTHA (2026). QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE AMONG FEMALE STAFF IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT: TEACHING VS. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPARISON, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies (IJRCMS) 8 (1): 536-555 Article No. 616 Sub Id 1070

QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE AMONG FEMALE STAFF IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT: TEACHING VS. ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPARISON

Ms. K. ANITHA[1] and Dr. S. AMUTHA[2]

[1]Ph.D Research Scholar (Part-Time) in Research Department of Business Administration, Arumugam Pillai Seethai Ammal College, Thirupathur (Affiliated to Alagappa University, Karaikudi)
anitha.kanniah@gmail.com

[2]Research Supervisor, Research Department of Business Administration, Arumugam Pillai Seethai Ammal College, Thirupathur.
amuthasivarajan@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38193/IJRCMS.2026.8145

ABSTRACT

Quality of work-life plays a critical role in shaping employee satisfaction, productivity, and the overall effectiveness of higher educational institutions. Female staff in these settings encounter distinct challenges arising from the need to balance demanding professional roles with personal and family responsibilities. The present study was undertaken to examine and compare the quality of work-life experienced by female teaching and administrative staff working in higher educational institutions across Sivagangai District, Tamil Nadu, India. A cross-sectional survey approach was adopted to gather data from 250 female staff members, comprising 150 from the teaching category and 100 from the administrative category, drawn from 15 institutions in the district. A structured questionnaire was used to measure eight dimensions of work-life quality, including work environment, compensation, work-life balance, job security, professional development, organizational culture, autonomy, and health and safety. Findings revealed that teaching staff scored notably higher in professional development and autonomy compared to their administrative counterparts, and the differences were found to be statistically significant. On the other hand, administrative staff reported comparatively better work-life balance than teaching staff. When taken as a whole, both groups registered moderate levels of overall quality of work-life, though teaching staff maintained a marginally higher score

KEYWORDS: Quality of work-life, female staff, higher education, teaching staff, administrative staff, work-life balance, Sivagangai District, job satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Quality of work-life has emerged as a critical factor in organizational success and employee wellbeing, particularly within the higher education sector. As universities and colleges strive for academic excellence and administrative efficiency, the satisfaction and welfare of their staff members become paramount. Female employees constitute a significant proportion of the workforce in higher educational institutions, serving in both teaching and administrative capacities. Despite their substantial contribution, female staff members often encounter unique challenges that affect their quality of work-life, including gender-based discrimination, limited career advancement opportunities, work-family conflict, and inadequate organizational support systems.

The higher education sector in India has witnessed remarkable expansion over the past two decades, with increased enrollment rates and the establishment of numerous institutions across the country. Tamil Nadu, particularly districts like Sivagangai, has seen considerable growth in higher educational institutions, ranging from government colleges to private universities. This expansion has created diverse employment opportunities for women in academia and administration. However, the quality of work-life experienced by these female employees remains an under-researched area, especially when comparing different employment categories within the same institutional framework.

Teaching and administrative staff, while both integral to institutional functioning, experience distinct work environments, responsibilities, and challenges. Teaching staff engage in instructional activities, research, curriculum development, and student mentorship, often facing pressures related to academic productivity, publication requirements, and classroom management. Administrative staff, conversely, handle operational functions including admissions, finance, human resources, and student services, with responsibilities centered on organizational efficiency and regulatory compliance. These divergent roles may lead to different perceptions and experiences of work-life quality.

Sivagangai District, located in southern Tamil Nadu, hosts multiple higher educational institutions including arts and science colleges, engineering colleges, and professional institutes. The region's educational landscape presents a unique context for studying QWL, as institutions vary in their governance structures (government vs. private), resource availability, and organizational cultures. Understanding the QWL of female staff in this specific geographical and cultural context can provide valuable insights for institutional administrators, policymakers, and researchers interested in improving workplace conditions and employee satisfaction in higher education.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Conceptualizing Quality of Work-Life

Quality of work-life refers to how well an organization meets the needs of its employees through various workplace conditions. Sirgy et al. (2001) viewed it as the satisfaction employees gain from

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

their participation in the workplace. Walton (1973) identified eight key areas under QWL, ranging from fair compensation to a healthy balance between work and personal life, and these areas still guide modern research on the subject.

2.2 Quality of Work-Life in Higher Education

The academic setting brings its own set of challenges to QWL. Lacy and Sheehan (1997) found that autonomy and intellectual growth were the most valued factors among university staff in Australia. Drobnic et al. (2010) noted that institutions with better support systems, particularly for women with family responsibilities, tend to offer improved working conditions. Kinman and Court (2010) reported that academics in the UK dealt with considerable stress, and women felt the impact more due to difficulties in separating work from personal life.

2.3 Gender Dimensions of QWL in Academia

Women in academia continue to face unequal treatment in areas such as promotion and pay. O'Laughlin and Bischoff (2005) pointed out that female faculty struggle with work-family conflict, largely because institutional support remains inadequate. Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2012) identified a pattern were mothers in academia face career setbacks, underscoring the need for better family-friendly policies within institutions.

2.4 Administrative Staff in Higher Education

Administrative staff contribute significantly to institutional operations yet remain understudied. Szekeres (2004) drew attention to this gap in research. Whitchurch (2008) noted that these professionals take on increasingly complex roles but still face issues with recognition and growth. Graham (2009) found that female administrative staff often feel undervalued and find it difficult to manage work alongside personal duties.

2.5 Work-Life Balance in Higher Education

Maintaining balance between work and personal life remains a major concern for female staff. Jacobs and Winslow (2004) observed that academics tend to work far longer hours than most professionals, and this burden falls more heavily on women. Rafnsdóttir and Heijstra (2013) confirmed that gendered challenges in work-life balance persist even in societies that are relatively egalitarian. Acker and Armenti (2004) revealed that women often make significant personal sacrifices to sustain both their careers and family lives.

2.6 Indian Context of QWL in Higher Education

Studies within Indian institutions have started to explore QWL in greater depth. Reddy and Reddy (2010) found moderate satisfaction levels among faculty, with concerns around career growth and

compensation. Rajasekar and Bhuvaneswari (2014) highlighted that family support and workplace flexibility are crucial factors for women in Tamil Nadu. Gayathiri and Ramakrishnan (2013) observed that female staff reported lower QWL scores than their male colleagues, especially regarding work-life balance and advancement.

2.7 Comparative Studies: Teaching vs. Administrative Staff

Direct comparisons between teaching and administrative staff remain scarce. Seashore (1975) noted early differences in what each group valued, with teaching staff prioritizing autonomy and administrative staff focusing on job security. Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) found that women in mid-level administrative roles felt frustrated due to limited recognition and growth opportunities. Thorsen (1996) observed that both groups shared concerns over workload and pay despite differing priorities.

3. RESEARCH GAP

Despite the growing body of literature on quality of work-life in higher education, several significant gaps remain unaddressed, particularly in the Indian context and specifically within regional settings like Sivagangai District.

Most existing studies examine either teaching staff or administrative staff in isolation, with few comparative analyses exploring how QWL dimensions differ between these two distinct employee categories within the same institutional context. The unique challenges, opportunities, and organizational experiences of teaching versus administrative staff remain insufficiently understood.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. **To assess the overall quality of work-life** among female staff members in higher educational institutions of Sivagangai District.
2. **To compare the quality of work-life** between female teaching staff and female administrative staff.
3. **To identify specific QWL dimensions** where each group (teaching vs. administrative staff) experiences.
4. **To examine the relationship between demographic variables**.
5. **To explore institutional factors** that influence quality of work-life experiences of female teaching and administrative staff.
6. **To provide evidence-based recommendations** for educational administrators and policymakers to develop targeted interventions.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

5. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey research design to assess and compare quality of work-life among female teaching and administrative staff in higher educational institutions of Sivagangai District. The comparative approach enabled systematic examination of differences between the two employee categories while the cross-sectional design facilitated data collection at a single point in time, providing a comprehensive snapshot of current QWL perceptions.

5.2 Study Population and Sampling

Population: The study population comprised all female staff members (both teaching and administrative) employed in higher educational institutions across Sivagangai District, Tamil Nadu. The district hosts approximately 25 higher educational institutions including government colleges, aided colleges, self-financing colleges, and professional institutes.

Sampling Frame: A comprehensive list of higher educational institutions in Sivagangai District was obtained from the District Collectorate and Education Department. From this frame, 15 institutions were selected representing diverse institutional types: 5 government colleges, 5 aided colleges, and 5 self-financing institutions.

Sampling Technique: A stratified random sampling technique was employed. The population was first stratified by employment category (teaching vs. administrative), and then by institutional type (government, aided, self-financing). Random sampling was conducted within each stratum to ensure representative selection.

Sample Size: The total sample consisted of 250 female staff members:

- Teaching staff: n = 150 (60%)
- Administrative staff: n = 100 (40%)

This sample size was determined based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula for finite populations, ensuring adequate statistical power (0.80) for detecting medium effect sizes at $\alpha = 0.05$.

6. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Category	Sub-Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Employment Category	Teaching Staff	150	60.0
	Administrative Staff	100	40.0
Age Distribution	25–30 years	42	16.8
	31–35 years	68	27.2
	36–40 years	72	28.8
	41–45 years	45	18.0
	Above 45 years	23	9.2
	Mean age = 37.4 years (SD = 6.8)	—	—
Marital Status	Married	198	79.2
	Unmarried	45	18.0
	Divorced / Widowed	7	2.8
Educational Qualification	*Teaching Staff (n = 150)*		
	Master's Degree	82	54.7
	M.Phil.	45	30.0
	Ph.D.	23	15.3
	Administrative Staff (n = 100)		
	Bachelor's Degree	38	38.0
	Master's Degree	52	52.0
	Professional Qualifications	10	10.0
Years of Service	1–5 years	58	23.2
	6–10 years	92	36.8
	11–15 years	63	25.2
	Above 15 years	37	14.8
	Mean service = 9.6 years (SD = 5.4)	—	—
Type of Institution	Government	85	34.0
	Aided	82	32.8
	Self-Financing	83	33.2
Employment Status	Permanent	172	68.8
	Temporary	78	31.2
Total Respondents		**250**	**100.0**

Source: Primary Data

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

The study included 250 female respondents, of whom 150 (60%) belonged to the teaching category and 100 (40%) to the administrative category. The majority of participants fell within the 36–40 age group, constituting 28.8% of the total sample, while the 31–35 age group followed closely with 27.2%. The mean age recorded was 37.4 years with a standard deviation of 6.8, suggesting a moderately experienced workforce. A large proportion of the respondents, 198 out of 250, were married, accounting for 79.2%, with only 2.8% falling under the divorced or widowed category.

Regarding educational background, among teaching staff, the majority held a Master's degree at 54.7%, followed by M.Phil. holders at 30% and Ph.D. holders at 15.3%. In contrast, administrative staff were predominantly Master's degree holders at 52%, with 38% holding a Bachelor's degree and the remaining 10% possessing professional qualifications. This indicates a relatively well-qualified sample across both employment categories.

In terms of service duration, the largest segment comprised respondents with 6–10 years of experience, making up 36.8% of the group. The mean years of service stood at 9.6 with a standard deviation of 5.4, reflecting a fair mix of moderately and highly experienced employees. The distribution across institution types was nearly uniform, with government, aided, and self-financing institutions contributing 34%, 32.8%, and 33.2% respectively, ensuring balanced representation. Lastly, 68.8% of respondents held permanent positions while 31.2% were in temporary roles, indicating that the sample was largely composed of permanent employees.

6.2 Overall Quality of Work-Life

The overall quality of work-life among female staff in higher educational institutions of Sivagangai District was assessed by calculating mean scores across all eight dimensions.

Category	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Level
Total Sample (N = 250)	3.46	0.50	Moderate
Teaching Staff (n = 150)	3.52	0.48	Moderate
Administrative Staff (n = 100)	3.38	0.52	Moderate

Table 2: Statistical Comparison (Teaching Staff vs. Administrative Staff)

Test Statistic	Value
t-value	2.18
Degrees of Freedom (df)	248

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

p-value	0.030
Cohen's d (Effect Size)	0.28 (Small)

The overall QWL score indicates a moderate level of work-life quality among female staff members. Teaching staff reported significantly higher overall QWL compared to administrative staff, though the effect size was small, suggesting meaningful but not substantial differences between groups.

6.3 Dimension-Wise Quality of Work-Life Analysis

Table 3: Mean Scores for QWL Dimensions by Employment Category

QWL Dimension	Teaching Staff (n=150)	Administrative Staff (n=100)	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
	M (SD)	M (SD)			
Work Environment	3.54 (0.62)	3.48 (0.59)	0.78	0.437	0.10
Compensation & Benefits	3.28 (0.71)	3.15 (0.68)	1.47	0.143	0.19
Work-Life Balance	3.08 (0.68)	3.45 (0.62)	-4.42	<0.001***	0.56
Job Security	3.42 (0.66)	3.52 (0.61)	-1.23	0.220	0.16
Professional Development	3.82 (0.64)	3.21 (0.71)	7.12	<0.001***	0.90
Organizational Culture	3.58 (0.57)	3.41 (0.63)	2.24	0.026*	0.28
Autonomy & Participation	3.71 (0.58)	3.15 (0.65)	7.15	<0.001***	0.91
Health & Safety	3.38 (0.69)	3.29 (0.66)	1.04	0.300	0.13

*Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001*

1. Work Environment (No Significant Difference)

Both teaching and administrative staff showed moderate-to-good satisfaction with their work environment. Teaching staff scored slightly higher at 3.54, yet the gap was not meaningful in statistical terms. This points to the fact that institutions in Sivagangai District generally maintain adequate physical facilities for both groups.

2. Compensation and Benefits (No Significant Difference)

Teaching staff scored marginally higher than administrative staff, with means of 3.28 and 3.15 respectively. Since the difference was not significant, both groups appear to share similar concerns about whether their pay and benefits are sufficient. The moderate ratings suggest that compensation structures need attention across both categories.

3. Work-Life Balance (Significant Difference, p<0.001)

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Administrative staff reported noticeably better work-life balance, scoring 3.45 compared to 3.08 among teaching staff, with a medium effect size. Teaching staff likely face greater strain due to lesson preparation, examination duties, and research pressures that extend beyond regular working hours. Administrative staff benefit from more defined schedules and clearer role boundaries, which helps them manage personal and professional responsibilities more effectively.

4. Job Security (No Significant Difference)

Both groups felt reasonably secure in their positions, with administrative staff scoring slightly higher at 3.52 compared to 3.42. The absence of a significant difference indicates that female staff across both categories experience similar levels of employment stability, though individual perceptions may vary depending on whether they hold permanent or temporary positions.

5. Professional Development (Significant Difference, $p<0.001$)

This dimension recorded the largest gap between the two groups. Teaching staff scored 3.82 against 3.21 among administrative staff, reflecting a large effect size. Institutions appear to invest more heavily in faculty development through conferences, research support, and training programs. Administrative staff, on the other hand, reported limited access to growth opportunities and career advancement pathways.

6. Organizational Culture (Significant Difference, $p<0.05$)

Teaching staff perceived a more favorable organizational culture, scoring 3.58 compared to 3.41 among administrative staff. Teaching staff tend to experience greater recognition and a more participatory environment. Administrative staff, however, may operate within more rigid hierarchical structures where recognition and inclusion are comparatively limited.

7. Autonomy and Participation (Significant Difference, $p<0.001$)

Teaching staff scored significantly higher at 3.71 than administrative staff at 3.15, with a large effect size. This was the second-largest difference observed across all dimensions. Teaching roles naturally allow for greater academic freedom and independence in decision-making. Administrative positions, by contrast, are governed by standardized procedures and require closer supervisor oversight, which reduces the sense of autonomy.

8. Health and Safety (No Significant Difference)

Both groups recorded moderate satisfaction with health and safety measures, with teaching staff slightly ahead at 3.38 compared to 3.29. Although the specific sources of stress may differ between the two groups, both categories expressed similar concerns. The moderate scores point toward a need for better support in stress management and psychological wellbeing within institutions.

6.4 Analysis by Institutional Type

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Table 4: QWL Scores by Institutional Type

Institution Type	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff
	M (SD)	M (SD)
Government (n=85)	3.68 (0.44)	3.52 (0.48)
Aided (n=82)	3.54 (0.46)	3.42 (0.51)
Self-Financing (n=83)	3.35 (0.49)	3.21 (0.54)
F-value	12.45***	8.62***

*Note: ***p* < *0.001*

Post-hoc Analysis (Tukey HSD): For both employment categories, government institutions showed significantly higher QWL scores compared to self-financing institutions ($p<0.001$). Government colleges also scored higher than aided colleges, though the difference was smaller. This pattern reflects better job security, superior compensation, stronger organizational support, and more comprehensive benefits in government institutions.

6.5 Analysis by Employment Status

Table 5: QWL Scores by Employment Status

Employment Status	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff	Overall
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Permanent (n=172)	3.68 (0.42)	3.52 (0.46)	3.62 (0.44)
Temporary (n=78)	3.18 (0.46)	3.08 (0.52)	3.14 (0.49)
t-value	8.12***	5.94***	7.86***

*Note: ***p* < *0.001*

Permanent employees in both categories reported significantly higher QWL compared to temporary staff, with large effect sizes. This finding underscores the critical importance of employment security in overall work-life quality. Temporary staff face uncertainty, limited benefits, reduced professional development opportunities, and lower organizational commitment.

6.6 Correlation Analysis

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Table 6: Correlations between Demographic Variables and Overall QWL

Variable	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff
Age	0.18*	0.22*
Years of Service	0.31***	0.28**
Number of Dependents	-0.24**	-0.29**

*Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001*

Age showed weak positive correlations with QWL in both groups, suggesting slightly better work-life quality with maturity and experience. Years of service demonstrated moderate positive correlations, indicating that longer-tenured employees experience better QWL, possibly due to increased job security, better positions, and institutional familiarity. Number of dependents showed significant negative correlations, revealing that greater caregiving responsibilities adversely affect work-life quality for female staff

6.7 Analysis by Marital Status

Table 7: QWL Scores by Marital Status

Marital Status	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff	Overall
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Married (n=198)	3.42 (0.49)	3.31 (0.54)	3.38 (0.51)
Unmarried (n=45)	3.78 (0.38)	3.68 (0.42)	3.74 (0.40)
Divorced/Widowed (n=7)	3.21 (0.56)	3.08 (0.61)	3.16 (0.57)
F-value	14.82***	9.45***	16.23***

*Note: ***p < 0.001*

Unmarried female staff reported significantly higher QWL compared to married staff in both employment categories. Post-hoc analysis revealed that unmarried staff scored significantly higher than both married staff ($p<0.001$) and divorced/widowed staff ($p<0.01$). This pattern reflects the additional burden of household responsibilities and family obligations that married women typically shoulder. Divorced and widowed staff faced the lowest QWL, likely dealing with single-parent responsibilities, financial pressures, and limited support systems while managing professional demands.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

6.8 Interaction Effects: Employment Category × Institutional Type

Table 8: Two-Way ANOVA - Employment Category × Institutional Type

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	p-value	η²
Employment Category	4.82	1	4.82	22.15***	<0.001	0.083
Institutional Type	8.94	2	4.47	20.53***	<0.001	0.144
Category × Institution	2.36	2	1.18	5.42**	0.005	0.042
Error	53.24	244	0.218	-	-	-
Total	69.36	249	-	-	-	-

*Note: **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001*

The significant interaction effect indicates that the QWL difference between teaching and administrative staff varies by institutional type. In government institutions, the gap between teaching and administrative staff is smaller (Δ=0.16) compared to self-financing institutions (Δ=0.14) and aided institutions (Δ=0.12). This suggests that government institutions provide more equitable conditions across employment categories, while private institutions show greater disparities.

6.9 Multiple Regression Analysis: Predictors of Overall QWL

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Overall QWL

Predictor Variable	B	SE	β	t-value	p-value	VIF
(Constant)	2.14	0.18	-	11.89	<0.001	-
Employment Category (Teaching=1)	0.12	0.04	0.14	3.00**	0.003	1.23
Employment Status (Permanent=1)	0.38	0.05	0.36	7.60***	<0.001	1.45
Years of Service	0.02	0.01	0.21	2.00*	0.047	2.12
Marital Status (Married=1)	-0.18	0.05	-0.17	-3.60***	<0.001	1.18
Number of Dependents	-0.08	0.02	-0.19	-4.00***	<0.001	1.34
Institutional Type (Gov=1)	0.22	0.06	0.18	3.67***	<0.001	1.28
Age	0.01	0.01	0.09	1.00 (NS)	0.318	2.45

Model Summary: $R^2 = 0.487$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.472$, $F(7,242) = 32.76$, $p < 0.001$ *Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, NS = Not Significant*

The regression model explained 48.7% of variance in overall QWL, indicating these predictors

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

substantially account for QWL variations. Key findings:

1. **Employment Status** emerged as the strongest predictor (β=0.36), confirming that permanent positions contribute most significantly to QWL
2. **Number of Dependents** showed strong negative prediction (β=-0.19), highlighting caregiving burden's impact
3. **Years of Service** positively predicted QWL (β=0.21), reinforcing tenure benefits
4. **Institutional Type** significantly predicted QWL (β=0.18), with government institutions providing advantages
5. **Marital Status** negatively predicted QWL (β=-0.17), with married staff experiencing greater challenges
6. **Employment Category** showed modest positive prediction (β=0.14), with teaching staff reporting slightly higher QWL
7. **Age** did not independently predict QWL when controlling for other variables, suggesting its effect operates through service duration

The model's VIF values (<3.0) indicate no problematic multicollinearity, supporting the validity of these regression estimates.

6.10 Chi-Square Analysis: Employment Status × Institutional Type

Table 10: Distribution of Employment Status by Institutional Type

Institutional Type	Permanent	Temporary	Total	χ^2	p-value
Government	72 (84.7%)	13 (15.3%)	85	45.67***	<0.001
Aided	58 (70.7%)	24 (29.3%)	82		
Self-Financing	42 (50.6%)	41 (49.4%)	83		
Total	**172**	**78**	**250**		

*Note: ***p < 0.001*

Employment status distribution differs significantly across institutional types. Government institutions employ 84.7% permanent staff, compared to 70.7% in aided institutions and only 50.6% in self-financing colleges. This pattern explains part of the QWL advantage in government institutions, as employment security fundamentally influences work-life quality. The high proportion of temporary staff in self-financing institutions (49.4%) creates precarious employment conditions affecting both individual wellbeing and institutional stability.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

6.11 Dimension-Wise Comparison: Top and Bottom Performers

Table 11: Highest and Lowest Scoring Items by Employment Category

Category	Dimension	Item	M	SD
Teaching Staff - Highest	Professional Development	"I have access to conferences and workshops"	4.12	0.68
	Autonomy	"I have freedom in choosing teaching methods"	4.05	0.72
	Organizational Culture	"My colleagues are supportive and cooperative"	3.98	0.65
Teaching Staff - Lowest	Work-Life Balance	"My workload is reasonable and manageable"	2.68	0.88
	Work-Life Balance	"I have adequate time for family responsibilities"	2.76	0.82
	Compensation	"I receive adequate compensation"	2.84	0.91
Administrative Staff - Highest	Job Security	"I feel secure about my employment future"	3.68	0.71
	Work-Life Balance	"I can maintain clear work-life boundaries"	3.62	0.68
	Work Environment	"My workplace has adequate facilities"	3.58	0.73
Administrative Staff - Lowest	Professional Development	"I have opportunities for career advancement"	2.58	0.95
	Autonomy	"I am involved in decisions affecting my work"	2.65	0.91
	Professional Development	"Training for skill development is provided"	2.72	0.87

This item-level analysis reveals specific strengths and critical concerns for each group. Teaching staff excel in dimensions related to academic freedom and professional development but struggle significantly with workload and work-life integration. Administrative staff find strengths in job security and work-life boundaries but face severe deficits in career development and participatory decision-making. These specific items provide targeted intervention points for institutional administrators.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

6.12 Correlation Matrix : QWL Dimensions

Table 12 : Pearson Correlation Matrix of QWL Dimensions

Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Work Environment	1.00							
2. Compensation	.52***	1.00						
3. Work-Life Balance	.38***	.31***	1.00					
4. Job Security	.44***	.58***	.36***	1.00				
5. Professional Development	.41***	.35***	.28**	.42***	1.00			
6. Organizational Culture	.56***	.47***	.45***	.48***	.52***	1.00		
7. Autonomy	.39***	.33***	.42***	.37***	.61***	.54***	1.00	
8. Health & Safety	.47***	.40***	.63***	.45***	.38***	.55***	.46***	1.00

*Note: **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001*

All QWL dimensions showed significant positive intercorrelations, confirming the multidimensional yet integrated nature of work-life quality. Strongest correlations emerged between:

- Professional Development and Autonomy (r=.61), suggesting that career growth opportunities and workplace independence are closely linked
- Work-Life Balance and Health & Safety (r=.63), indicating that work-family integration critically affects wellbeing
- Compensation and Job Security (r=.58), reflecting that financial adequacy and employment stability are closely related concerns
- Organizational Culture and Work Environment (r=.56), showing that positive workplace relationships and physical conditions mutually reinforce

These correlations suggest that interventions targeting one dimension may produce spillover benefits in related areas, supporting holistic rather than piecemeal QWL enhancement strategies.

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

6.13 ANOVA Analysis: QWL across Number of Dependents

Table 13: QWL Scores by Number of Dependents

Number of Dependents	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff	Overall
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
No dependents (n=48)	3.74 (0.42)	3.62 (0.48)	3.69 (0.45)
1-2 dependents (n=125)	3.52 (0.46)	3.42 (0.51)	3.48 (0.48)
3-4 dependents (n=62)	3.38 (0.52)	3.21 (0.56)	3.31 (0.54)
5+ dependents (n=15)	3.08 (0.61)	2.95 (0.68)	3.03 (0.64)
F-value	16.34***	11.28***	19.45***
η^2 (effect size)	0.248	0.260	0.192

*Note: ***p < 0.001; Post-hoc (Tukey): Each group differs significantly from others at p<0.05*

Interpretation: A clear inverse relationship exists between number of dependents and QWL across both employment categories. Staff with no dependents reported the highest QWL (M=3.69), while those with 5 or more dependents scored lowest (M=3.03). The large effect sizes (η^2 ranging from 0.192 to 0.260) indicate that caregiving burden substantially impacts work-life quality. This pattern is particularly pronounced for teaching staff, who already struggle with work-life balance. Female staff managing multiple dependents face compounded challenges balancing professional demands with family care responsibilities, highlighting the urgent need for family support mechanisms in higher education institutions.

6.14 Effect Size Analysis: Practical Significance of Key Findings

Table 14: Cohen's d Effect Sizes for Major Comparisons

Comparison	Cohen's d	Interpretation	Practical Significance
Teaching vs. Administrative: Professional Development	0.90	Large	**Very High** - Major intervention needed
Teaching vs. Administrative: Autonomy	0.91	Large	**Very High** - Fundamental structural differences
Administrative vs. Teaching: Work-Life Balance	0.56	Medium	**Moderate** - Significant real-world impact

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

Permanent vs. Temporary: Overall QWL	1.12	Large	**Very High** - Employment status critically important
Government vs. Self-Financing: Overall QWL	0.68	Medium-Large	**High** - Institutional type matters substantially
Married vs. Unmarried: Overall QWL	0.82	Large	**High** - Marital/family status strongly impacts QWL
5+ vs. No Dependents: Overall QWL	1.15	Large	**Very High** - Caregiving burden severely affects QWL

Effect size analysis reveals that several comparisons demonstrate not only statistical significance but also substantial practical significance. The largest effect sizes emerged for:

1. **Employment Status** (d=1.12): The difference between permanent and temporary staff represents the single most impactful factor, with practical implications for institutional hiring practices
2. **Caregiving Burden** (d=1.15): Number of dependents produces dramatic QWL variations, indicating urgent need for family support policies
3. **Professional Development Gap** (d=0.90) and **Autonomy Gap** (d=0.91): These large effect sizes between teaching and administrative staff signal fundamental inequities requiring systemic reform
4. **Marital Status** (d=0.82): The substantial impact of marriage on QWL reflects challenges in balancing professional and domestic roles

These large effect sizes indicate that interventions addressing these factors could produce meaningful, observable improvements in female staff wellbeing and satisfaction.

6.15 Satisfaction Level Distribution Analysis

Table 15: Distribution of Respondents across QWL Satisfaction Levels

Satisfaction Level	Score Range	Teaching Staff	Administrative Staff	Total
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Very Low	1.00-2.00	3 (2.0%)	6 (6.0%)	9 (3.6%)
Low	2.01-3.00	22 (14.7%)	24 (24.0%)	46 (18.4%)
Moderate	3.01-4.00	98 (65.3%)	59 (59.0%)	157 (62.8%)
High	4.01-4.50	25 (16.7%)	10 (10.0%)	35 (14.0%)
Very High	4.51-5.00	2 (1.3%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (1.2%)

The majority of respondents (62.8%) fall within the moderate QWL range, indicating acceptable but

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 01 Jan-Feb; 2026 Page. No. 536-555

not optimal conditions. Concerning patterns emerge: 22% of respondents (18.4% low + 3.6% very low) experience suboptimal QWL requiring urgent attention. Administrative staff show higher representation in lower satisfaction categories (30% in low/very low ranges) compared to teaching staff (16.7%). Only 15.2% of respondents report high or very high QWL, suggesting substantial room for improvement across institutions. This distribution indicates that while catastrophic QWL failures are rare, excellence is equally uncommon, with most female staff experiencing middling work-life quality.

7. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

This study examined quality of work-life among 250 female staff members (150 teaching, 100 administrative) in higher educational institutions of Sivagangai District. The investigation yielded several significant findings:

Overall QWL: Female staff reported moderate overall quality of work-life (M=3.46), with teaching staff scoring significantly higher (M=3.52) than administrative staff (M=3.38), though the effect size was small.

Dimension-Specific Differences: Significant differences emerged in four of eight QWL dimensions:

1. Teaching staff reported substantially higher professional development opportunities (large effect)
2. Teaching staff experienced greater autonomy and participation (large effect)
3. Administrative staff achieved better work-life balance (medium effect)
4. Teaching staff perceived more favorable organizational culture (small-to-medium effect)

No significant differences were found in work environment, compensation and benefits, job security, and health and safety dimensions.

Institutional and Employment Factors: Government institutions provided superior QWL compared to aided and self-financing colleges for both employment categories. Permanent staff experienced significantly better QWL than temporary employees across all dimensions.

Demographic Correlations: Years of service positively correlated with QWL, while number of dependents showed negative correlations, highlighting the challenge of balancing caregiving responsibilities with professional demands.

CONCLUSION

Quality of work-life in higher educational institutions extends beyond individual employee satisfaction to influence institutional effectiveness, academic excellence, student experiences, and societal contributions of higher education. Female staff members, who constitute a substantial and growing proportion of the higher education workforce, deserve equitable, supportive work environments enabling them to thrive professionally while maintaining healthy, fulfilling personal lives. As higher education continues evolving in response to technological advances, demographic

shifts, and changing societal needs, the wellbeing of those who educate, support, and administer our institutions must remain central. Creating work environments where female staff whether teaching or administrative can flourish professionally while maintaining work-life balance is not merely an organizational imperative but a social responsibility essential for educational excellence and gender equity. The findings of this study provide a foundation for institutional reform and policy development in Sivagangai District and offer insights potentially applicable to similar contexts across India and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Acker, S., & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education, 16*(1), 3-24.
- Drobnic, S., Beham, B., & Präg, P. (2010). Good job, good life? Working conditions and quality of life in Europe. *Social Indicators Research, 99*(2), 205-225.
- Gayathiri, R., & Ramakrishnan, L. (2013). Quality of work life: Linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2*(1), 1-8.
- Graham, C. (2009). Investing in early career general staff. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 13*(4), 97-102.
- Jacobs, J. A., & Winslow, S. E. (2004). Overworked faculty: Job stresses and family demands. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 596*(1), 104-129.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 518-542.
- Kinman, G., & Court, S. (2010). Psychosocial hazards in UK universities: Adopting a risk assessment approach. *Higher Education Quarterly, 64*(4), 413-428.
- Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher Education, 34*(3), 305-322.
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2015). Review of literature on quality of work life. *International Journal for Quality Research, 9*(2), 263-284.
- O'Laughlin, E. M., & Bischoff, L. G. (2005). Balancing parenthood and academia: Work/family stress as influenced by gender and tenure status. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(1), 79-106.
- Probert, B. (2005). 'I just couldn't fit it in': Gender and unequal outcomes in academic careers. *Gender, Work & Organization, 12*(1), 50-72.
- Rafnsdóttir, G. L., & Heijstra, T. M. (2013). Balancing work–family life in academia: The power of time. *Gender, Work & Organization, 20*(3), 283-296.
- Rajasekar, D., & Bhuvaneswari, S. (2014). A study on quality of work life among women teachers in higher education. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review, 1*(3), 199-203.

- Reddy, M. L., & Reddy, P. M. (2010). Quality of work life of employees: Emerging dimensions. *Asian Journal of Management Research, 1*(1), 827-839.
- Seashore, S. E. (1975). Defining and measuring the quality of working life. In L. E. Davis & A. B. Cherns (Eds.), *The quality of working life* (Vol. 1, pp. 105-118). Free Press.
- 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 theories. *Social Indicators Research, 55*(3), 241-302.
- Szekeres, J. (2004). The invisible workers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 26*(1), 7-22.
- Thorsen, E. J. (1996). Stress in academe: What bothers professors? *Higher Education, 31*(4), 471-489.
- Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review, 15*(1), 11-21.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family*. Rutgers University Press.
- Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of third space professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 377-396