

Quality of Work Life: A Study of the Impact of Job Satisfaction

Geovana Cardozo Graeff

Business School and Technology, Atitus Educação
Passo Fundo, Brazil

Iasmin Wencelowski Britto

Business School and Technology, Atitus Educação
Passo Fundo, Brazil

Viviane Rossato Laimer

Escola Superior do Cooperativismo
Porto Alegre, Brazil

Claudionor Guedes Laimer

Business School and Technology, Atitus Educação
Passo Fundo, Brazil

E-mail of the corresponding author: claudionor.laimer@atitus.edu.br

This study was financed in part by the Fundação Meridional and the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001.

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of work life (QWL). The research was conducted through a survey of 93 employees from companies in different economic sectors in southern Brazil. Data was collected through an online questionnaire on the Google Forms platform. The research results revealed a strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and QWL. Thus, the higher the job satisfaction, the higher the quality of work life. This finding highlights the importance of maintaining a work environment that promotes job satisfaction, as this can result in promoting employee well-being, leading to greater productivity and retention of talent. The study suggests that future research explore other factors, such as human resources policies, and use longitudinal approaches to assess changes in satisfaction and QWL over time. This study contributes to the understanding of the complex interactions between job satisfaction and QWL, emphasizing the importance of organizational strategies that promote employee well-being.

Keywords: Work environment, Job satisfaction, Quality of work life.

DOI: 10.7176/RHSS/15-2-04

Publication date: February 28th 2025

1. Introduction

Quality of work life (QWL) has become a paramount concern for organizations seeking to maintain their competitive edge in an increasingly dynamic and challenging marketplace. Recognized as a critical factor in talent retention and productivity enhancement, QWL directly influences metrics such as turnover and absenteeism, positioning itself as a strategic element within human resources management (Girardi et al., 2023).

QWL encompasses a comprehensive set of organizational practices and policies aimed at fostering a healthy and supportive work environment. Beyond physical infrastructure improvements, this approach encompasses initiatives that promote emotional, psychological, and financial well-being among employees. After all, satisfied

employees tend to deliver higher quality and more effective results, significantly contributing to organizational success (Silva & Laimer, 2023).

In today's complex organizational landscape, employee well-being has emerged as a top priority. Organizations must adopt a holistic perspective that considers the individual and collective needs of their employees, cultivating an environment where they feel valued and engaged. Employee satisfaction is not merely a consequence but rather a result of well-structured and implemented organizational policies (Alves et al., 2024).

Investing in quality of work life yields mutual benefits: organizations reap the rewards of more engaged teams, a positive organizational climate, and increased productivity; employees, in turn, experience greater motivation, recognition, and development opportunities. This virtuous cycle propels overall organizational performance, enabling companies to achieve superior results.

Given this context, the present study aims to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of work life. By exploring this relationship, the study seeks to provide insights for the development of more effective organizational policies and practices that promote employee well-being and, consequently, enhance productivity and organizational prosperity.

2. Literature review

2.1 *Quality of Work Life (QWL)*

The concept of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is rooted in the interaction between individuals, work, and organizations. Initially, the topic gained relevance when explored from the perspective of task performance and job definition, as pointed out by Santos and Lima (2011). Over time, the focus broadened, highlighting the positive results that QWL can generate for both employees and organizations.

Although widely debated in the literature, the concept of QWL still lacks a consensual definition. However, there is a convergence around the idea that QWL represents a response to the Taylorist approach, promoting humanization, well-being, and employee participation in decision-making processes (Vital & Paiva, 2019).

Some studies, such as Bom Sucesso (1998) and Martel and Dupuis (2006), expand the concept by incorporating factors such as organizational culture, family structure, interpersonal relationships, conflicts, and self-esteem. This approach reflects the complexity of QWL, which is not limited to working conditions but also considers the interaction between professional and social life.

QWL can be understood as a set of organizational actions aimed at improving the work environment, using managerial, technological, and structural innovations. Its focus is on the health, satisfaction, and happiness of employees, encompassing physical, psychological, and social aspects (Venson et al., 2013).

QWL encompasses physical, environmental, psychological, and social aspects of the work environment, seeking to create and maintain conditions that promote employee well-being (Easton & Van Laar, 2018). In addition to health and safety, elements such as employee participation and engagement are fundamental to achieving quality and productivity.

2.2 *Job satisfaction*

Job satisfaction is a topic that contributes to understanding employee well-being and can vary significantly among individuals. The literature presents two main approaches: one that assesses overall satisfaction and another that analyzes specific aspects, such as factors that directly influence the work environment (Oliveira & Fonseca, 2021).

Among the elements that influence job satisfaction are perceptions of the environment, relationships with colleagues, opportunities for growth, and remuneration. More satisfied employees tend to demonstrate greater engagement, efficiency, and productivity, while low levels of satisfaction are associated with decreased performance, increased absenteeism, and a greater propensity to seek new opportunities (Alves et al., 2024).

Job dissatisfaction can lead to substantial costs for companies, such as increased turnover, absenteeism, workplace conflicts, and reduced commitment to organizational goals (Nodari et al., 2010). Turnover, often associated with dissatisfaction, is influenced by factors such as financial conditions, job satisfaction, and employee demographic characteristics (Cappi & Araújo, 2015).

Additionally, job satisfaction is a complex and dynamic phenomenon. What motivates one employee may not motivate another. Elements such as feeling useful and perceiving that one's contributions are valued by the company are determinants for stimulating satisfaction (Silva & Laimer, 2023). This perception involves both

identification with the work and appreciation for what one does (Girardi et al., 2023).

Therefore, understanding the multiple aspects of job satisfaction is essential to create an organizational environment that is both healthy and productive, promoting the development of individuals and teams.

3. Research method

This study is characterized as a quantitative and descriptive research, conducted through a survey. The sample consisted of 93 participants, selected based on a convenience sampling technique, considering accessibility and availability to participate in the research. To ensure the validity and reliability of the results, the participants were employees of companies from different economic sectors in southern Brazil.

Data collection was carried out through an online questionnaire, developed on the Google Forms platform. The instrument included sociodemographic questions to characterize the participants (age, gender, education, and income) and questions about the study variables, measured by validated scales. Participants responded using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), where higher scores indicate greater agreement.

The variables analyzed in the study were:

- a) Quality of Work Life (QWL): measured by the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) scale, developed by Easton and Van Laar (2018), composed of 24 items (detailed in the Appendix).
- b) Job Satisfaction: assessed by the Job Satisfaction Assessment Scale (JSAS), developed by Pedrotti, Laimer, and Laimer (2021), composed of 25 items (detailed in the Appendix).

Some questionnaire items were formulated in a reversed manner to avoid response bias, requiring participants to evaluate the statement from an opposite perspective. For these items, the obtained scores must be analyzed in an inverted manner. For example, the item “I often feel under pressure at work” had a mean score of 2.484. Since the Likert scale used ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating greater agreement, the reversed score of this item reflects a higher level of quality of work life among respondents. Thus, the mean score below the midpoint of the scale reinforces the interpretation that participants tend to disagree with the original statement, indicating lower perceived pressure in the workplace.

Before large-scale application, the questionnaire was submitted to a validation process with experts and a pre-test with three participants. As no problems or need for adjustments were identified, the pre-test responses were integrated into the main database. The link to the form was generated by the platform itself and shared with participants via WhatsApp.

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of scientific research. All participants were informed about the research objectives and formally consented to participate. Data collection was planned to preserve the anonymity of the participants and ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the responses, allowing each individual to respond autonomously and at the most convenient time.

After collection, the data were tabulated in spreadsheets and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 27. Initially, the normality of the data was verified using the skewness and kurtosis indices. Data are considered symmetric when skewness is between ± 3 , and the distribution is considered normal when kurtosis is between ± 10 (Kline, 2016). The results indicated a normal distribution, allowing for the performance of parametric tests.

Descriptive analyses, including means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) of the scales used, are presented in the Appendix.

4. Results and Discussion

The results of this study provided relevant insights into the levels of quality of work life and job satisfaction among participants. Initially, it was found that the overall average of QWL, measured by the WRQoL scale, was 3.8 ($\mu = 3.799$; $\sigma = 0.634$), indicating moderate levels of positive perception. Job satisfaction measured by the JSAS presented an overall average of 3.7 ($\mu = 3.703$; $\sigma = 0.604$), also indicating intermediate levels.

A detailed analysis of the data shows that the predominant age range among respondents is 21 to 40 years, representing 77.12% of the sample. Previous studies highlight that this age group is often characterized by high levels of work involvement, especially in dynamic markets, but may also face challenges related to work-life balance.

The analysis of salary revealed that 55.91% of participants have an income of up to two minimum wages, which can directly influence levels of satisfaction and perception of QWL, especially due to the relationship between financial gains and access to well-being resources, as discussed by Alves et al. (2024). On the other hand, the distribution by gender (58.1% women and 41.9% men) suggests potential differences in perceptions of QWL, corroborating research that indicates that women may experience greater challenges in the workplace due to structural inequalities.

Regarding diversity in education level, 59.14% of participants have completed high school or have incomplete higher education. This educational variation may be associated with different perceptions of QWL and job satisfaction, as higher education levels tend to create different expectations regarding the professional environment.

To investigate the influence of job satisfaction on QWL, a simple linear regression analysis was used (Table 1). The model $ST \rightarrow QWL$ presented an explanatory power of 62.8% ($R^2 = 0.628$), with statistically significant results ($p < 0.05$) confirmed by the analysis of variance (Table 2). This indicates that the model is able to explain a significant portion of the variation in quality of work life based on job satisfaction.

The results of the simple linear regression analysis indicated that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of QWL ($\beta = 0.793$, $p < 0.000$). This positive and significant relationship (Table 3) indicates that higher levels of job satisfaction are associated with higher perceived QWL among employees. These findings are consistent with recent studies that show that positive perception of work can promote greater well-being (Girardi et al., 2023) and retention in the company (Silva & Laimer, 2023; Alves et al., 2024). In addition, the statistical significance of the model reinforces the importance of implementing organizational strategies aimed at improving the work environment and promoting healthier practices.

The relationship between job satisfaction and QWL is based on the idea that employee well-being is essential for creating a healthy and productive organizational environment. QWL involves strategic management focused on diagnosing, implementing, and evaluating practices that directly impact working conditions and the humanization of work relationships. In this sense, job satisfaction is one of the main components of QWL, as it reflects the worker's perception of their work environment, growth opportunities, and the recognition they receive. When working conditions are adequate, and there is a balance between organizational demands and individual needs, satisfaction levels increase, fostering employee motivation and engagement (Vargas et al., 2023).

Job satisfaction, in turn, is directly associated with meeting employees' needs, both in terms of available resources and materials and social interactions within and outside the organization (Alves et al., 2024). A work environment that values well-being and promotes healthy interpersonal relationships significantly contributes to QWL, creating a positive cycle in which job satisfaction drives talent retention (Silva & Laimer, 2023). Thus, understanding QWL in its multiple aspects allows companies to adopt more effective strategies to enhance job satisfaction, leading to positive impacts not only for employees but also for the organization as a whole.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and quality of work life (QWL). The results revealed that job satisfaction is strongly associated with QWL. These aspects are fundamental to employees' perception of well-being, which, in turn, directly impacts QWL.

The findings highlight the importance of companies investing in a positive organizational climate, which, in addition to fostering employee motivation, tends to enhance team performance. Strengthening the relationship between leaders and subordinates emerges as an essential factor in creating a healthy work environment, promoting engagement and satisfaction. The literature suggests that a positive work environment contributes not only to employee motivation but also to reducing issues such as absenteeism and turnover.

Despite its contributions, this study has some limitations that should be considered. The sample used was limited in terms of size and composition, which may restrict the generalization of the results to other populations, sectors, and geographical contexts. Therefore, future research could benefit from using larger and more diverse samples, including workers from different economic sectors and geographic regions. Multi-regional or cross-sector studies could provide a broader understanding of the dynamics between job satisfaction and QWL, allowing for the identification of contextual patterns and relevant moderating factors.

Furthermore, this study adopted a cross-sectional design, making it impossible to analyze causal relationships over time. Longitudinal studies could deepen the understanding of how job satisfaction influences QWL by

assessing the evolution of these factors in different organizational settings. Similarly, future investigations could incorporate additional variables such as absenteeism (Girardi et al., 2023), talent retention (Silva & Laimer, 2023), and human resource management policies, including incentive programs, training, and development initiatives. The adoption of qualitative or mixed methodologies is also recommended to capture contextual nuances and provide a more in-depth analysis of the factors that impact job satisfaction and quality of work life.

These future approaches could expand the applicability of this study's findings, contributing to the development of more effective organizational strategies aimed at improving employee well-being and performance.

References

- Alves, C. R., Britto, I. W., Laimer, V. R., & Laimer, C. G. (2024). The Effect of Job Satisfaction on the Intention to Stay and Leave the Company: A Study in the Construction Sector, *Journal of Business and Management*, 26(12), 19-24.
- Bom Sucesso, E. D. P. (1998). *Trabalho e qualidade de vida*. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark.
- Cappi, M. N., & Araújo, B. F. V. B. (2015). Satisfação no trabalho, comprometimento organizacional e intenção de sair: um estudo entre as gerações X e Y. *REAd. Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, 21(3), 576-600.
- Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2018). *User manual for the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale: a measure of quality of working life*. University of Portsmouth.
- Girardi, Y. T. P., Rauber, A. O., Laimer, V. R., & Laimer, C. G. (2023). Is there a relationship between job satisfaction and workplace absenteeism? An investigation involving Brazilian and Bangladeshi workers. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 28(11), 38-44.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling (4 th.)*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Martel, J. P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of work life: Theoretical and methodological problems, and presentation of a new model and measuring instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77, 333-368.
- Nodari, C. H., Bó, G. D., & Camargo, M. E. (2010). Turnover e satisfação no trabalho em empresas multinacionais: um estudo de caso. *Revista de Administração da Unimep*, 8(2), 1-16.
- Oliveira, L. B., & Fonseca, F. V. M. (2021). Satisfação no trabalho e empregabilidade: um estudo comparativo com profissionais que atuam em projetos ágeis ou tradicionais. *Revista de Gestão e Projetos*, 13(1), 1-24.
- Pedrotti, E., Laimer, V. R., & Laimer, C. G. (2021). Validação de escala de avaliação da satisfação no trabalho (Working Paper). Universidade Federal da Fronteira Sul, Chapecó, SC, Brasil.
- Santos, E., & Lima, J. F. (2011). Qualidade de vida no trabalho: uma opção para o bem-estar do indivíduo no trabalho. *Rios Eletrônica*, 5(5), 115-123.
- Silva, R. W., & Laimer, C. G. (2023). Does the employee intend to stay or leave the company? The effect of job satisfaction. *Revista Pesquisa em Ação*, 2(1), p. 68-76.
- Vargas, J. M. M. G., Cunha, N. R. S., Moura, L. R. C. M., Emmendoerfer, M. L., & Mendes, D. C. (2023). Elderly Public Servants: Assessment of their satisfaction with Quality of Life at Work. *Navus: Revista de Gestão e Tecnologia*, 13, 1-17.
- Venson, A. B. S., Fiates, G. G. S., Dutra, A., Carneiro, M. L., & Martins, C. (2013). O recurso mais importante para as organizações são mesmo as pessoas? Uma análise da produção científica sobre qualidade de vida no trabalho (QVT). *Revista de Administração da UFSM*, 6(1), 139-156.
- Vital, M. S., & Paiva, K. C. M. (2019). Qualidade de vida no trabalho e vínculos organizacionais: proposição de um modelo integrativo e perspectivas de pesquisas. *Revista Gestão & Planejamento*, 20(1), 635-659.

Table 1. Summary of linear regression model

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Estimated standard error	Durbin-Watson
JS → QWL	0.793	0.628	0.624	0.341	2.040

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 2: Analysis of variance of linear regression model

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
JS → QWL	Regression	17.862	1	17.862	153.852	0.000
	Residual	10.565	91	0.116		
	Total	28.427	92			

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 3: Linear regression coefficients of the models

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta (β)	Error	Beta (β)			Tolerance	VIF
QWL	1.350	0.200		6.735	0.000		
Job Satisfaction (JS)	0.661	0.053	0.793	12.404	0.000	1.000	1.000

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Appendix

All items have a 5-point Likert-type scale response format. Participants responded to the items by rating each statement and indicating their opinion on the degree of agreement.

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
Quality of Work Life ($\alpha = 0.863$)		
I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job.	4.387	0.781
I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.	4.301	0.964
I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.	4.409	1.013
I feel well at the moment.	4.226	0.990
My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in around my family life.	4.215	1.082
My current working hours / patterns suit my personal circumstances.	4.269	1.002
I often feel under pressure at work. *	2.484	1.388
When I have done a good job it is acknowledged by my line manager.	3.828	1.167
Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed. *	2.022	1.242
I am satisfied with my life.	3.968	1.037
I am encouraged to develop new skills.	4.032	1.068
I am involved in decisions that affect me in my own area of work.	3.140	1.332
My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively.	4.183	0.977
My line manager actively promotes flexible working hours / patterns.	3.903	1.294
In most ways my life is close to ideal.	3.710	1.028
I work in a safe environment.	4.344	0.961
Generally things work out well for me.	4.312	0.766
I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.	3.710	1.282
I often feel excessive levels of stress at work. *	2.785	1.326
I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.	3.710	1.157
Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered.	3.957	0.999
The working conditions are satisfactory.	4.204	0.927
I am involved in decisions that affect members of the public in my own area of work.	3.226	1.423
I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working life.	3.860	1.049
Job Satisfacion ($\alpha = 0.907$)		
I notice a willingness to collaborate among my coworkers.	3.839	1.096
I have a friendly relationship with my coworkers, and they have the same with me.	4.312	0.921
I get along well with my coworkers.	4.516	0.829
Most of my friends are also my coworkers.	3.000	1.399

I trust my coworkers.	3.387	1.133
I believe my salary is adequate compared to others'.	3.409	1.369
I feel that my salary reflects my responsibilities and contributions to the company.	3.258	1.398
My salary is sufficient to meet the needs of my cost of living.	2.914	1.388
When I receive my salary at the end of the month, I feel it is fair; I believe the amount I receive is appropriate for the work I do.	3.097	1.407
My work effort is fully rewarded by the salary I receive.	3.075	1.408
My boss organizes all the tasks that need to be completed in my department properly and orderly.	3.344	1.355
My boss shows interest in my work.	4.075	1.086
My boss and I have a cordial relationship in the workplace.	4.387	0.909
My boss treats me well in the workplace; they are polite and considerate.	4.419	0.851
My boss holds this position due to their competence; I consider them deserving of the role they occupy.	4.387	0.921
I perform my work with interest and dedication.	4.624	0.658
My work requires close attention to deadlines and details.	4.559	0.758
I am grateful for the opportunity to perform my work.	4.602	0.694
Some stages of my work require special attention to avoid mistakes.	3.194	1.337
To perform my tasks, I carry out various different functions.	3.892	1.184
The time required for a promotion is appropriate and fair.	3.344	1.395
The company offers guarantees and recognizes employees who are promoted.	3.323	1.446
The career or promotion plan is fair and provides opportunities to those who deserve them.	3.204	1.449
I feel I have access to promotions, and it depends on me to make them happen.	3.290	1.543
The time needed for my promotion is appropriate and, in my opinion, fair.	3.118	1.334

* Items with score reversed.