



ORGANISATIONAL PRESSURE AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF STAFF OF UNIVERSITIES IN DELTA NORTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT, NIGERIA

Ofili, E. C.¹ⁱ,

Obiunu, J. J.²

¹Department of Guidance and Counselling,
Delta State University,
Abraka, Nigeria

²Dr., Department of Guidance and Counselling,
Delta State University,
Abraka, Nigeria

Abstract:

This study examined the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work life among the staff of universities in Delta North Senatorial District. Two research questions and two null hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted the correlational research design. The population comprised 1,445 staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The sample of the study comprised 429 staff. The staff was selected through a multi-stage sampling procedure. The instrument that was used to collect data for this study is a questionnaire. The psychometric properties of the instrument were established and adjudged to be adequate. The research questions were answered with the aid of regression and Fisher-z statistics were used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work life of staff in universities; but that there is no significant moderating impact of sex on the relationship that exists between organisational pressure and quality of work life of staff in universities; and that there is a significant relationship among organisational pressure, self-efficacy, and quality of work life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The study recommended that management of universities in Delta North Senatorial District should take note of the impact of organisational pressure on quality of work life of staff and ensure that such pressures are reduced to their barest minimum in order to give the staff a sense of job satisfaction and overall quality of work life.

Keywords: organisational pressure; academic staff; non-academic staff; quality of work life; tertiary institutions

ⁱ Correspondence: email ofili.emmanuel@delsu.edu.ng, obiunu@delsu.edu.ng

1. Introduction

Tertiary education is the education given after secondary education in universities, colleges of education, polytechnics, monotechnics including those institutions offering correspondence courses. Universities (as one of the tertiary institutions) over the years have served as training grounds of high-level manpower development centres for the various sectors of the economy and also engaging in systematic discourse and research venues all aimed at ensuring proper human interaction. It is in line with this that Oyekan (2014) suggested that universities are expected to be agency saddled with the task of extending the frontiers of knowledge for the overall benefit of society.

At the heart of universities, is the workforce, made up of academic and non-academic staff. Academic staff is those charged with the responsibility of academic work which includes lecturing, research, and in most cases community services. They perform the major functions of universities. Non-academic staff on the other hand include a variety of staff such as secretaries, clerks, typists, storekeepers, laboratory assistants, and similar others. This category of staff renders support services to assist the academic staff in their job performances. Generally, the functions of academic staff in universities include management of students' affairs, planning for university activities, implementing policies and expectations of higher authorities, planning for staff development, trying to cope with allocating scarce educational resources, and providing leadership in all areas of higher education management. They are also expected to serve on various committees, communicate vital information, keep records and files, and perform other tasks assigned to them by the management.

From the above, it is clear that staff in universities perform very important roles, without which, the institutions cannot play the role of high-level manpower development. They are one of the greatest resources in any society, and play a crucial role in training specialized forces. Ultimately, the result of their efforts is social development and growth in human capital. Imparting specialized knowledge is made possible by higher educational institutions only with the sincere efforts of the staff employed in these higher educational institutions. Passing on specialised knowledge to the student community can happen effectively only when the teaching staff is truly committed to their profession and the non-teaching staff provides the requisite support.

Apart from their primary roles, staff of universities is expected to be expert in their various subjects, possessing in-depth knowledge about related fields of specialisation, an embodiment of empathy, with high tolerance level and a technology savvy, and the list is infinitely big. Having such a great expectation about them from all quarters, they need to fulfil a lot of obligations. Combining these roles with family is such a herculean task. After going through so much in the workplace, an employee will still go home to the rigours of life at home. Thus, their contributions toward the successful implementation and execution of their work are very important. This can happen once the person involved feels that his or her expectations are taken care of by the management or the institution. His or her level of satisfaction makes a big difference in his or her

contributions to the development of the institutions. One of the results of job satisfaction is Quality of work life.

Quality of work life is the quality of the relationship between employees and the total working environment, with human dimensions, technical and economic consideration (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2013). It is necessary for the competitive environment for maintaining qualified and skilled employees. High quality of work life helps to fulfil employee's needs, thereby fulfilling organizational goals effectively and efficiently. According to Saraji and Dargahi (2006), quality of work life is a dynamic multi-dimensional construct that includes concepts such as job security, reward systems, training and career advancements opportunities, and participation in decision-making.

Quality of work life is considered to be the quality of association between employees and the total working environment: with human dimensions, technical and economic considerations. In other words, QWL could be measured on factors such as; work-life balance, job satisfaction and contentment, career advancement opportunities, and so on. Recently, the organizational responses to the changing needs of working families resulted in the concept of Flexible work arrangements (FWA). FWA can take many forms, but most options involve giving employees greater control over when and where work gets done and how much time employees choose to work (Harrington & Hall, 2007). Therefore, this becomes an important part of balancing employees' work and life resulting in a higher degree of QWL for employees (Sahni, 2017).

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is both a goal and an ongoing process for achieving that goal. As a goal, quality of work life is the commitment of an organization to work improvement: the creation of more involving, satisfying, and effective jobs and work environments for people at all levels of the organization. The process of improving the quality of work life requires everyone in the organization to actively participate in efforts to achieve this aim (Boonrod, 2009). It is a process through which a company reacts to employee requirements by creating tools that let them fully participate in the choices that shape their working lives. It is employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace (Iqbal, 2013). Quality of Work Life is a continuing process, which means utilizing all resources, and especially human resources. It means developing among all members of the organization awareness and understanding of the concerns and needs of others and a willingness to be more responsive to those concerns and needs (Dargahi, Sharifi, & Yazdi, 2007).

QWL is also a combination of strategies, procedures, and ambiance related to a workplace that all together, enhance and sustain employee satisfaction by aiming at improving work conditions for the employees of the organizations (Sinha, 2012). To ensure the organization's long-term efficacy and success, enhancing how things are done is also a part of increasing the quality of one's working environment.

A lot of variables are associated with quality of work life, which have either influence on quality of work life or influenced by quality of work life. Some of these may include organisational pressure. Organisational pressure is the physical, mental, and

emotional wear and tear brought about by incongruence between the requirements of job and capabilities, resources, and needs of the employee to cope with job demands. It is an unavoidable characteristic of life and work. Arising from the nature of their work, university staff are bound to experience pressure in the course of performing their duties. Ahsan, et al. (2009) identified sources of organisational pressure among university staff of tertiary to include work overload, homework interface, role ambiguity, and performance pressure. Others may include conducting research, conflict, demands from colleagues and supervisors, incompatible demands from different personal and organization roles, inadequate resources for appropriate performance, insufficient competency to the demands of their role, inadequate autonomy to make a decision on different tasks, and feeling of underutilization.

Organisational pressure produces a condition of psychological strain that causes employees to display several negative behavioural reactions. It can produce physical and psychological disabilities. It is also associated with lower employee morale, motivation, and job satisfaction, increased tardiness, high rates of absenteeism and turnover, reduced productivity, decreased quality and quantity of care, and increased costs of healthcare services.

Organisational pressure is a serious threat to the quality of working life (QWL) of employees and can cause hostility, aggression, absenteeism, and turnover, as well as reduced productivity. High levels of organisation pressure have been linked to low levels of productivity, as stress decreases attention, concentration, and decision-making skills. Pressure from work can lead the body to experience some physiological reactions that can affect an individual physically and mentally.

In various tertiary institutions in Delta State, organisational pressure and its impact on the quality of work life are the prominent entities affecting the employees. Employees are laden with domestic responsibilities and work responsibilities, both of which require due attention. Thus, there arises a need to strive for the attainment of work-life balance. Getting work-life balance involves devoting equal time to work and family; equal psychological involvement at work and family front; and getting an equal level of satisfaction from work and family roles. According to reports, people who prioritize their families over their careers have the highest life quality and the least stress (Pandu, et al., 2013).

Apart from the influence of organisational pressure on the quality of work life of staff, the researcher is interested in the moderating role of sex. Many of the factors that generate stress—or stressors—are psycho-social in nature. Moreover, it is generally accepted in the literature that people react differently to exposure to these factors. In other words, stress-related symptoms or illnesses can vary between individuals. Thus, it is also important to consider sex when studying stress-related problems.

According to Rivera-Torres, et al. (2013), women and men are exposed to different working environments and different types of demands and tensions, even when they work in the same sector and profession. Research shows that organisational pressure can affect both men and women. Nevertheless, women may be disproportionately exposed

to more stressors. Women have greater exposure to monotonous tasks than men, are less likely to do jobs involving problem-solving or learning, are less likely to be able to choose when to take a break from their work, and are more likely to be interrupted by unexpected tasks (Gunkel, et al., 2007).

In view of the above and arising from the fact that university staff, in order to be able to perform their duties very well and satisfied, there is need them to possess the quality of work life, this study is therefore aimed to examine the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

2. Statement of the Problem

Observations have shown that most staff in tertiary institutions in Delta North Senatorial District seem to lack quality of work life. This is evidenced by the numerous complaints observed by the researcher that their employers are not being fair to them in terms of the provision of good working conditions, leading to job dissatisfaction. This is compounded by failure or inability to promptly pay salaries. The life of staff in these universities seems to be that of constant struggle. Struggles at work with the workload, colleagues, and supervisors; and struggle at home with their spouse, children, in-laws, and other domestic demands. All these combined with the poor condition of service are making the attainment of quality of work life elude an average university staff. In this kind of situation, it is difficult if not impossible to expect an optimal level of performance from such an employee.

Certain factors have been shown to be responsible for this poor quality of work life among university staff. However, the focus of this study is on organisational pressure. The problem of this study, therefore, is, to what extent will organisational pressure influence the quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District?

2.1 Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

- 1) Is there any relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District?
- 2) Is there any moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District?

2.2 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

- 1) There is no significant relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

- 2) There is no significant moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

3. Methods

This study adopted the correlational research design. The population of the study comprised 1,445 staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The sample comprised 151 academic staff and 278 non-academic staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial State (representing 50.50% and 24.26% of the entire population of academic and non-academic staff respectively). The staff was selected from across public universities in Delta North Senatorial District through a multi-stage sampling procedure. In the first stage, the number of staff in each university was selected through a proportionate sampling technique. For instance, 50.50% of academic staff and 24.26% of non-academic staff were selected from each of the selected universities. In the second stage, the stratified sampling technique was used to categorise the staff into male and female staff. Then in the third stage, the researcher used a convenience sampling technique to select the staff that eventually took part in the study. In this case, only staff who were available and willing to participate in the study were allowed to participate.

The instrument that was used to collect data for this study is a questionnaire, which is divided into four sections. Section A of the questionnaire contains demographic data of the respondents such as sex and years of experience. Section B contains Organisational Pressure for Academic Staff. It was adapted from previous studies of Archibong et al. (2010) and Ofoegbu and Nwadiani (2006). It contains 26 items that are designed to measure the level of organisational pressure of academic staff (however, the items were reduced to 22 after validation). Section C contains Organisational Pressure for Non-Academic Staff. It was adapted from Peretomode (2012). It contains 22 items, that are designed to measure the organisational pressure of non-academic staff. Section D contains items on Quality of Work Life, which was adapted from the Chelladurai (2012). It contains 49 items that are designed to measure the quality of work life of academic and non-academic staff. Items on the Quality-of-Work-Life Scale were structured on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 for Strongly Disagree to 4 for strongly agree (However, the items were reduced to 24 after validation).

The face validity of the instruments was established by three experts in Guidance and Counselling Department. These experts assessed the instruments for appropriateness and suitability to the objective of the study, and their suggestions were reflected in the final version. After the face validity, 50 copies of the questionnaire were administered to 50 staff in Delta State University, Abraka, and the data obtained were subjected to factor analysis. The principal component analysis of the extraction method was used to estimate the content validity of the instrument. It yielded the following values 70.26% for Organisational Pressure for Academic Staff Rating Scale; 73.35% for Organisational Pressure for Non-Academic Staff Rating Scale; and 80.32% for Quality of

Work Life Rating Scale. In order to estimate the construct validity of the instruments, the rotated factor loading of the varimax method was done, which yielded the following values: 0.55-0.88 for Organisational Pressure for Academic Staff Rating Scale; 0.62-0.94 for Organisational Pressure for Non-Academic Staff Rating Scale; and 0.54-0.98 for Quality of Work Life Rating Scale.

In order to establish the reliability of the instruments, 50 copies of the instruments were distributed and administered to 50 staff of Delta State University Abraka. The data generated were analysed with Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient in order to determine whether the instruments have internal consistency. It yielded the following coefficients 0.84 for Organisational Pressure for Academic Staff Rating Scale; 0.80 for Organisational Pressure for Non-Academic Staff Rating Scale; and 0.80 for Quality of Work Life Rating Scale.

The questionnaire was administered to the respondents directly by the researchers with the help of two research assistants. The research assistants were recruited and trained by the researchers. The scope of the training covered the objectives of the study, and how to collect and collate the data in good condition. The researcher was on ground throughout the period to offer guidance. For ethical reasons, the respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the information provided. They were told that the process is completely voluntary and that they were free to discontinue the activities if and when they feel uncomfortable. The questionnaire was retrieved immediately to avoid loss of data. In analysing the data, regression and fisher-z statistics were used to test the hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance.

4. Results

Research Question 1: Is there any relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District?

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

Table 1: Regression analysis of the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District

Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Regression	178.548	1	178.548	22.881	.000 ^b
Residual	3292.978	422	7.803		
Total	3471.526	423			
Variables in Equation					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	72.371	.783		92.455	.000
Organisational Pressure	.082	.017	.227	4.783	.000
$\alpha = 0.05$, $R = 0.227$, $R\text{-Square} = 0.051$ a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Work Life b. Predictors (Constant): Organisational Pressure					

In Table 1, the researcher presented the result of a regression analysis, which was used to test the hypothesis that states that there is no significant relationship between organisational pressure and the quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The result shows that $F(1, 423) = 22.881$, $p < 0.05$ level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. This implies that there is a significant relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

The R^2 value of 0.051 showed that organisational pressure contributed 5.1% to the variability in quality of work life among staff of universities. The unstandardized coefficient (B) for predicting quality of work life from organisational pressure is 0.082; the standardized coefficient (β) was 0.227, $t = 4.783$. Organisational pressure is significant at an alpha level of 0.05.

Research Question 2: Is there any moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District?

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District

Table 2: Pearson’s correlation and Fisher’s Z statistics of the moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District

Sex	Variable	N	r	Fisher-z	Remark
Male	Organisational Pressure	242	0.168	0.62	Not Significant
	Quality of Work Life				
Female	Organisational Pressure	182	0.109		
	Quality of Work Life				

In Table 2, the researcher presented the result of a Pearson’s correlation and Fisher’s Z statistics, which was used to determine the moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The result shows that male staff had a coefficient (r) of 0.168 while female staff had a coefficient (r) of 0.109.

In order to determine the moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District, the statistical significance of the difference between the correlation coefficients of the male and female staff was conducted and a value of 0.62 was obtained, which is less than 1.96, the correlation coefficients are therefore not statistically significantly different. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, which means that there is no significant moderating impact of sex on the relationship between organisational pressure and quality of work of life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District.

5. Discussion

The finding revealed that there is a significant relationship between organisational pressure and the quality of work life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. This finding implies that organisational pressure can influence the quality of work life of the staff of universities. This is probably because staff who are always facing organisational pressure may likely not achieve quality of work life. Organisational pressure has a way of diminishing people's satisfaction with their jobs.

The above finding is in line with the finding of Fredman and Doughney (2012), which revealed that the well-being of staff has been found to be negatively affected by reduced academic autonomy, increased workloads, and high job insecurity. The finding also agrees with Kian-Sam, et al. (2010), whose finding revealed a moderate relationship between work life quality and work commitment, stress, and satisfaction. The finding is also consistent with the result of Raeissi, et al. (2019), which revealed that major influencing factors of quality of work life were inadequate and unfair payment, lack of solving staff problems by organization and poor management support, job insecurity, high organisational pressure, unfair promotion policies, and inadequate involvement in the decision-making. Again, the results are in line with those of Kelbiso, et al. (2017), who found that busy schedules, poor staffing, a lack of decision-making autonomy, performing tasks unrelated to nursing, a lack of professional development opportunities, an unsuitable work environment, and low pay were the main causes of low QWL.

The finding, however, shows that there is no significant moderating impact of sex on the relationship that exists between organisational pressure and quality of work life of staff in universities in Delta North Senatorial District. What this finding implies is that sex does not moderate the likely influence of organisational pressure and quality of work life of staff. The way organisational pressure affect staff may be the same irrespective of their sex. Male staff may experience organisational pressure the same way as female staff. Hence, how such pressure affects their quality of work life may also be the same.

The above finding agrees with Kian-Sam, et al. (2010), whose finding showed that no differences in work stress and satisfaction based on the same demographic variables. The finding, however, is at variance with Cuéllar-Molina, et al. (2018); Sullivan (2019); Chung and Van Der Lippe (2020), whose findings revealed demonstrated that sex plays a vital role in quality of work life. The finding also disagrees with Indumathi and Selvan (2013), whose finding revealed that compared to male staff, female employees are greatly affected in the quality of work life factors such as stress, social integration and communication at the work place.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that organisational pressure can influence the quality of work life among staff of universities in Delta North Senatorial District. The relationship that exists between organisational pressure and quality of work

life cannot be moderated by the sex of staff. In other words, both male and female staff will experience the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable in the same way. Arising from the findings of this study, the study recommended that management of universities in Delta North Senatorial District should take note of the impact of organisational pressure on quality of work life of staff and ensure that such pressures are reduced to their barest minimum in order to give the staff a sense of job satisfaction and overall quality of work life

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors did not declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Ofili E. C. is a Priest of the Roman catholic, who is currently doing an M.Ed. degree in Guidance and Counselling. He obtained his B.A. Philosophy, BTh Theology and Postgraduate Diploma in Education.

Obiunu, J. J. is a Priest of the Roman catholic. He is currently of Professor of Guidance and Counselling.

References

- Ahsan, N., Abdullah, Z., Gun Fie, D. Y., & Shah Alam, S. (2009). A Study of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction among University Staff in Malaysia: Empirical Study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1).
- Archibong, I. A., Bassey, A. O., Effiom, D. O. (2010). Occupational stress sources among university academic staff. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 217-225.
- Boonrod, W. (2009). Quality of Working Life: Perceptions of Professional Nurses at Phramongkutkloao Hospital. *Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand*, 92, 7-15.
- Chelladurai, K. (2012). *Quality of work life and job satisfaction A Study with reference to the Faculty Members of Higher Educational Institutions in Coimbatore District*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Bharathiar University, Tamilnadu.
- Chung, H., & Van Der Lippe, T. (2020). Flexible working, work-life balance, and gender equality: introduction. *Soc Indic Res.*, 151, 365–81. doi: 10.1007/s11205-018-2025-x
- Cuéllar-Molina, D., García-Cabrera, A. M., & Lucia-Casademunt, A. M. (2018). Is the institutional environment a challenge for the well-being of female managers in Europe? The mediating effect of work–life balance and role clarity practices in the workplace. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*, 15, 1813. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15091813
- Dargahi, H., Sharifi, & Yazdi, M. K. (2007). Quality of Work Life in TUMS Hospital Clinical Lab Employees. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 23, 630-633.
- Fredman, N., & Doughney, J. (2012). Academic dissatisfaction, managerial change and neoliberalism. *Higher Education*, 64(1), 41–58.

- Gunkel, M., Lusk, E., Wolf, B., & Li, F. (2007). Gender specific effects at work: An empirical study of four countries. *Gend. Work Organ.*, 14, 56–79.
- Harrington, B., & Hall, D. T. (2007). *Career management & work-life integration: using self-assessment to navigate contemporary careers*. Sage.
- Indumathi, G. S., & Selvan R. T. (2013). A perception on quality of work-life among male and female employees in the information technology companies. *International Journal of Research in Engineering & Technology*, 1(7), 31-36.
- Iqbal, K. (2013). Determinants of Organizational Justice and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction. A Pakistan Base Survey. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2, 48-56.
- Kelbiso, L., Belay, A., & Woldie, M. (2017). Determinants of quality of work life among nurses working in Hawassa town public health facilities, South Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *Nurs Res Pract.*, 5, 15–26.
- Kian-Sam, H., Kok-Wah, T., & Suraini, B. (2010). Relationships Between Work Life Quality of Teachers with Work Commitment, Stress and Satisfaction: A Study in Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia, *Jurnal Teknologi*, 1–15.
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Swamy, D. R. (2013). Review of Literature on Quality of Work life. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 7(2), 201-214.
- Ofoegbu, F., & Nwandiani, M. (2006). Level of perceived stress among lecturers in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33 (1), 66-74.
- Oyekan, O. A. (2014). Resource Situation as Determinants of Academic Staff Productivity in Nigerian Universities. *European Journal of Globalization and Development Research*, 9(1), 545-551.
- Pandu, A., Balu, A., & Poorani, K. (2013). Assessing work-life balance among IT & ITeS women professionals. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 611-620.
- Peretomode, V. F. (2012). *Leadership: Concepts, Principles and Theories*. Lagos: O. O. P. Limited.
- Raeissi, P., Rajabi, M. R., Ahmadizadeh, E., Rajabkhah, K., & Kakemam, E. (2019). Quality of work life and factors associated with it among nurses in public hospitals. *Iran. Journal of the Egyptian Public Health Association*, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42506-019-0029-2>.
- Rivera-Torres, P., Araque-Padilla, R. A., & Montero-Simó, M. J. (2013). Job Stress Across Gender: The Importance of Emotional and Intellectual Demands and Social Support in Women. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 10, 375-389; doi:10.3390/ijerph10010375
- Sahni, J. (2017). Exploring what constitutes 'quality' in quality of work life for female employees. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 11(4), 785–798.
- Saraji, G. N., & Dargahi, H. (2006). Study of Quality of work life (QW L), *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, 35(4), 8-14.
- Sinha, C. (2012). Factors Affecting Quality of Work Life: Empirical Evidence from Indian Organizations. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1, 31-40.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Open Education and E-learning Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).