

Quality of Work Life and Assessing the Impact of Workers' Perceptions on Productivity

Dr M Shubhangini¹, Dr Nalina K B², Dr. Aruna Adarsh³

¹JSS Science and Technology University, Mysuru, India

²Professor, JSSCMS, JSS Science and Technology University, Mysuru, India

³Associate Professor, JSS CMS, JSS Science and Technology University, Mysuru, India

Abstract— The study explores the intricate interplay between the quality of work life (QWL) and employees' perceptions of their impact on organizational performance. The research sheds light on the significance of both subjective and behavioral dimensions within the QWL framework, elucidating their pivotal roles in shaping individual employee aspirations to enhance organizational productivity. The empirical findings underscore that factors such as perceiving supervisor support through attentive listening and responsiveness, integration into a positive work environment, and garnering professional and humane respect significantly contribute to employees' wisdom in strengthening organizational performance. The work's implications are particularly germane in the matter of the burgeoning service sector and the escalating trends of automation and digitalization in workforce functions. Notably, the outcomes contribute to the ongoing discourse regarding the imperative to delve into subjective and behavioral facets within the domain of smart and learning organizations, advocating for a nuanced focus beyond remuneration as the sole catalyst for organizational productivity driven by employee contributions.

Keywords— Work-life quality, the performance of the organization; organizational productivity.

I. INTRODUCTION

The performance of employees at the workplace is complexly connected to various factors influencing their well-being, practices, and surroundings, as well as their overall welfare and quality of work life (QWL). Quality Work Life encompasses dimensions such as job satisfaction, incentive, efficiency, condition, professional security, safety, and general well-being, with a focus on four principal factors: a secure work environment, job-related health care, proper hours of work, and fair compensation [Citation 1]. As articulated in [Citation 2], this conception considers the impact of job satisfaction because of workplace, and non-work life domains satisfaction, and satisfaction in overall life, individual happiness, and personal well-being. Additionally, enhancing QWL among employees is posited to have a positive ripple effect on organizational productivity, and conversely, increased productivity is anticipated to fortify QWL [Citation 3].

Existing literature engages in a continuous and fruitful discourse on the constituents of QWL [Citation 3] and its diverse connections through non-economic presentation metrics, specifically addressing satisfaction and fulfilment of basic physical conditions crucial for ensuring serviceable, healthiness, and safety in the workplace [Citation 1]. The more elusive constituents of QWL, about the employees' socio-emotional and psychosomatic needs, remain relatively unexplored. Investigating these components necessitates the demonstration of behavioral lenses to unveil elements that exert the most significant influence on job satisfaction, motivation, and productivity [Citations 4,5].

In the realm of organizational health, the nexus between productivity and QWL has been explored, prompting the consideration of tailored strategies to enhance productivity in hospital settings [Citation 6]. Nevertheless, there exists a gap in understanding the various means in which the facets of QWL

i.e., both behavioral and subjective impact a worker's sense of contributing to the efficiency of the organization they work for.

As previously highlighted, there is an opportunity for advancing knowledge concerning the effects related to the subjective constituents of evaluating QWL satisfaction on the performance of an organization. This becomes particularly relevant when a response variable is important in the framework of resource optimization and the simultaneous imperative to maximize outcomes, namely productivity [Citation 7]. Hence, it is appropriate to delve into the behavioral motivations, non-economic, and subjective, that drive employees to willingly contribute to consolidating the productivity of an organization they work for.

Aligned with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s perspective on efficiency displays, there exists considerable variation in productivity among organizations, necessitating further investigation into the internal determinants of productivity within the organizational 'black box' [Citation 8]. There is a recognized imperative to advance our understanding of individual determinants influencing organizational productivity, as exemplified by the recent initiative by the Global Forum on Productivity (GFP) titled 'The Human Side of Productivity.' This project in its study adopts an approach a several dimensions, considering key individuals such as employees, executives, and owners [Citation 9].

Recent scrutiny within the condition of higher education has explored the quality of life in determining contentment among shareholders i.e., pupils and co-workers such as the administrative workforce, educators, and research scholars. This inquiry unties avenues for research into the role played by distinct organizational cultures within educational institutions, influencing the perception of quality life of academicians both the stakeholders [Citation 10].

The ongoing debate underlines the essential understanding of the significance of organizational culture by employing a

dual perspective on organizational and individual health. This understanding is crucial for formulating strategic guidelines for new organizational policies, rooted in specific values and beliefs influencing the behavioral objectives of the organization, in alignment with the chosen level of self-efficacy concerning employee management and motivation [Citation 11].

In light of this discourse, this study holds particular relevance. There remains a dearth of knowledge regarding the essential conditions required to endorse the individual components or behavioral factors of fulfilment of Quality of Work Life (QWL), with a focus on each worker's contribution to enhancing organizational productivity. The study directs attention to previously unexplored aspects, for example, the employee feeling valued by the superior, the accessibility of challenging professions with room for career progression, the advancement of environments for continuous learning, the sense of belonging fostered by the managers, the perception of taking a significant role, and the job's potential for skill development and personal and professional growth. Employing a pioneering data survey in European terms, the study employs statistical and econometric analyses to illuminate the underexplored relationship between QWL and performance in an organization, utilizing an idiosyncratic measure of satisfaction communicated over employees' perceived contribution to organizational productivity.

Acknowledging the boundaries connected with the subjective nature of the predictive variable is justified in light of the scarcity of studies employing an observable lens to examine the Quality of Work Life (QWL) and performance relationship. Furthermore, this research does not aim to compare relationships using objective versus subjective measures but focuses on representing the dependent variable—organizational performance.

This research endeavor, endeavors to elucidate employees' contentment with the opportunities and conditions afforded by their employers within the context of six European nations. The primary focus lies on the scopes of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and the proclivity towards cultivating a lifestyle marked by enhanced well-being, satisfaction, and happiness. Additionally, the investigation seeks to delineate how the workplace functions as a facilitator for augmenting productivity, thereby contributing to the broader discourse on organizational dynamics.

This research paper makes a distinctive contribution to the existing work on Quality of Work Life (QWL) and organizational performance by delineating key factors that exert a substantial impact on employees' perceptions regarding its impact on the performance of an organization. Furthermore, it provides innovative understandings of the purposes of human assets superiors, emphasizing the critical role played by the subjective and behavioral dimensions of QWL in shaping collaborative behaviors that enhance productivity within the organizational milieu

The collaborative efforts of research allies elaborate in the research design and execution of the survey led to the development of an innovative tool aimed at assessing Quality of Work Life (QWL). Subsequently, the survey was

administered to a sample of 488 employees from private and public firms in Karnataka. Noteworthy insights derived from the initial outcome of the survey serve as foundational ideas for the existing research. Specifically, 80% reported feeling secure in their workplace, with over 77% expressing satisfaction regarding the safety and sanitation of their work environments. Nearly 81% of respondents feel that their skills with job requirements align, with their organization effectively and 76% are content with the maintenance and cleanliness conditions of their workplaces. A substantial majority (80%) believe they contribute significantly to productivity in their organization, and an overwhelming 82% emphasize the importance of having a meaningful job for productivity.

Although initial observations indicate that employees acknowledge the significance of conventional human asset management practices and factors conducive to organizational performance it is imperative to underscore the specific focus of the present investigation. This study seeks to elucidate the organizational 'black box,' with a particular emphasis on the subjective and behavioral elements that foster Quality of Work Life and exert a direct influence on employees' perceptions of their contributions to organizational performance, particularly in the realm of productivity

The ensuing segments of this scholarly document are structured in the following manner: commencing with an exhaustive review of pertinent literature that informs the delineation of research hypotheses, and the subsequent section expounds upon the research methodology employed. Sequentially, the findings are deliberated upon, culminating in the paper's conclusion, which incorporates reflections on identified limitations and discernible implications for future research.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

Illuminating the Relationship between Organizational Performance and Quality of Work Life (QWL)

The conceptualization of organizational performance at the individual organizational level is characterized by a lack of simplicity and universal consensus within the literature [Citation 12]. This complex construct is multidimensional and intricately connected to an organization's overarching goals and objectives, encompassing its capacity to efficiently utilize resources and produce outcomes aligned with its objectives and pertinent to its stakeholders [Citation 12]. Within the organizational assessment process, the analysis of organizational performance emerges as a pivotal step, with existing literature delineating three principal domains: financial, operational, and organizational efficiency [Citation 14]. The conceptual framework for performance involves the consideration of four fundamental elements, namely effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and financial viability [Citation 13].

Recognizing individuals as the paramount asset within an organization is a widely acknowledged notion in the literature [Citation 15]. The management of human impacts is identified as a pivotal factor significantly shaping organizational performance [Citation 16]. Performance management characterized as an ongoing process encompassing the

identification, measurement, and enhancement of individual and team performance in alignment with the organization's strategic objectives, assumes a central role in this dynamic [Citations 17,18]. These perspectives accentuate the essential imperative to advance scholarly understanding of the subjective factors & behavioral factors that influence the intricate relationship between organizational performance and Quality of Work Life (QWL).

Diverse performance management systems delineated in the literature present notable advantages, including heightened motivation, increased self-esteem, valuable insights for managerial decision-making, enhanced clarity in organizational goals, fewer incidents of employee misconduct, easing of organizational change, high incentive to retain talent, and promotion of augmented employee engagement [Citation 19]. These systems emerge as pivotal sources of information informing decisions related to rewards, resource allocation, succession planning, and staffing strategies within organizational contexts [Citation 20].

The significance of individual employees' emotional intelligence in influencing behavior and, consequently, their workplace accomplishments and performance is underscored in the literature [Citation 21]. The realization of employees' requirements through organizational development emerges as a central tenet within the Quality of Work Life (QWL) movement [Citation 22]. The reciprocal relationship between the enhancement of QWL and heightened productivity is emphasized, wherein productivity improvements contribute to the strengthening of QWL [Citation 3].

The imperative to enhance both Quality of Work Life (QWL) and performance aligns with the political agenda of European Union (EU) countries, especially in light of challenges posed by the aging population and the pressing need to augment labour productivity [Citation 23]. The procedures for employment states explicitly address the quality of work life, emphasizing its significance in the broader socio-economic context [Citation 24].

Empirical investigations have delved into the nexus between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and organizational performance, with certain studies identifying a positive and statistically significant correlation [Citation 25]. Additionally, these studies have established positive associations between QWL and job satisfaction [Citation 25]. One more research endeavour [Citation 26] has demonstrated that the commitment of employees serves as a partial mediator in the relationship between QWL and organizational performance, underscoring the impact of the work environment on commitment and subsequent organizational performance. The argument is put forth that enhancing QWL can lead to heightened levels of employee job satisfaction, commitment, and overall improvement in performance [Citation 27]. In pursuit of elevated employee commitment and enhanced organizational performance, managerial attention to various dimensions of QWL is recommended [Citation 26].

On the contrary, certain scholars have stated a negative but insignificant relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) & organizational performance, while concurrently identifying a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee

performance in an organization [Citation 28]. This amalgamation of findings underscores the necessity to further advance our understanding of the as-yet-to-be-explored subjective and behavioral factors of QWL and its intricate impact on employee performance in an organization.

Investigating the Behavioral and Subjective Dimensions of Quality of Work Life (QWL)

The evaluation of community welfare encounters challenges when dealing with the concept of Quality of Life (QOL), often necessitating a specific assessment of an individual or group. [Citation 29]. Literature establishes a correlation between a great quality of life and workplace productivity. Subsequently, there has been an increased emphasis on comprehending the role of occupational stress, which encompasses factors such as job demands, control, insecurity, organizational justice, intra-group conflict, strain, effort-reward imbalance, employment level, and shift work. This examination has unveiled associations with issues that detrimentally impact the quality of life, including sleeplessness, leading to reduced performance and substantial productivity losses for organizations.

Quality of life is influenced by a major factor, encompassing psychosocial constraints, health situations, comfort in the workplace, and the suitability of provided resources and infrastructures. Policies and regulations tailored to individualized employee considerations have shown promise in significantly improving productivity through subjective components like trust, commitment, satisfaction, and control. However, there remains a research opportunity to deepen our understanding of the roles played by both subjective and behavioral factors of Quality of Work Life (QWL).

Social groups reflecting individuals' integration leading to social support has been identified as an important sign of the quality of life for performance in an organization [Citation 31]. Organization's Infrastructures also play a pivotal role in contributing to workplace well-being, thereby exerting an influence on the overall quality of life. For example, the provision of green spaces in urban areas has been proposed to enhance workplace quality of life, fostering social contact, physical activity, and association with nature [Citation 32]. In contrast, shift work has been associated with a deterioration in quality of life [Citation 33].

Supportive decision-making, appropriate appreciation, and understanding of supervisors are fundamental dimensions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) [Citation 34]. Studies underscore the importance of feedback on job performance and positive relationships with supervisors, suggesting a direct impact on QWL [Citation 35]. Notably, supervisory behavior emerges as the important component of QWL, contributing to employee role efficacy which is a significant proportion of the variance i.e., 21% [Citation 36].

Considering the previous statements in the literature, the following research hypothesis is derived:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): There is a positive association between employees who perceive support and appreciation from their supervisors and their sense of contributing to the organization's productivity.

The construct of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is intricate and multidimensional, lacking a universally accepted definition, thereby presenting challenges in the precise measurement of its parameters. Distinct from job satisfaction, QWL is considered a precursor to the latter and is related to employee job satisfaction, motivation, productivity, health, employee job security, safety, and overall well-being of employees. [Citation 37].

As outlined by [Citation 1], QWL consists of four principal components: a secure environment, professional health care, suitable working hours, and a commensurate salary. Moreover, [Citation 2] asserts that QWL encompasses the influence of the workplace on job satisfaction, satisfaction in non-work life domains, and overall life satisfaction, personal joy, and subjective well-being.

Several issues contribute to employees' QWL, including the community environment within which the organization is situated, the interaction between work and non-work life, the nature of specific tasks, and the characteristics of the work environment [Citation 38]. The provision of secure and health-promoting working conditions is aimed at safeguarding employees' well-being, with measures to enhance QWL expected to positively influence employee motivation, subsequently leading to enhanced performance and productivity [Citation 38].

Consequently, a work environment capable of satisfying employees' personal needs is posited to contribute to an outstanding QWL [Citation 39].

The following research hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): There exists a positive correlation between workers who perceive integration in a favorable working environment and their likelihood of feeling that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

Several models in the literature aim to conceptualize Quality of Work Life (QWL). One such model, as presented by [Citation 39], establishes a connection between psychological growth needs and QWL, acknowledging needs such as skill, identity, significance, self-sufficiency, and feedback. Additionally, [Citation 2] proposes a model outlining five crucial factors associated with satisfying employees' needs: (i) environment; (ii) work requirements; (iii) managerial behavior; (iv) subsidiary programs; and (v) managerial commitment. This perspective holds particular significance in organizations committed to societal responsibility, as QWL contributes to employee pride, community commitment, satisfaction, and society's societal impact [Citations 11,40]. Organizational support, encompassing aspects like fatigue relief and enhanced self-efficacy, emerges as a positive influencer on QWL [Citation 41].

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is defined as the state experienced by individuals in the search for their organized goals within the context of work areas. The reduction of discrepancies between individuals and these goals is anticipated to have a positive effect on the quality of life, performance in an organization, and overall societal functioning [Citation 42]. Moreover, QWL possesses the potential to initiate transformations in organizational culture, serving as a reflection of employees' interpretations of workplace conditions and their

perceptions thereof [Citation 43]. QWL is further regarded as a sign of the holistic quality of the human experience within the work domain, fostering a conducive workplace that improves employee happiness and satisfaction [Citation 44].

The experience of being treated with respect and experiencing pride in one's job significantly contributes to an enhanced sense of organizational belonging, fostering employees' perception of themselves as valuable assets [Citation 45]. Notably, studies by [Citations 46,47] have identified the feeling of being respected as a predictive aspect of Quality of Work Life (QWL), alongside self-esteem, daily routine variety, challenging job assignments, self-sufficiency, safety, rewards, and future. The augmentation of QWL is anticipated to result in increased productivity [Citation 48].

Expanding on this perspective, the QWL construct stands to benefit from the inclusion of subjective measures related to employee satisfaction, motivation, involvement, and commitment within their professional lives [Citation 49]. QWL is herein defined as the degree to which individuals can fulfil crucial personal needs during their tenure with the organization, following research hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Professionals who perceive themselves as being respected are more inclined to believe that their contributions positively impact the organization's productivity. The perception of an organization's level of responsibility is a contributing factor to employees experiencing enhanced Quality of Work Life (QWL) [Citation 50]. Research on perceived QWL highlighted the significance of employee's place in non-competitive and cooperative work environments for an improved quality of life [Citation 51]. Elements such as job security, human relations, and work-life balance have been identified as positive influencers of QWL [Citation 52]. Findings from the 1st European Quality of Life Survey analysis reveal that favourable features of work, including generous rewards, security in the job, promising job prospects, and engaging tasks, exert a substantial influence on both job satisfaction and life satisfaction [Citation 53]. Conversely, a deficient work-life balance diminishes workers' overall life quality [Citation 53].

Work-life balance is acknowledged as a pivotal component of QWL in the pertinent literature [Citations 38,54–58]. However, it is crucial to note that employees' levels of emotional intelligence may influence their work-life balance [Citation 59]. Despite this, a prior empirical study [Citation 60] did not identify any significant positive or negative association between work-life balance and productivity.

Considering all things, work-life adjustment plays a basic part in overall life fulfillment and impacts work-life encounters by cultivating higher levels of work fulfillment and organizational commitment [Quotation 61]. An increased level of engagement in work-life is likely to have a positive effect on work-life adjustment and encourage an increase by accomplishing objectives within the proficient space [Quotation 62]. Hence, the resulting investigative speculation is defined:

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Professionals who have the option to embrace work-life balance within their organizational context

are more inclined to perceive that their contributions positively impact the organization's productivity. Quality of Work Life (QWL) is comprehensively defined as involving the acquisition, training, development, motivation, and appraisal of employees to elicit their optimal performance aligned with organizational objectives [Citation 28]. It serves as the fundamental underpinning for employee well-being, ultimately leading to heightened performance levels [Citation 26]. Sub-components of QWL encompass skills, occupational improvement, and training opportunities [Citation 45,63,64]. The cultivation of skills and abilities is identified as capable of enhancing job satisfaction and overall QWL, consequently influencing employee performance [Citation 65,66]. Employees express the expectation of skill development and career advancement, contributing to improved organizational performance [Citation 67]. Training, as an activity directed toward performance enhancement, affords opportunities for skill development and garnering encouragement from the management team [Citation 38].

As demonstrated in a prior empirical study [Citation 68], both QWL and motivation exert positive influences on employees' performance. Elevated heights of QWL engender job satisfaction, eventually culminating in effective and efficient performance outcomes [Citation 49]. In concordance with these assertions and empirical findings, the ensuing hypothesis is posited:

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Professionals who perceive organizational investments in their careers, such as continuous learning, the acquisition of new skills, or support for professional growth, are more prone to acknowledge their substantial contributions to organizational productivity in comparison to their counterparts.

III. EMPIRICAL APPROACH

Research Methodology and Data Description

The research methodology employed a diverse set of questionnaires meticulously designed in alignment with eleven international benchmarks. These benchmarks are as follows: (i) "Health and well-being at work: a survey of employees, 2014" from the UK Department for Work and Pensions; (ii) "ACT Online Employee Health and Wellbeing Survey 2016" from the Australian Capital Territory Government; (iii) "British Heart Foundation 2012, Employee survey"; (iv) "British Heart Foundation 2017, Staff health and wellbeing template survey"; (v) "Rand Europe (2015), Health, wellbeing and productivity in the workplace—Britain's Healthiest Organization summary report"; (vi) "South Australia Health, Government of South Australia Staff needs assessment, Staff health and wellbeing survey"; (vii) "Southern Cross Health Society and BusinessNZ, Wellness in the Workplace Survey 2017"; (viii) "State Government Victoria, Workplace Health & Wellbeing needs survey"; (ix) "East Midlands Public Health Observatory, Workplace Health Needs Assessment for Employers, February 2012"; (x) "Tool for Observing Worksite Environments (TOWE)" from the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services; and (xi) "Measure of QWL," as proposed in [Citation 2].

The sample included 5 public and 15 private companies involving at least 2 employees per company, resulting in a total

of 488 questionnaires. The deliberate exclusion of owners or general managers aimed to mitigate potential response bias.

A convenience sampling approach, employing randomized selection, was utilized. In each company, a designated contact person ensured questionnaire completion, subsequently, it was validated by the research team. Personal interviews were conducted to maximize the response rate.

The researcher has adhered to specific instructions for interviewee selection, encompassing 15 firms amongst micro, small, and medium-sized firms, in addition to five large firms and public entities.

The essential objective of the consideration is to assess the effect of workers' Quality of Work Life (QWL) on their recognition of organizational execution commitment. The innovative perspective is within the appraisal of both subjective and behavioral variables of employees' QWL over assorted organizations (open and private) with particular measurements and financial exercises. An add up to 488 surveys were collected from organizations over Karnataka.

The survey utilized in this consideration comprises two primary areas. The primary segment is committed to surveying the Quality of Work Life (QWL) and incorporates measurements such as needs, working environment, work essentials, manager's conduct, back programs inside the organization, organizational stretch, execution in the organization, and commitment at work. Likert scales, extending from 1 to 7, were utilized in this segment to degree assertion with explanations inside each sub-section. The scale values were hence changed into twofold factors for investigation, enveloping variables like Feeling of contributing to efficiency, Managers' bolster, not too bad work environment, Proficient regard at work put, and Work-life adjust. The moment portion of the survey test characterization, capturing statistical points of interest such as sex, age, marital status, position within the organization, division, measure, and age of the organization, sort of representative contract, and worker capabilities. Categorical reaction levels were utilized in this area. The consequent areas characterize the sample and display a set of comes about for the whole considered population.

Descriptive Statistics

In terms of respondents' statistical characteristics, the sexual orientation dissemination was 48% ladies and 52% men. For age, 9% fell inside the 20-25 age bunch, 34% within the 26-35 run, 37% within the 36-45 category, 14% within the 46-55 extend, and as it were 7% were matured over 55. Conjugal status demonstrated that 34% were single, 58% were hitched, and about 8% were indistinct. Concerning organizational parts, 18% held administrative positions, 67% involved qualified parts, and 16% held non-qualified positions. Instructive capabilities uncovered that 50% had a college degree, 20% of them had completed post-graduate degrees, 20% completed Auxiliary instruction, 9% had 9 a long time of school instruction, and as it were 1% completed 4 a long time. For the segment of movement of respondents' organizations, about 2% had a place in the essential division, 14% in the auxiliary segment, 77% in the tertiary segment, and 7% in open organizations. The bulk of respondents worked in small and

medium firms, with 26% in companies with 1-9 workers, 39% in firms had 10-49 workers, 15% in companies had 50-249 representatives, 14% in companies with 250-1000 workers, and 6% in companies more 1000 representatives.

For the organization's age, 15% were between 1 and 7 long time old, 35% were between 8 and 15 a long time, 24% were between 16 and 30 a long time, nearly 19% were between 31 and 40 a long time, and roughly 7% had been in presence for more than 40 a long time. About respondents' contract sorts were 68% with changeless contracts, 11% with contracts for an indicated period, about 9% with transitory contracts, 5% as specialists, and 9% with other sorts of contracts. Finally, in terms of their capabilities inside the firm, for all intents and purposes senior managers 7%, 10% as center level directors, about 18% as the manager in charge, 20% as exceedingly qualified workers, about 28% as qualified, 4% as mostly gifted, and 7% as non-qualified. Furthermore, 3% distinguished as learners, and 1% detailed not knowing their capability status.

Descriptively, employees expressed the highest agreement in their workplaces with items related to worker's professional respect and individuals (75%), followed by the presence of a good work environment (60%), as presented in Table 1 below. Approximately 60% emphasized that supervisors' support was significant, 37% highlighted the significance of achieving work-life balance, and 55% indicated that organizational support for skills development was crucial. Notably, around 80% of workers felt they genuinely contributed to the

organization's productivity. Analyzing the correlation matrix revealed that items most strongly related to the perception of worker's contribution to organizational productivity were professional respect, a positive environment to work, and enhanced support from supervisors'.

TABLE 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1. The Feeling of contribution to productivity	0.8105564	0.4002165	-1.4917	0.311
2. Supervisors' support	0.681677	0.4776184	-0.50	-1.81
3. Good work environment	0.6496965	0.4872548	-0.594	-1.49
4. Professional respect	0.6964981	0.460218	-0.857	-1.27
5. Work-life balance	0.3815409	0.477151	0.499	-1.69
6. Skills' development	0.5680934	0.4958241	-0.276	-1.931
7. Female	1.515564	0.5002446	-0.062	-2.004
8. Age	2.745136	1.01798	0.371	-0.227
9. Married	0.5603113	0.4968328	-0.244	-1.948
10. Manager role	0.1770428	0.3820768	1.697	0.884
11. College Education	0.7256809	0.4466052	-1.015	-0.974
12. SME	0.8035019	0.3977365	-1.532	0.349
13. Company age	2.651751	1.172012	3.111	7.71

SME: Small and Medium-sized Enterprises.

TABLE 2. Correlation Matrix.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	1												
2	0.2722 ***	1											
3	0.2735 ***	0.3715 ***	1										
4	0.2869 ***	0.3878 ***	0.3911 ***	1									
5	0.1724 ***	0.2999 ***	0.2662 ***	0.3085 ***	1								
6	0.2161 ***	0.2777 ***	0.3064 ***	0.3299 ***	0.3079 ***	1							
7	-0.0333	-0.0477	-0.0346	-0.0641	0.0001	0.0272	1						
8	0.0624	-0.0038	0.0387	0.0759*	-0.0042	0.0402	0.0824 *	1					
9	0.031	-0.0095	0.0143	-0.0221	-0.0371	-0.0048	0.0197	0.4640 ***	1				
10	0.0774 *	0.1438 ***	0.1341 **	0.1177 ***	0.0738 *	0.1060 *	0.1028 *	0.1012 **	0.1131 *	1			
11	0.2079 ***	0.0919 **	0.1390 **	0.1063 *	0.1052 *	0.1505 ***	0.0235	-0.0726	0.0527	0.1481 ***	1		
12	-0.0374	-0.0153	-0.0718	0.0037	0.0074	-0.0259	-0.0091	-0.2010 ***	-0.1421 ***	-0.0143	-0.0736 *	1	
13	0.0103	-0.0214	-0.0628	-0.0265	-0.0486	-0.0245	0.0541	0.3258 ***	0.2320 ***	0.003	-0.0116	-0.4105 ***	1

Levels of Significance: * $p < 0.10$. ** $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.0$.

The characterized factors considered within the think about were a while later utilized in the handle of estimation, including

two diverse models: (I) Conventional Slightest Squares (OLS) show; (II) Multinomial Logit demonstrate. These models point

to clarify subjective and behavioral components of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and its impact on workers' discernments of their commitment to efficiency. The basis for utilizing both models is as said below:

- (I) The evaluation of the OLS relapse demonstration is worthy since the set of information considered for the think about is ordinarily conveyed. The binary-coded subordinate variable in this consideration speaks to the likelihood of the effect of a hypothesized set of autonomous factors, as illustrated within the going before writing audit. Particularly, the subordinate variable expects an esteem of 1 in occurrences where the worker pronounces their commitment to efficiency and 0 in all other cases.
- (II) The estimation of the multinomial show gives an implication for evaluating a representation at the level of the same subordinate variable. This encourages the comparison of observational suggestions with Show 1 and the examination of the changeability within the likelihood of the impact of the same hypothetical set of autonomous factors. The comparison is conducted over pattern levels comparing to three categories: 'not contributing to productivity' (level 1), 'contributing to efficiency to a few extent' (level 2), and 'totally contributing to productivity' (level 3). Log odds for these categories relative to the pattern are computed, and the log odds are treated as a direct work of the predictors.

A few control factors were consolidated into the investigation, counting sex, age, conjugal status, employee's part, employee's instruction, organization's division, organization's size, organization's age, and employee's position within the organization. This comprehensive modeling approach encourages a nuanced investigation of the perplexing connections between the distinguished indicators and workers' discernments of their commitment to efficiency. The conceptual demonstration of the model is shown in figure 1



Figure 1. Conceptual Model: Qwl And Feeling Of Contribution To Productivity

TABLE 3. Detailed Representation Of The Set Of Variables

Variables	Description
The feeling of contribution to productivity	1 if the employee perceives their contribution to the organization's productivity, 0 otherwise.
Scale of feeling contribution to organization's productivity	Assign a value of 1 to workers who sense a lack of contribution to the organization's productivity, 2 for those who feel they contribute to some extent, and 3 for those who believe they fully contribute to the organization's productivity.
Supervisors' support	Assign a value of 1 if the employee is content with the support/treatment from supervisors, 0 otherwise.
Good work environment	Assign a value of 1 if the employee is content with the working environment, 0 otherwise.
Professional respect	Assign a value of 1 if the employee feels valued by the organization both professionally and personally, 0 otherwise.
Work-life balance	Assign a value of 1 if the employee perceives the organization as attentive to work-life balance, 0 otherwise.
Skills development	Assign a value of 1 if the employee believes the organization fosters skills development, 0 otherwise.
Female	Assign a value of 1 if the individual is female, 0 otherwise.
Age	Assign a value of 1 for the age range of 20–25 years, 2 for 26–35 years, 3 for 36–45 years, 4 for 46–55 years, and 5 for individuals aged 55 years and above
Married	Assign a value of 1 if the individual is married, 0 otherwise.
Manager role	Assign a value of 1 if the individual holds a managerial role, 0 otherwise.
College Education	Assign a value of 1 if the individual has a college education, 0 otherwise.
SME	Assign a value of 1 if the individual is a Subject Matter Expert (SME), 0 otherwise
Company age	Assign a value of 1 for the experience range of 1 to 6 years, 2 for 7 to 15 years, 3 for 16 to 29 years, 4 for 30 to 49 years, and 5 for individuals with 50 years of experience or more.

Significance levels are denoted as follows: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Standard errors are presented in brackets. LR Chi2 refers to the Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square test, and Prob. > Chi2 represents the probability that the chi-square statistic for the overall model is greater than the observed value, testing the joint null hypothesis that all regression coefficients (except the constant term) are zero

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the results of the Conventional Slightest Squares (OLS) relapse examination for the inspected test, depicted in Demonstrate 1 of Table 4, where the subordinate variable is the self-reported feeling of contributing to efficiency (parallel coded as 1 for certifiable and 0 for something else), the LR Chi2 measurement of 14.38 with a p-Value of 0.0000 means the in general measurable importance of the model.

As depicted in Table 4, three factors stand out as factually critical determinants affecting workers' recognition of their

commitment to efficiency. These striking components include (i) proficient regard; (ii) the presence of a positive work environment; and (iii) the seen bolster from bosses. Outstandingly, the factors of work-life adjustment and organizational back for aptitude development don't show any factually critical impact on employees' detailed sense of contributing to organizational efficiency. These discoveries abdicate important experiences into the nuanced connections between particular components of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and the commitment of workers' recognitions to organizational efficiency.

TABLE 4: Quality Work Life: Subjective and behavioral components affecting Workers' feeling of commitment to productivity.

Variables	Model 1:	Model 2:	
Dependent Variable: Contribution to Productivity	OLS Regression	Multinomial Logit	
Independent variables:	Coef.	Baseline: Feeling of not contributing to productivity	
		Coef. Feeling of contributing to productivity to some extent	Coef. Feeling of totally contributing to productivity
Supervisors' support	0.1112487 *** (0.0386135)	0.1387051 (0.2829922)	0.0169725 (0.313576)
Good work environment	0.1012274 ** (0.0396864)	-0.1571931 (0.2944245)	-0.3292686 (0.3255704)
Professional respect	0.1194258 *** (0.0417695)	0.2335013 (0.2996408)	0.5612954 * (0.3395112)
Work-life balance	0.0181309 (0.0371606)	-0.4871505 * (0.2743621)	-0.5201555 * (0.3044264)
Skills development	0.0525111 (0.0367527)	0.2142189 (0.271979)	0.2460842 (0.3016579)
Female	-0.0188813 (0.0330991)	0.0149441 (0.2438254)	-0.2331886 (0.2705418)
Age	0.0220647 (0.0191218)	0.3310333 ** (0.1469402)	0.3456309 ** (0.1619994)
Married	-0.0007321 (0.0376591)	-0.2280585 (0.2797668)	-0.0901252 (0.309747)
Manager role	-0.0100354 (0.0443451)	0.4593606 (0.3697954)	0.6808159 * (0.3938579)
College Education	0.1415679 *** (0.0379515)	0.0578064 (0.2788375)	-0.0239672 (0.3085947)
SME	0.0022576 (0.045563)	0.1645333 (0.336115)	0.0256681 (0.3730899)
Company age	0.0044527 (0.0160382)	0.0342415 (0.1197577)	-0.0841063 (0.1328729)
Obs.	514	514	
LR Chi ²	14.38	22.06	
Prob. > Chi ²	0.0000	0.0002	

Also, the control factors scrutinized within the beginning show, it is vital that representatives having a college instruction display a factually critical and positive impact on their recognition of contributing to productivity.

As shown in Model 2, the likelihood proportion remainder of 22.06, coupled with a p-value of 0.0002, shows the generally measurable noteworthiness of the demonstration. This show consolidates a set of indicators relevant to workers' sense of commitment to efficiency, treating the subordinate variable as a positive variable with three levels: 1) Not at all contributing to efficiency; 2) a few levels of commitment to efficiency; and 3) entirely contributing to efficiency.

Concerning the perception of contributing to some amount of productivity, merely work-life balance emerges as an important predictor, albeit with a negative influence. Furthermore, the age of workers is positively associated with their likelihood of feeling somewhat productive in their organizations.

For the third level, representing the sentiment of wholly contributing to organizational productivity, workers who perceive respect from their companies and feel confident and valued by their organizations exhibit a significant and positive

association with this elevated level of contribution. Additionally, older workers and those in managerial or directorial roles within their organizations are more likely to feel highly productive. These nuanced findings shed light on the complex interplay between various predictors and the multi-dimensional nature of employees' perceptions of their contribution to organizational productivity.

In comparing the two estimation methodologies, it is discerned that the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) model provides more comprehensive insights into the predictors elucidating workers' perception of contributing to productivity. The OLS model identifies positive and significant influences of three out of six subjective and behavioral components of Quality of Work Life (QWL). Delving deeper into the analysis, it becomes imperative to scrutinize factors predicting a sense of lacking contribution to productivity. This investigation is crucial for refining human capital management strategies through a behavioral lens.

Considering the array of research hypotheses, novel insights emerge about the subjective and behavioral components of QWL influencing employees' perception of contributing to productivity.

Model 1 lends support to H1a, underscoring that employees who feel supported and valued by their supervisors are more inclined to perceive their contribution to organizational productivity. These findings align with the antecedent research by [Citation 30], emphasizing the pivotal role of support and appreciation in fostering heightened productivity.

Moreover, Model 1 substantiates H2 by revealing a significant and positive impact of conducive workplace environments, characterized by safety and sanitation, on workers' sense of productivity. These results are congruent with prior studies demonstrating a positive correlation between job security, workplace safety, well-being, job satisfaction, and motivation [Citation 37]. Additionally, the positive impact of a safe work environment on productivity, as indicated in [1], aligns with these findings. The results are in line with the broader literature, suggesting that participation in a socially supportive workgroup within the workplace enhances the likelihood of contributing to organizational performance [Citation 31]. This aligns with the findings of a previous study applied in the Croatian context [Citation 51], emphasizing the significant impact of cooperative working environments on QWL.

In support for Hypothesis 3 (H3) is evident in both Models 1 and 2, indicating that workers perceiving professional respect have a more substantial influence on organizational productivity. In Model 1, the observed results demonstrate a positive and statistically substantial impact on workers feeling professionally appreciated on their sense of productivity. Model 2 further validates this influence, particularly for workforces with a strong perception of contributing significantly to organizational productivity. These findings align with the theoretical framework proposed by [Citation 39], emphasizing the connection between psychological growth needs and various facets related to specialized recognition and respect, such as skill diversity, task uniqueness and importance, self-

sufficiency, and response, with both Quality of Work Life (QWL) and performance.

Moreover, these results corroborate the conclusions drawn by prior researchers [Citations 11,40], suggesting that employees' sense of superiority and obligation, especially in terms of professional acknowledgment, enhances their contribution. This aligns with earlier empirical evidence that emphasizes the positive impact of employees feeling valued and being taken into account in organizational objectives on overall performance [Citation 42].

Regarding Hypothesis 4 (H4), which posits that workforces benefiting from work-life balance are expected to perceive themselves as contributors to productivity, Model 1 does not provide significant evidence. In Model 2, a significant, albeit adverse, effect is identified, indicating that employees perceiving their organization as having a work-life balance vision are less expected to feel their commitment to productivity. This disparity may be attributed to the absence of work-life balance practices implemented by supervisors and the organization itself. Additionally, a potential development of negative emotions related to the provision of work-life balance, especially in specific organizational contexts, might be construed as a means of diminishing the perceived leadership accountabilities assigned to targeted workforces.

Whereas these nuanced about are opposite, they don't negate the discoveries of [Quotation 52], who attest a positive affiliation between work-life adjustment and quality of work-life, in this manner upgrading efficiency. In arrangement with this viewpoint, accomplishing an adjustment between individual and proficient life is expected to have a positive relationship with organizational commitment and, thus, efficiency at work [Citation 61]. Vitally, the experimental findings not as it were don't invalidate the already set up positive affiliation between work-life adjustment and Quality of Work Life (QWL) but moreover enlighten issues related to 'invisible ceiling' elements related to sex administration flow and supervisors' conduct inside the organizational setting. These issues warrant advanced investigation in future inquiries about commitment to organizational efficiency, grounded-in-person conduct (of bosses and laborers), and subjective well-being affected by the organizational context's boundaries

In contrast, H5 ascertains that workers who observe their organizations invest in their careers and skills enlargement, contributing to organizational productivity, does not find support in our findings. Interestingly, these results deviate from prior research, such as [Citation 39], which emphasized an association between professional valorization, QWL, and performance. Similarly, the positive arguments put forth in [Citation 28] regarding reinforcing investment in employees' training for achieving better performance levels in the upcoming do not align with our contrasting results. This discrepancy could be attributed to the subjective nature of the productivity measure used, focusing on the perception of being dynamic. Additionally, these results run counter to previous literature advocating a positive association between organizational investment in workers' management and organizational performance [Citation 16]. The attention given to employee management systems, supporting organizational

goals with career choices, rewards, and planned growth, and their positive impact on employees and organizational performance, as suggested in the literature, is not corroborated by our findings.

This consideration utilizes an imaginative approach to look at the effect of individual and behavioral components of Quality of Work Life (QWL) on organizational execution, operationalized through workers' recognition of their commitment to the organization's efficiency. Observational discoveries emphasize the importance of variables related to laborers accepting back from managers, integrating into a positive work environment, and being regarded both professionally and by and by.

A distinctive research challenge addressed in this study involves the pioneering use of a subjective measure of workers' commitment to organizational productivity. This approach offers new insights for organizations by exploring previously unexplored empirical facets of various subjective and behavioral components. Rather than solely focusing on increasing compensation, the study advocates for a more behavioral-oriented organizational management approach.

Contributing to the QWL and organizational performance literature, this analysis introduces two axes of reasoning grounded in novel empirical evidence. Firstly, it identifies factors influencing organizational performance, using an alternative measure based on workers' perceptions of contributing to organizational productivity. Secondly, it proposes a new program for human capital executives, emphasizing the significance of individual and behavioral components of QWL to enhance efficiency at both the company and individual levels.

Implications derived from the evidence suggest that human capital leaders aiming to bolster organizational productivity should prioritize a strategic action agenda. This includes nurturing an organizational philosophy that values supervisors' behavioral practices respecting workers, promoting positive emotions and feelings of appreciation among workers, ensuring supervisors mitigate risky conditions to reduce ambiguity and risk, and emphasizing the significance of workers' duties and tasks.

Surprisingly, the research does not provide further evidence supporting the conventional view regarding the significance of work-life balance and organizational support for workers' abilities in contributing to productivity. This discrepancy may be attributed to the research question's framing in the original survey, potentially reflecting a hypothetically negative perception of leadership responsibilities related to work-life balance. However, there is considerable room for enhancement in supporting subjective conditions conducive to stimulating organizational productivity, particularly concerning gender issues, handling trade-offs between private and professional life, and delineating leadership responsibilities based on gender roles.

The analysis has boundaries, primarily the absence of a temporal dimension, hindering the establishment of causal relationships between individual and behavioral constituents and organizational performance. Yet another limitation pertains to the subjective nature of the reply variable demonstrating

organizational productivity, necessitated by the study's aims and challenges in obtaining such data. Future research could address these limitations by incorporating a time dimension and utilizing a more diverse set of metrics, both objective and subjective, for a comprehensive understanding of the relationships between QWL components and organizational performance.

This study opens avenues for further research, suggesting a comparative analysis across diverse organizational cultures and contexts globally. Exploration of different forms of organization, such as multinationals, family-controlled enterprises, those led by women, and those emphasizing ethnic diversity and values, could deepen our understanding. Additionally, future research may investigate new methods of organizational strategy and management, such as design thinking, and managerial gamification, to ascertain their potential to elicit subjective, inclusive, and participatory behavior, ultimately contributing to enhanced organizational performance.

REFERENCES

- Pandey, M.K.; Tripathi, P. Examine the relationship between level of aspiration, believes in just world, psychological well-being and quality of work-life. *Indian J. Heal. Well-being* 2018, 9, 53–59.
- Sirgy, M.; Efraty, D.; Siegel, P.; Lee, D. New Measure of Quality of Work Life (Qowl) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories'. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 2001, 55, 241–302. [CrossRef]
- Sattar, S.; Laila, K.; Zakir, M.; Khan, H. Relation of Job Related Factors with Different Dimensions of Quality of Work Life. *World J. Public Heal.* 2018, 3, 16–22. [CrossRef]
- Schneider, B.; Hanges, P.J.; Smith, D.B.; Salvaggio, A.N. Which comes first: Employee attitudes or organizational, financial and market performance? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2003, 88, 836–851. [CrossRef]
- Ruzevicius, J. Working life quality and its measurement. *Forum Ware Int.* 2007, 2, 1–8. Nayeri, N.D.; Salehi, T.; Noghabi, A.A. Quality of work life and productivity among Iranian nurses. *Contemporary Nurse. Contemp. Nurse* 2011, 39, 106–118. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Sirgy, M.J. Theoretical Perspectives Guiding QOL Indicator Projects. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 2011, 103, 1–22. [CrossRef]
- OECD. *Compendium of Productivity Indicators*; OECD: Paris, France, 2019.
- OECD. The Human Side of Productivity: Setting the Scene. In *Background Paper, OECD Global Forum on Productivity, 4th Annual Conference in Sydney, Australia Preliminary Version*; OECD: Paris, France, 2019.
- Pedro, E.; Leitão, J.; Alves, H. Does the Quality of Academic Life Matter for Students' Performance, Loyalty and University Recommendation? *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* 2016, 11, 293–316. [CrossRef]
- Leitão, J.; Alves, H.; Krueger, N.; Park, J. *Entrepreneurial, Innovative and Sustainable Ecosystems Best Practices and Implications for Quality of Life*; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2018; ISBN 978-3-319-71014-3.
- Peterson, W.; Gijssbers, G.; Wilks, M. *An Organizational Performance Assessment System for Agricultural Research Organizations: Concepts, Methods, and Procedures*; International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR): Hague, The Netherlands, 2003; ISBN 9291180688.
- Lusthuus, C.; Adrien, M.-H.; Anderson, G.; Montalvan, G.; Carden, F. *Organizational Assessment: A Framework for Improving Performance*; International Development Research Centre and Inter-American Development Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2002; ISBN 0889369984.
- Venkatraman, N.; Ramanujam, V. Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1986, 12, 801–814. [CrossRef]
- Boudreau, J.W. *Human Resources and Organization Success*; Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies: Ithaca, NY, USA, 1996.
- Moreno, E.; Ávila, M.; García-Contreras, R. Can gender be a determinant of organizational performance and knowledge sharing in public sector organizations? In *Ad-minister no32*; EAFIT University, Ed.; Universidad EAFIT: Medellin, Colombia, 2018; pp. 137–158.
- Aguinis, H. *Performance Management*, 3rd ed.; Kelley School of Business I.U., Ed.; Kelley School of Business: Bloomington, IN, USA, 2013; ISBN 9780132556385.
- Aguinis, H.; Ramani, R.S.; Villamor, I. The First 20 Years of Organizational Research Methods: Trajectory, Impact, and Predictions for the Future. *Organ. Res. Methods* 2019, 22, 463–489. [CrossRef]
- Aguinis, H.; Joo, H.; Gottfredson, R.K. Why we hate performance management-And why we should love it. *Bus. Horiz.* 2011, 54, 503–507. [CrossRef]
- Aguinis, H.; Pierce, C.A. Enhancing the relevance of organizational behavior by embracing performance. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2008, 29, 139–145. [CrossRef]
- Tamini, B.; Chadha, N.K. Emotional Intelligence and Quality of Work Life between Iranian and Indian University Employees: A Cross-Cultural Study. *IPA Int. J. Psychol.* 2018, 12, 91–117. [CrossRef]
- Sirgy, M.; Reilly, N.P.; Wu, J.; Efraty, D. A work-life identity model of well-being: Towards a research agenda linking Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) programs with Quality of Life (QOL). *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* 2008, 3, 181–202. [CrossRef]
- Pot, F.D.; Koningsveld, E.A. Quality of working life and organizational performance – two sides of the same coin? *Scand. J. Work. Environ. Health* 2009, 35, 421–428. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- The Council of the European. Union Council decision on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States. *Off. J. Eur. Union* 2010, 53, 46–51.
- Chib, S. Quality of Work Life and Organisational Performance Parameters At Workplace. *SEGi Rev.* 2012, 5, 36–47.
- Nayak, T.; Sahoo, C.K. Quality of Work Life and Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Employee Commitment. *J. Health Manag.* 2015, 17, 263–273. [CrossRef]
- Vadivel, S.; Velmurugan, R. Quality of work life of employees in private companies concerning Coimbatore. *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res. Dev.* 2017, 4, 128–131.
- Islam, Z.; Siengthai, S. Quality of work life and organizational performance: Empirical evidence from Dhaka Export Processing Zone. In *Proceeding of ILO Conference on Regulating for Decent Work*, Geneva, Switzerland, 8–10 July 2009.
- Felce, D.; Perry, J. Quality of life: Its definition and measurement. *Res. Dev. Disabil.* 1995, 16, 51–74. [CrossRef]
- Deguchi, Y.; Iwasaki, S.; Shimoto, H.; Ogawa, K.; Fukuda, Y.; Nitta, T.; Mitake, T.; Nogi, Y.; Inoue, K. Relationships between temperaments, occupational stress, and insomnia among Japanese workers. *PLoS ONE* 2017, 12, e0175346. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Yuh, J.; Choi, S. Sources of social support, job satisfaction, and quality of life among childcare teachers. *Soc. Sci. J.* 2017, 54, 450–457. [CrossRef]
- Elgizawy, E.M. Expectation Towards Green Lawns to Enhance Quality of Life at Workplaces. *Procedia Environ. Sci.* 2016, 34, 131–139. [CrossRef]
- Kawabe, Y.; Nakamura, Y.; Kikuchi, S.; Suzukamo, Y.; Murakami, Y.; Tanaka, T.; Takebayashi, T.; Okayama, A.; Miura, K.; Okamura, T.; et al. Relationship of type of work with health-related quality of life. *Qual. Life Res.* 2015, 24, 2927–2932. [CrossRef]
- Vagharseyyedin, S.A.; Vanaki, Z.; Mohammadi, E. The nature nursing quality of work life: An integrative review of the literature. *West. J. Nurs. Res.* 2011, 33, 786–804. [CrossRef]
- Knox, S.; Irving, J. An interactive quality of work-life model applied to organizational transition. *J. Nurse Adm.* 1997, 27, 39–47. [CrossRef]
- Gupta, P.; Khandelwal, P. Quality of work life about role efficacy. *Psychol. Stud. (Mysore)*. 1988, 33, 34–38.
- Eurofound New Work Organisation, Working Conditions and Quality of Work: Towards the Flexible Firm? Available online: https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_publication/field_ef_document/ef0274en.pdf (accessed on 8 October 2018).
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T.S.; Swamy, D.R. Review of literature on quality of work life. *Int. J. Qual. Res.* 2013, 7, 201–214.
- Hackman, J.R.; Oldham, G.R. *The Job Diagnostic Survey: An Instrument for the Diagnosis of Jobs and the Evaluation of Job Redesign Projects*; Yale University: New Haven, CT, USA, 1974.
- Silva, J.; Oliveira, L.; Mamede, J.; Wanderley, T.; Silva, S.; Barros, J. Level of satisfaction: factor generator of quality of life at work. *Rev. Pesquisa. Cupid. é Fundam. Online* 2018, 10, 343–350. [CrossRef]

42. Kim, J.; Jang, S. Seafarers' Quality of Life: Organizational Culture, Self-Efficacy, and Perceived Fatigue. *Environ. Res. Public Health* 2018, *15*, 2150. [CrossRef]
43. Martel, J.-P.; Dupuis, G. Quality of Work Life: Theoretical and Methodological Problems, and Presentation of a New Model and Measuring Instrument. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 2006, *77*, 333–368. [CrossRef]
44. Afsar, T.S.; Burcu, E. The Adaptation and Validation of Quality of Work Life Scale to Turkish Culture. *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* 2013, *9*, 897–910. [CrossRef]
45. Jaiswal, A. Quality Of Work Life. *J. Bus. Manag. Soc. Sci. Res.* 2014, *3*, 83–87.
46. Amornpipat, I. Quality of Work-Life of Pilots: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Kasem Bundit J.* 2018, *19*, 367–377.
47. Levine, M.; Taylor, J.; Davis, L. Defining Quality of Working Life. *Hum. Relations* 1984, *37*, 81–104. [CrossRef]
48. Corcoran, T.B. *Improving the Quality of Work Life in Public Schools*; Research for Better Schools, Inc.: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1986.
49. Ghasemzad, A.; Zadeh, M.A.; Bagheri, S. A study of the relationship between teachers and principals' spiritual leadership, quality of work life, job satisfaction and productivity. *Am. J. Sci. Res.* 2012, *49*, 11–20.
50. Srivastava, S.; Kanpur, R. A Study on Quality Of Work Life: Key Elements & Its Implications. *IOSR J. Bus. Manag. Ver. I* 2014, *16*, 2319–7668.
51. Royuela, V.; López-Tamayo, J.; Suriñach, J. The institutional vs. the academic definition of the quality of work life. What is the focus of the European Commission? *Soc. Indic. Res.* 2008, *86*, 401–415. [CrossRef]
52. Šverko, B.; Galic', Z. The perceived quality of working life in Croatia and the European Union. *Fac. Humanity. Soc. Sci.* 2014, *23*, 557–575. [CrossRef]
53. Waghmare, S.; Dhole, V. Quality of Work Life and Influencing Factors. *Int. J. Adv. Res.* 2017, *5*, 1328–1332. [CrossRef]
54. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *First European Quality of Life Survey: Quality of Work and Life Satisfaction*; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions: Luxembourg; Office for Official Publications of the European Communities: Brussels, Belgium, 2007; ISBN 9289709200.
55. Bhavani, M.; Jegadeeshwaran, M. Job Satisfaction and Quality of Work Life - A Case Study of Women Teachers in Higher Education. *SDMIMD J. Manag.* 2014, *5*, 1. [CrossRef] Subhashini, S.; Ramani, C.S.G. Quality of Work Life Among Women Employees Working in. *Asia pacific J. Res.* 2013, *1*, 22–29.
56. Rethinam, G.; Ismail, M. Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *Eur. J. Soc. Sci.* 2008, *7*, 58–70.
57. Arif, S.; Ilyas, M. Quality of Work-Life Model for Teachers of Private Universities in Pakistan. *Qual. Assur. Educ.* 2013, *21*, 282–298. [CrossRef]
58. Saraji, N.G.; Dargahi, H. Study of Quality of Work Life (QWL). *Iran. J. Public Health* 2006, *35*, 8–14.
59. Ban, M.S.; Panchal, U.V. A study of Quality of Work Life of engineering institute faculties. *Int. J. Eng. Sci. Manag. Res.* 2017, *4*, 79–82.
60. Bloom, N.; Kretschmer, T.; Reenen, J. Van Work-Life balance, management practices. In *International Differences in the Business Practices and Productivity of Firms*; National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2009; pp. 15–54. ISBN 0226261948.
61. Lee, D.J.; Sirgy, M.J. What Do People Do to Achieve Work-Life Balance? A Formative Conceptualization to Help Develop a Metric for Large-Scale Quality-of-Life Surveys. *Soc. Indic. Res.* 2017, *138*, 771–791. [CrossRef]
62. Sirgy, M.; Lee, D.-J. Work-Life Balance: An Integrative Review. *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* 2018, *13*, 229–254. [CrossRef]
63. Nekouei, H.; Othman, M.B.; Bt Masud, J.; Bt Ahmad, A. Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction among employee in government organizations in IRAN. *J. Basic Appl. Sci. Res.* 2014, *4*, 217–229.
64. Rathamani, P.; Ramchandra, R. A Study on Quality of Work Life of Employees in Textile Industry – Sipcot, Perundurai. *IOSR J. Bus. Manag.* 2013, *8*, 54–59. [CrossRef]
65. Geetha, R.; Mani, R.S. Quality of work life: A literature review. *Int. J. Appl. Eng. Res.* 2016, *11*, 8928–8931.
66. Jerome, S. A Study on Quality of Work Life of Employees at Jeppiaar Cement Private Ltd: Perambalur. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Sci. Manag. Stud.* 2013, *1*. [CrossRef]
67. Yadav, R.; Khanna, A. Literature Review on Quality of Work Life and Their Dimensions. *IOSR J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.* 2014, *19*, 71–80. [CrossRef]
68. Indrasari, M.; Momin, M.M.; Syamsudin, N.; Newcombe, P.; Permana, S. Influence of Motivation and Quality of Work Life on The Performance of Employees. *J. Trap. Manaj. Bisnis* 2018, *4*, 42–48. [CrossRef]
69. 2019 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).
70. Leitão, J., Pereira, D., & Gonçalves, Á. (2049). Quality of Work Life and Organizational Performance: Workers' Feelings of Contributing, or Not, to the Organization's Productivity. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(20), 3803. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16203803>