Comparative Study of the Quality of Life, Quality of Work Life and Organisational Climate Instruments

MSc. Rudy de Barros Ahrens, MSc. Renata Klafke , Prof. Dr. Luciana da Silva Lirani, Prof. Dr. Luiz Alberto Pilatti , Prof. Dr. Antonio Carlos de Francisco

Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná (UTFPR) – Campus Ponta Grossa, Brazil. Telephone: 55-42-9821-7475 // 55-42-3235-7027

Abstract: *People's lives are increasingly centred on work; they spend at least one-third of their time within the organisations that employ them. Investigating the factors that interfere with employees' well-being and the organisational environment is becoming an increasing concern in organisations. This article identifies the criteria of the quality of life (QoL), quality of working life (QWL) and organisational climate instruments to point out their similarities. For bibliographic construction and data research, articles were sought in national and international journals, books and dissertations/articles in SciELO, Science Direct, Medline and Pub Med databases. The results show direct relationships amongst QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments. The relationship between QoL and QWL instruments is based on fair compensation, social interaction, organisational communication, working conditions and functional capacity. QWL and organisational climate instruments are related through social interaction and interfaces. QoL and organisational climate instruments are related based on social interaction, organisational communication, and work conditions.*

Keywords: *Employee Involvement; HR Management; Job Satisfaction; Evaluation*

I. Introduction

The success of organisations is directly related to the needs of the market in which they are located. In this respect, success or failure can be influenced by employees' dedication and commitment, as well as what they think about the company where they work. The reduction of hierarchical levels, product changes, strategies, mission, vision and values are changing more rapidly; these shifts affect communication and are making managers rethink organisational decision-making processes (Ahrens, Timossi, & De Francisco, 2015; Rose, Beh, & Uli, 2006).

As a result of these changes in organisational structures, the quality of life (QoL), quality of working life (QWL) and the organisational climate are enduring profound shifts, creating a challenge for managers and highlighting the role of the human resource department (Ahrens et al., 2015).

Oliveira and Limongi-France (2005) reiterate the importance of human beings' living conditions. People's lives are increasingly centred on work; they spend at least one-third of their time within the organisations that employ them. Investigating the factors that interfere with employees' well-being and the organisational environment is becoming an increasing concern in organisations. According to Denisi (2011), the proper focus of performance evaluation is to change the behaviour of workers at work, and focus of organizational environment research is to show employees the company is trying to make a better and pleasant place for them to work. Given this focus, Timossi (2009) and Finegan (2000) point out that organisations should adopt a more human vision of the worker to identify the variables that can be improved to enhance the health and well-being of people in their work environments, thereby maximising the individual's performance, because improving the company's performance will allow strategic goals to be reached more easily and reduce the turnover (Denisi, 2011).

Developing a satisfactory working environment for employees not only involves financial and economic elements but also socio demographic and behavioural components, including working hours, time spent with family and personal and professional growth (Ahrens et al., 2015; Moen, Lam, Ammons, & Kelly, 2013). Werther and Davis (1983) argue that environmental, organisational and behavioural challenges directly influence the work environment. Moreover, Freitas, Souza and Quintella (2013) comment that the increase or maintenance of the QoL, QWL and organisational climate represents a major challenge.

In the last forty years, the QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments were created to identify any personal and organisational problems, but none of these have similar characteristics or purposes (Minayo, 2013). Currently, there are different ways (interviews, questionnaires, and research validated instruments, like WHOQOL-100, FS-36) (Constanza et al. 2007) that can be used to analyse the organisational environment, but each of these comprises different perspectives and goals. Considering validated academic instruments, one considers QoL, another focuses on QWL and a third identifies the organisational climate; yet, all of them have

similar elements and features that are directed towards the same purpose, and they create time and financial costs for the company when applied individually that could be reduced in combining these instruments.

Using one approach (micro-organisational) to visualise the organisational environment may not be the most appropriate method, as human beings are bio psychosocial, complex and often influenced by their culture. The term bio psychosocial was coined in the 1970s to express the view that medicine needed not only biomedical approach but also a psychological focus whereby social factors could also be addressed (Cooper, Bilton, & Kakos, 2012). Because of human complexity, at one time or another, a worker will have a different perception of the organisation where he works; thus, managers need to visualise the organisational environment as a whole (macro-organisational approach), making viable the identification of problems or situations that represent the organizational environment as a whole.

This study is justified because it is clear that there are direct and indirect relationships between the QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments. They have characteristics that seek the same goal, but until now, no research has addressed this relationship among them. Thus, the aim of the present study is to identify the indicators of the QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments and clarify their similarities.

II.   Methods

This research can be characterised as bibliographical, descriptive and qualitative. For bibliographic construction and search of the data, the authors searched for articles in national and international journals, doctoral theses, books that are reference in the topic and dissertations in SciELO, ScienceDirect, Medline and PubMed databases. The research period was between 1960 and 2015, which refers to the historical evolution of the instruments of analysis of the organizational environment.The studied subjects were as follows: a) quality of life, b) quality of working life, c) organisational climate, d) quality of life instruments, e) quality of life at work instruments and f) organisational climate instruments. After the survey, the reference list for the literature was constructed. For this, 17 articles from international journals, 24 articles from national magazines, 4 theses, 4 dissertations and 25 books were chosen.

To identify the relationships between the QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments, it was necessary to identify the areas, factors and indicators of each instrument. For these comparisons, four QoL instruments, four QWL instruments and five organisational climate instruments were selected. These instruments were mainly chosen because they are internationally used and recognised. Furthermore, they have greater representation than other instruments in the organisational scenario. Apart from that they were repeated used in the articles studied during the exploratory analysis.

In the research scenario there are some different tools for the QoL analysis, such as: i) QWB (1970) - Quality of Well-Being. QWB is a generic instrument that measures the general health and well-being over the past three days. The instrument is divided into physical activities, social activities, mobility and complex symptom and problems; ii) SIP (1976) - Sickness Impact Profile. It is a generic questionnaire used to assess the impact diseases have in the physical and emotional sphere; iii) EQ-5D (1987) - The health questionnaire EuroQol. This questionnaire was developed by EuroQoL group in 1987, and it has basically five dimensions: mobility, personal care, usual activities, discomfort and anxiety or depression. But, for this work, other QoL instruments were selected, as follows: FS-36 (1997), WHOQOL-100 (1999), QVS-80 (1999) and NHP (2004).

After choosing the QoL tools, the authors directed the study to the QWL instruments. The ones found in the research scenario were: i) Werther and Davis (1983) – The authors see the QWL compromised by some factors, which are: supervision, working conditions, income, benefits and job projects; ii) Nadler and Lawler (1983) identified some factors that predict the success of projects in the QWL, such as perceived need; focus in the problem, training project template, compensation designed for both process and for the results, multiple systems, and extensive involvement of the organization/managers; iii) Rodrigues (1994) examines the man versus his relations with work and living conditions, as well as workers' expectations about their jobs. He studied the first manifestations that took place in the seventeenth century until the modern behavioural theories. For him, the manager is studied through classical and evolution concepts, as well as in terms of their roles and conflicts; iv) Pedroso (2010) developed the TQWL-42, a general instrument for assessing the quality of working life evaluating the quality of working life from 42 questions sectioned into six major areas: Biological / Physiological, Psychological / Behavioural, Sociological / Economic / Environmental Policy and / Organizational;

As noticed, although there are several instruments, the chosen QWL instruments for this study were basically selected because of their academic and professional usage and validity. So, the analysed ones were: Fernandes (1996), Hackman and Oldham (1975), Timossi (2009) and Westley (1979). After the selection, the authors of this paper sought to identify the indicators of each instrument. Bordering the existing organizational climate instruments, it is possible to identify some tools to measure this variable: i) Kozlowski (1989), which expands Litwin and Stringer´s models (1968), from nine to eleven factors, integrating climate and leadership; ii) Rizzatti´s instrument (2002) was created in his master's thesis (1995) to analyse the organizational climate of the

Federal University of Santa Catarina. Later on, in 2002, he improved it in his doctoral thesis, when he made a greater study involving other federal universities from the South of Brazil; iii) Martins (2008) presents a series of factors that aim to map the leaders' support towards the physical, control / pressure and the cohesion between colleagues. These variables are easily confused with satisfaction at the workplace; iv) Menezes, Sampaio, Gomes, Teixeira and Santos (2009) carried out their instruments based on Sbragia (1983) and Kolb et al. (1986) studies, thus proposing a model of only six factors: security, strategy, remuneration, community relations, leadership and professional development; Although the above studies were mentioned and identified in the literature, this paper chose other instruments to analyse, basically because of their academic and professional eminence. So, the following models were chosen for this work: Bispo (2006) model, Coda (1997) model, Kolb (Kolb, Rubin, & McIntyre, 1978) model, the Litwin and Stringer (1968) model and Sbragia (1983) model. After the selection, identification and analysis of these instruments, the authors sought to evaluate the similarities amongst them, this identification, analysis and evaluation were based on the researched documents (articles from international journals, articles from national magazines, theses, dissertations and books). This was indicated by X, which represented indicators obtained in each instrument.

III.   Results And Discussion

3.1 Interface between QoL and QWL

After selecting the instruments, the domains, factors and indicators of each one were identified. Table 1 shows the indicators selected for the QoL instruments.

Table 1 – Interface of the QoL models

DOMAINS/FACTORS/INDICATORS	SF-36	WHOQOL-100	QVS-80	NHP
Functional capacity	x	-	-	-
Pain/discomfort/energy/fatigue/sleep	x	x	x	x
Vitality	x	-	-	-
Health	x	-	x	-
Social/interaction/social relations/social support/sexual activity	x	x	x	x
Body image/appearance	x	x	x	
health/psychological health /self-esteem/positive feeling	x	x	x	x
Mental health	x	-	-	-
Mobility/activities of daily life/drug dependence	-	x	x	-
Environment security/transport/physical environment/ participation/leisure/health care/financial resources/home environment/opportunity information	-	x	x	-
Religion/belief	-	x	-	-
Physical activity/physical ability	-	x	x	x
Occupational environment	-	-	x	-
QoL perception	-	x	X	-
Work capacity	-	x	-	-

Source: Authors 2016

It can be observed that the SF-36, WHOQOL-100 and QVS-80 instruments are more complex and have wider ranges of indicators. Meanwhile, WHOQOL-100 is more representative, and it is able to identify complex elements in people's QoL. The NHP has few areas, which may ultimately affect the verification of QoL, since it cannot explore this area in a complex manner. Table 2 shows the areas, factors and indicators of each QWL instrument.

Table 2 – Interface of the QWL models

DOMAINS/FACTORS/INDICATORS	TIMOSSI	WESTLEY	HACKMAN AND OLDHAM	FERNANDES
Responsibility/autonomy/commitment	-	x	x	-
Compensation/reward/promotion/pay/benefits/working hours	x	x	-	x
Relationship/interpersonal relations/ cooperation	x	x	x	x
Company image/identity/pride/liability of the company and community	x	-	-	x
Consideration/prestige/tolerance/staff appreciation	x	x	-	-
Growth opportunity/professional incentives/challenges	x	x	-	-
Communication/information flow/knowledge information /feedback	x	x	x	x
Influences of work on life/work impact/work awareness	x	-	x	-
Working conditions/physical/security/cleaning	x	-	-	x
Labour relations/company x union employees	-	x	-	
Participation/creativity/decision making/public ideas	x	x	-	x
Assistance to employees/health/education/occupational health	-	-	-	x
Capabilities/identifying with the task/ job security / variety of task / multi-skilling	x	x	x	-
Work organisation/methods/working groups	-	-	-	x
Social integration into the workforce/ discrimination	x	-	-	-
Constitutionalism/law enforcement/structures /rules	x	-	-	-

Source: Authors 2016

The instrument developed by Timossi (2009) addresses a larger number of domains, factors and indicators of QWL than the other tools. The tool with the next greatest number of domains, factors and indicators is Westley's (1979) instrument. Timossi's (2009) tool adapts Walton's (1973) dimensions, and it has become an international reference for QWL assessment.

Comparing the QoL and QWL frameworks, it is clear that the indicators relate to the same goal. The factors of 'relationships', 'interpersonal relations' and 'cooperation' reported in the QWL instruments can also be seen in the QoL instruments under the terms 'social items', 'integration', 'social relations', 'social support' and 'sexual activity'. These indicators seek to identify whether the individual has social relations with other individuals or society in general. In the WHOQOL-100 instrument, this is represented by Domain IV (social affairs); this is verified in the Timossi instrument in the domain of social integration within the organisation.

Other indicators identified in the Timossi and Westley QWL instruments are 'the condition of work', 'physical condition', 'security' and 'cleaning', which can be related to 'environment', 'physical security', 'transport', 'physical environment', 'leisure participation', 'health care', 'financial resources', "home environment" and 'opportunity to access information' in the QoL instrument. This covers working conditions in general to identify the quality of such conditions in the organisation". In the WHOQOL-100, Domain V (environment) relates to Timossi's (2009) instrument in terms of security conditions and health.

It is also clear that the factors of 'assistance to employees', 'health', 'education' and 'occupational health' in the QVT instruments are related to 'occupational environment' in the QoL instruments. This factor seeks to identify characteristics of the workplace in terms of whether the organisation provides appropriate assistance to its employees.

There is a relationship between the indicator of 'functional capacity' in the QWL instruments and the indicators of 'capacity', 'identifying with the task', 'job security', 'variety of tasks', 'versatility' and 'commitment' in the QoL instruments.

The final factor that shows the relationship between the QWL and QoL is 'ability to work'; the QWL instruments include 'capabilities', 'identifying with the task', 'job security', 'variety of tasks', 'versatility' and 'commitment'. Furthermore, 'organization work, 'methods' and 'working groups' are categorised under 'capacity to work' in the QoL instruments.

One can also verify a relationship between 'compensation', 'rewards', 'promotion', 'pay' and 'benefits' in the QWL instruments and 'environment', 'physical security', 'transport', 'physical environment', 'leisure participation', 'health care', 'financial resources', 'home environment' and 'opportunity to access information' in the QoL instrument. Finally, one can verify that the indicators of 'communication', 'information flow', 'knowledge' and 'information feedback' in the QWL instruments are related to 'environment', 'physical security', 'transport', 'physical environment', 'leisure participation', 'health care', 'financial resources', 'domestic environment' and 'information opportunity' in the QoL instrument.

3.2 Interfaces between QoL and organisational climate

In considering the relationship between the QoL and QWL instruments, special attention was paid to the relationship between QoL and the organisational climate. Table 3 lists the areas, factors for each of these instruments.

Table 3 – Interface of the organisational climate

DOMAINS/FACTORS/INDICATORS	LITWIN AND STRINGER	KOLB	SBRAGIA	BISPO	CODA
Structure/rules	x	-	x	x	x
Responsibility/autonomy/commitment	x	x	x	-	x
Motivation/rewards/promotion/ compensation/justice/wage policy	x	x	x	-	x
Relationship/cooperation/teamwork	x	-	x	x	x
Conflict/organisational clarity/leadership/support/organisational culture	x	x	x	x	x
Identity/pride	x	-	x	x	-
Participation/initiative/integration	-	x	x	-	-
Personal appreciation/ recognition/consideration /prestige /tolerance	-	x	x	x	-
Growth opportunities/professional incentives /challenges /progress	x	-	x	x	x
Communication	-	x	x	-	x
Job stability	-	-	-	x	x
Transportation home x work x home	-	-	-	x	-
Sociocultural level	-	-	-	x	-
Security	-	-	x	-	-
Relationship between company and union employees	-	-	-	-	-

Family living	-	-	-	x	-
Vacation/leisure	-	-	-	x	-
Physical and mental health	-	-	-	x	-
Family financial situation	-	-	-	x	-
Politics/local, national and international economy	-	-	-	x	-
Public security	-	-	-	x	-
Social life	-	-	-	x	-
Sports	-	-	-	x	-

Source: Authors 2016

It can be observed that the Bispo (2006) and Coda (1997) models are complex instruments that cover internal and external indicators. Both are recognised and used, but they have not been validated. Amongst the models listed in the table, only which Sbragia´s work (1983) has been validated; although it does not have the complexity of Bispo's (2006) and Coda's (1997) indicators, it is internationally recognised.

Comparing the QoL and organisational climate framework, it can be perceived that there are areas that relate to the same goal in the two instruments. 'Social items', 'interaction', 'social relations', 'social support' and 'sexual activity' in the QoL instruments parallel the 'relationship' and 'cooperation' items presented in the organisational climate instrument. While in the QoL instruments, these items assess the existence of personal and professional relationships, in the organisational climate instruments, only professional relationships are considered.

Other indicators that can be associated in the QoL and organisational climate frameworks are the 'environment', 'physical security', 'transport', 'physical environment', 'leisure participation', 'health care', 'financial resources', 'domestic environment' and 'opportunity to access information' in the QoL instruments versus 'physical conditions', 'security', also the 'transport' home, 'work', 'communication', 'vacation', 'leisure', 'motivation', 'rewards', 'promotion', 'pay', 'justice', 'wage policy' and 'physical and mental health' items in the organisational climate instruments. Finally, in the QoL instruments, the occupational environment item is related to the physical conditions and safety items presented in the organisational climate instruments.

3.3 The interface between QWL and organisational climate

In Tables 2 and 3, the authors illustrate the areas of the selected instruments. The first indicator to have a relationship is 'responsibility'/'autonomy' in the QWL instruments, which is related to 'responsibility'/'autonomy'/'commitment' in the organisational climate tools.

One can also see that the compensation indicators of 'rewards', 'promotion', 'pay', 'benefits' and 'hours' identified in the QWL instruments are related to the items of 'motivation', 'rewards', 'promotion', 'remuneration', 'justice' and 'salary policy' in the organisational climate instrument. The terms 'relationships', 'interpersonal relations' and 'cooperation' used in the QWL tools are analogous to 'relations', 'cooperation' and 'teamwork' in the organisational climate instruments. In the QWL instruments, the indicators of 'company image', 'identity', 'pride' and 'community' are related to 'identity' and 'pride' as presented in the organisational climate instruments. The QVT instruments also point to 'consideration', 'prestige', 'tolerance', 'personal appreciation' and 'position', which are connected to 'personal valuation', 'recognition', 'consideration', 'prestige' and 'tolerance' in the organisational climate instruments. It is also clear that in the factors of 'growth opportunities', 'professional incentives' and 'challenges' in the QVT tools, there are connections with the items of 'growth opportunities', 'professional incentives' and 'challenges' in the organisational climate instruments.

Other related items are 'communication', 'flow of information', 'knowledge information' and 'feedback', as indicated in the QWL instruments. These connect with 'communication' in the organisational climate instruments. It is also possible to relate the factors of 'working conditions', 'physical security' and 'cleaning' in the QWL instruments with 'physical conditions' and 'security' in the organisational climate instruments. 'Union relations' or 'company-employee relation in the QWL instruments are related to the item of 'company–union official relationships' indicated in the organisational climate instruments. It is also notable that the areas of 'participation', 'creativity' and 'decision making' in the QWL instruments are related to 'participation', 'initiative' and 'integration' in the organisational climate instruments.

The final indicator that exhibits a relationship is 'constitutionalism' or 'compliance with laws, structures and rules' in the QWL instruments and 'structures' or 'rules' in the organisational climate instruments.

3.4 Relationship entre QWL, QoL and organisational climate instruments

Table 4 demonstrates the indicators that are in common in the three instruments (QWL, QoL and Organizational Climate instruments).

Table 4 - Relationship entre QWL, QoL and organisational climate instruments

DOMAINS/FACTORS/INDICATORS	QWL	QoL	Organisational climate
Fair compensation	x	x	x
Social interaction	x	x	x
Organisational communication	x	x	
Working conditions	x	x	x
Functional capacity	x	x	x
Functional responsibility	x	-	x
Institutional image	x		x
Personal recovery	x		x
Growth opportunities	x		x
Union relationships	x		x
Professional valuation	x		x
Functional assistance	x		x
Constitutionalism	x		x
Emotional and psychological		x	x
Logistics		x	x
Personal environment		x	x
Job security		x	x

The common indicators presented in the three instruments are 'fair compensation', 'social interaction', 'organizational communication', 'working conditions' and 'functional capacity'.

The other indicators: 'functional responsibility, 'institutional image', 'personal recovery', 'growth opportunities', 'union relationships', 'professional valuation', 'functional assistance', 'constitutionalism', 'emotional' and 'psychological', 'logistics', 'personal environment' and 'job security' are not related.

IV.   Conclusion

This survey focussed on the identification of the elements/criteria of the QoL, QWL and organisational climate instruments. Four QoL instruments (SF-36, WHOQOL-100, QVS-80, NHP), four QWL instruments (Fernandes, 1996; Hackman & Oldham, 1975; Timossi, 2009; Westley, 1979) and five organisational climate analysis tools (Bispo, 2006; Coda, 1997; Kolb et al., 1978; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Sbragia ,1983) were selected to assess their similarities.

It was observed that the three types of instruments had similarities, and their areas/factors and indicators were related. The relationships between the QoL and QWL instruments were based on 'fair compensation', 'social interaction', 'organisational communication', 'working conditions' and 'functional capacity' aspects.

The QWL and organisational climate instruments were correlated in terms of 'functional responsibility', 'fair compensation', 'social interaction', 'institutional image', 'personal recovery', 'growth opportunities', 'organisational communication', 'work conditions', 'union relationships', 'professional valuation', 'functional assistance', 'functional capacity' and 'constitutionalism' indicators. Furthermore, the QoL and organisational climate instruments were related through 'fair compensation', 'social interaction', 'organisational communication', 'work conditions', 'functional capacity', 'emotional' and 'psychological', 'logistics', 'personal environment' and 'job security' aspects. Thus, it is clear that the three types of instruments are related to the following areas: 'fair compensation', 'social interaction', 'organisational communication', 'working conditions' and 'functional capacity'.

One of the major limitations of this study was that no previous work that incorporated QoL, QWL and organisational climate was found. SciELO, ScienceDirect, Medline and PubMed databases were searched for sources, but only articles relating the relationship between QoL and QWL were retrieved. The small number of organisational climate instruments that have been internationally validated and recognised is another limitation. From the five selected instruments for implementation, only one has been validated and recognised.

Authors' contributions

RA and ACF are the idealisador of this paper. They outlined the project and the work schedule. They conducted the main research, collected the data information and analysed most of the results.

LS is the co-guiding the research. Person with expertise in the subject, who also read and corrected the final paper. She also contributed with the conclusions.

RK helped to construct the theory background and translated the original article into the English language.

LP also wrote some parts of the results of each instrument and approved the final paper.

All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

References

[1]. Ahrens, R. B, Timossi, L. S, & De Francisco, A. C. (2015). Análise da qualidade de vida no trabalho em frigorífico através de correlação multivariada. *Revista espacios*, *36*(2), 10.

[2]. Balcazar, F., Hopkins, B. L., & Suarez, Y. (1985). A critical, objective review of performance feedback. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 7(3-4), 65-89.*

[3]. Bispo, C. A. F. (2006). Um novo modelo de pesquisa de clima organizacional. *Revista produção, 16*(2), 258–273.

[4]. Ciconelli, R. M., Ferraz, M. B., Santos, W., Meinão, I., & Quaresma, M. R. (1999). Tradução para a língua portuguesa e validação do questionário genérico de avaliação de qualidade de vida SF-36 (Brasil SF-36). *Revbrasreumatol*, *39*(3), 143–150.

[5]. Coda, R. (1997). Pesquisa de clima organizacional e gestão estratégica de recursos humanos. *Psicodinâmica da vida organizacional: motivação e liderança*, *2*, 94–107.

[6]. Cooper, P., Bilton, K., & Kakos, M. (2012). The importance of a *biopsychosocial* approach to interventions for students with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Routledge Handbooks Editor.*

[7]. Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Ali, S., Beer, C., Bond, L., Boumans, R., ... & Gayer, D. E. (2007). Quality of life: An approach integrating opportunities, human needs, and subjective well-being. *Ecological Economics, 61(2), 267-276.*

[8]. Denisi, A. S. (2011). Managing performance to change behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, *31*(4), 262–276.

[9]. De Souza Minayo, M. C. (2013). Qualidade de vida e saúde como valor existencial. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, *18*(7), 1868.

[10]. Fernandes, E. (1996). QVT: como medir para melhorar. *Salvador: Casa da qualidade*.

[11]. Freitas, A. L. P., de Souza, R. G. B., & de Meirelles Quintella, H. L. M. (2013). Qualidade de Vida no Trabalho do técnico-administrativo em IES públicas: uma análise exploratória. *Revista brasileira de qualidade de vida*, 5(2).

[12]. Finegan, J. E. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*(2), 149–169.

[13]. Fleck, A. M. P. (2000). O instrumento de avaliação de qualidade de vida da Organização Mundial da Saúde (WHOQOL-100): características e perspectivas. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, *5*(1), 33–38.

[14]. Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(2), 159.

[15]. Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I. M., & McIntyre, J. M. (1978). *Psicologia organizacional: uma abordagem vivencial*. Atlas Editor.

[16]. Litwin, G. H., & Stringer Jr, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Oxford: Harvard University Graduate School of Business.

[17]. Moen, P., Lam, J., Ammons, S., & Kelly, E. L. (2013). Time work by overworked professionals strategies in response to the stress of higher status. *Work and Occupations*, *40*(2), 79–114.

[18]. Oliviera, P. M., & Limongi-França, A. C. (2005). Avaliação da gestão de programas de qualidade de vida no trabalho. *RAE - eletrônica*, *4*(1).

[19]. Rose, R. C., Beh, L., Uli, J., & Idris, K. (2006). Quality of work life: Implications of career dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 61–67.

[20]. Sbragia, R. (1983). Um estudo empírico sobre o clima organizacional em instituições de pesquisa. *Revista de Administração da Universidade de São Paulo*, *18*(2).

[21]. Teixeira-Salmela, L. F., de Castro Magalhães, L., Souza, A. C., de Castro Lima, M., Lima, R. C. M., & Goulart, F. (2004). Adaptação do Perfil de Saúde de Nottingham: um instrumento simples de avaliação da qualidade de vida. *Caderno de Saúde Pública*, *20*(4), 905–914.

[22]. Timossi, L. D. S. (2009). Correlações entre a qualidade de vida e a qualidade de vida no trabalho em colaboradores das indústrias de laticínios.Dissertação Mestrado Universidade Tecnológica do Paraná, *Ponta Grossa*.

[23]. Vilela Junior, G. B., Leite, N., Cieslak, F., Silva, T., & Albuquerque, A. M. (2007). Objetividade e subjetividade: desafios no processo de validação do instrumento qualidade de vida e da saúde (QVS-80). *Qualidade de vida, esporte e sociedade*, *3*(1), 59–62.

[24]. Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review*, *15*(1), 11.

[25]. Werther, W. B., & Davis, K. (1983). Administração de pessoal e recursos humanos. In *Administração de pessoal e recursos humanos*. 499 McGraw-Hill.

[26]. Westley, W. A. (1979). Problems and solutions in the quality of working life. *Human Relations*, *32*(2), 113–123.