

QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE TEST

© 2016, PE Konsult Ltd. All rights reserved.

Quality of Working Life is a term that had been used to describe the broader job-related experience an individual has. Quality of Working Life (QWL) refers to the favorableness or unfavorableness of a job environment for the people working in an organization. So, QWL is defined as the favorable conditions and environments of a workplace that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing them with rewards, job security, and growth opportunities.

The Quality of Working Life Test is a 48-item psychometric test that adopts Likert-type forced choice 6-point scale. For example, Scales: from 1-point “Very much unfavorable” to 6-points “Very much favorable”.

There are 6 factors (48 items) included into the Quality of Working Life Test, namely: (1) Relationships at work (16 items); (2) Demands at work (4 items); (3) Work tempo (3 items); (4) Pay (3 items); (5) Work itself (8 items); (6) Work environment and safety (4 items). Examples of items incorporated within Quality of Working Life Test (favorableness or unfavorableness with reference to how you have felt over the last 3 months in your workplace): “Work itself” and “Work equipment or resources” and “Work/family balance” and “Work-related feedback” and “Level of stress experienced at work” and “Work organization (how the work is organized)”.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The term QWL (quality of working life) has been used in academic literature for over 50 years and usually refers to aspects of the broader concept of quality of life that relates to the work setting. Typically, the conceptualization of QWL has incorporated job satisfaction and wellbeing, but agreement on what else should be included among key facets has been hard to achieve.

The QWL is a multi-dimensional concept, which has been defined by scholars in diverse ways showing discrepancy on its constructs as well as components (Levine et al., 1984; Mirvis and Lawler, 1984; Taylor, 1978; Walton, 1975). Some studies associate the concept of QWL with employee’s wellbeing (Lawler, 1982), conditions of work life (Elizur and Shye, 1990), income sufficiency, employee satisfaction, and work relations (Mohan and Kanta, 2013).

Job satisfaction is how content an individual is with his or her job. Scholars and human resource professionals generally make a distinction between affective job satisfaction and cognitive job satisfaction.

Wellbeing is a general term for the condition of an individual or group, for example their social, economic, psychological, spiritual or medical state; high well-being means that, in some sense, the individual or group's experience is positive, while low well-being is associated with negative happenings.

Muftah (2011) mentioned that QWL was one of the key areas of human resource management that is attracting attention and research focus. It was a philosophy that

considers people as the most important resources in the organization and views them as an “asset” to the organization rather than as “costs”. Hence, if organizations are concerned about developing their human resources and gaining a competitive advantage in the marketplace, it seems necessary that they attend to one of their most precious assets, namely, their human resources by employing high- quality working-life experiences in consonance their various needs eliciting favorable job-related responses in return (Chandrashu Sinha, 2012). Ahmad (2013) stated that the core pillar of QWL was to create a work environment that employee could work cooperatively with each other in order to achieve to organization objectives.

VALIDATION

Internal correlations are shown in Table below.

Table. Within Sample Correlations in Quality of Working Life Test (N =677)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Job satisfaction	1							
Quality of Working Life (general)	0.66	1						
1. Relationships at work	0.60	0.95	1					
2. Demands at work	0.29	0.58	0.46	1				
3. Work tempo	0.49	0.73	0.62	0.42	1			
4. Pay	0.47	0.71	0.62	0.38	0.47	1		
5. Work itself	0.69	0.90	0.81	0.38	0.61	0.61	1	
6. Work environment and safety	0.56	0.78	0.68	0.32	0.63	0.54	0.69	1

All presented correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

RELIABILITY

Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach α or coefficient alpha) was 0.97; Generally ranges from 0.72 to 0.97 (see Table below).

Table. Reliability Statistics for Quality of Working Life Test (N = 677)

Factors	Number of items	Reliability Statistics* Cronbach α
Job satisfaction	4	0.87
Quality of Working Life (general)	44	0.97
1. Relationships at work	16	0.95
2. Demands at work	4	0.72
3. Work tempo	3	0.81
4. Pay	3	0.75
5. Work itself	8	0.90
6. Work environment and safety	4	0.85

* Widely is accepted .70 coefficient alpha as a standard (Nunnally, 1978)

ESTONIAN NORMS

Estonian Norms for Quality of Working Life Test (see Table). Estonian norms are based on 543 people from 2 samples (one general sample, N=371, and one occupational (nurses' sample, N=172).

Table. Descriptive statistics of Quality of Working Life Test results in Estonia. Scales: from 1-point “Very much unfavorable” to 6-ponts “Very much favorable”.

Quality of Working Life Factors	NURSES (N=119)		EST (N=319)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Job satisfaction	4.94***	0.64	4.59	0.81
Quality of Working Life (general)	4.49	0.59	4.37	0.72
1. Relationships at work	4.56	0.70	4.43	0.87
2. Demands at work	3.42	0.92	3.45	1.06
3. Work tempo	4.41	0.94	4.35	0.94
4. Pay	4.17	1.01	3.96	1.08
5. Work itself	4.84*	0.59	4.65	0.74
6. Work environment and safety	4.74	0.76	4.76	0.84

Significantly different from the EST sample: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

POLISH NORMS

Polish Norms for Quality of Working Life Test (see Table). Polish norms are based on 234 people from one general sample.

Table. Descriptive statistics of Quality of Working Life Test results in Poland. Scales: from 1-point “Very much unfavorable” to 6-ponts “Very much favorable”.

Quality of Working Life Factors	M	SD
Job satisfaction	4.29	0.93
Quality of Working Life (general)	4.14	0.75
1. Relationships at work	4.27	0.80
2. Demands at work	3.66	0.99
3. Work tempo	4.07	0.93
4. Pay	4.00	1.05
5. Work itself	4.20	0.83
6. Work environment and safety	4.26	0.92

CORRELATION BETWEEN QWL AND PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE

Reliability between QWL test and Perceived Performance Scale (PPS) was 0.94.

Table. Correlations between quality of working life (measured by QWL test) and perceived performance (measured by Perceived Performance Scale) (N = 677).

Quality of Working Life Factors	Perceived performance
Job satisfaction	0.69*
Quality of Working Life (general)	0.60*
1. Relationships at work	0.52*
2. Demands at work	0.06
3. Work tempo	0.55*
4. Pay	0.44*
5. Work itself	0.65*
6. Work environment and safety	0.58*

* Correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)

PUBLICATIONS and/or CONFERENCES

(Bibliography of Studies Using the QWL test)

Teichmann, M. (2016). *E-HRM* (Human Resource or Personnel or Human Factor or Human Capital). In: Conference “New approaches to HR management: do they work in Central and Eastern Europe?” University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland, the 6th of October 2016.

Teichmann, M., Murdvee, M., Kożusznik, B., Smorzewska, B., Gaidajenko, A., Ilvest, J. Jr. (2017). *Relationship between the Employees’ Perceived Performance and Various Work Related Psychosocial Characteristics*. In: European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) Congress “Enabling Change through Work and Organizational Psychology”, May 17th - 20th 2017, Dublin, Ireland (in press).

Teichmann, M. (2017). *Changing world of work*. In: Congress “Psychology in the crossroad of traditions and innovations or Psychology between traditions and innovations”, 11th of May 2017, Vilnius. Lithuania (in press).