

# ASSESSING THE DIMENSIONS OF QUALITY OF WORK LIFE IN UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENTS: A CASE STUDY AT ORAN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Mohammed Mansouri <sup>1\*</sup>, Hana Bouhara <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psychological and Educational Research Lab, University of Sidi Bel Abbas, Sidi Bel Abbas, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences (Algeria).

Orcid No: 0009-0005-3017-1956

<sup>2</sup> Psychological and Educational Research Lab, University of Sidi Bel Abbas, Sidi Bel Abbas (Algeria).

The Author's E-mail: [mohammed.mansouri@univ-sba.dz](mailto:mohammed.mansouri@univ-sba.dz)<sup>1</sup>, [hana\\_bouhara@hotmail.fr](mailto:hana_bouhara@hotmail.fr)<sup>2</sup>

Received: 05/2023

Published: 01/2024

## Abstract:

**Objective:** This study delves into the Quality of Work Life (QWL) at Oran Graduate School of Economics, aiming to assess its influence on employee well-being in an academic context. It evaluates the availability of QWL and its perceptions across diverse employee segments.

**Methodology:** The research adopted a descriptive-analytical method, utilizing the modified Michigan QWL Questionnaire by Al-Maghribi (2004). The survey assessed six QWL dimensions among 65 employees of varying job categories, genders, and tenures. Advanced statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS v.25. Descriptive statistics provided an overview of the data. In contrast, inferential statistics, including t-tests and one-way ANOVA, examined differences in QWL perceptions. These analyses were pivotal in determining the consistency of responses across different demographic groups and measuring the variability in the perception of QWL elements.

**Findings:** Results indicated a moderate overall QWL level. The questionnaire showed internal solid consistency, validating the survey instrument. Importantly, no significant differences were found in QWL perceptions concerning job category, gender, or tenure, indicating a homogeneous work-life experience across the board. Key insights highlighted the need for job characteristics and participative decision-making improvements to bolster employee engagement and work-life integration.

**Conclusions:** This study enhances the understanding of QWL in the academic sector and underscores the significance of a detailed workplace analysis for improving employee satisfaction in educational institutions.

**Keywords:** Quality of Work Life (QWL); Academic Institutions; Employee Satisfaction; Job Characteristics.

## **Introduction**

Investigating Quality of Work Life (QWL) in academic environments has become a progressively relevant topic in human resources management and organizational behavior. This study focused on the Oran Graduate School of Economics and aims to analyze the intricate characteristics of Quality of Work Life (QWL). It references the influential studies conducted by Abdullah & Hussein (2022) and Asiri & Almengash (2022), which emphasize the substantial influence of QWL on the well-being and engagement of employees. In addition, the study examines the impact of teachers' unions, as analyzed by Mohammed Ali (2022), and explores the quality of work-life measures in Egyptian universities, as investigated by Belabel (2023). This study is enhanced by incorporating the results of Meghnous & Aggoun (2021), who investigated the quality of work life (QWL) at the University of Constantine<sup>2</sup>. Their findings revealed comparable patterns of QWL dynamics. This study aims to provide a detailed comprehension of the Quality of Work Life (QWL), specifically in the distinctive Oran Graduate School of Economics setting. It will analyze employee contentment and drive within this educational framework.

## **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

### **Research Questions**

This research addresses the critical need to understand QWL within the academic sector, particularly at Oran Graduate School of Economics. Our investigation is guided by a comprehensive review of recent scholarly works and aims to answer critical questions:

RQ1: What is the availability level of QWL dimensions at Oran Higher School of Economics?

RQ2: Does the job category affect the Quality of Work Life (QWL) perception among Oran Higher School of Economics employees?

RQ3: Is there a difference in perception of the quality of work life (QWL) between male and female employees at Oran Higher School of Economics?

RQ4: Are there any significant differences in perceptions of quality of work life (QWL) based on years of service among employees at Oran Higher School of Economics?

### **Hypotheses**

H1: The availability of Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions at Oran Higher School of Economics is medium.

H2: Job category affects the Quality of Work Life (QWL) perception among Oran Higher School of Economics employees.

H3: There is no difference in the perception of quality of work life (QWL) between male and female employees at the Oran Higher School of Economics.

H4: There are no significant differences in perceptions of QWL based on years of service among employees at Oran Higher School of Economics.

## Literature Review

### Brief History of Quality of Work Life (QWL)

Tracing the development of QWL, Beach (1999) marks its growing significance in the 1970s, with seminal studies by Cummings & Mollay (1977), David & Cherns (1975), and Hackman & Suttle (1977) contributing to its evolution. The concept, however, experienced a shift in focus in the late 70s and early 80s, as noted by Bowditch & Buono (1994), before regaining prominence in the mid-80s to mid-90s. As Lewis, Goodman, and Fandt (1995) observe, this resurgence was influenced by changing dynamics within organizations and across different national contexts, highlighting the importance of QWL in enhancing both employee satisfaction and organizational efficiency.

### 3.2 Concept of Quality of Work Life (QWL)

### Definition of Quality of Work Life (QWL)

Quality of Work Life (QWL), as defined and explained by researchers such as El-Barbary (2016), Madi (2014), and Jad Al Rab (2008), refers to a comprehensive work environment in which both tangible and intangible factors come together to provide employee happiness and job security. El-Barbary (2016) highlights incorporating these components as crucial for augmenting employee enthusiasm and commitment. Madi (2014) expands upon this notion by applying it to a broader level, defining QWL as including systems and programs that enhance different aspects of human capital, influencing the performance of individuals and organizations. Jad Al Rab (2008) defines Quality of Work Life (QWL) as an ongoing, deliberate process that seeks to balance employees' professional and personal lives while making a meaningful contribution to an organization's strategic goals.

### Research Methodology

#### Operational Definitions

**Quality of Work Life (QWL):** This study's quality of work life is operationally defined by its critical dimensions relating to the workplace environment at Oran Higher School of Economics. Each dimension represents a different aspect of QWL:

- **Work Environment:** This component focuses on the workplace's physical and psychological aspects, such as safety, comfort, and overall atmosphere.
- **Job characteristics:** include the nature of the job, such as the type of work, amount of difficulty, and variety.
- **Wages and Rewards:** This component concerns the financial compensation and perks offered to employees and their satisfaction with their earnings and incentives.
- **Teamwork:** This factor assesses the efficacy and satisfaction of collaborative efforts among colleagues.
- **Supervisory Style:** It evaluates management strategy, leadership style, and supervisor-subordinate interaction.
- **Decision Participation:** This dimension assesses how much employees participate in organizational decision-making processes.

**Educational institutions:** The Oran Graduate School of Economics is an educational institution that focuses on higher education and research in economics. Its goal is to provide quality education and research to prepare future professionals, foster innovation and entrepreneurship, and promote academic excellence.

### Population and Sample Selection

The study's population included individuals employed at the Oran Graduate School of Economics. A random sample of 65 employees from the Oran Graduate School of Economics was used for the investigation. The sample was selected by simple random sampling to guarantee equal representation of all employees, hence augmenting the study's validity. This approach entailed the arbitrary selection of individuals, leading to the participation of 27 males and 38 girls. The objective of this method was to reduce selection bias and faithfully represent the varied experiences and perspectives of the workforce.

### Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The Oran Graduate School of Economics had a workforce of 65 people with a varied demographic composition. They exhibited variations in gender, job categories, and years of experience. The varied demographics contributed to a thorough understanding of the Quality of Work Life (QWL) from multiple perspectives within the organization. In addition, it enhanced the study's significance and suitability to a broad spectrum of employees.

Table 1: Gender Distribution of Study Sample

*Gender Number Percentage (%)*

<i>Male</i>	27	41.5 %
<i>Female</i>	38	58.5 %

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Table 1 indicates that the sample has a higher percentage of women (58.5%) than men. This may be due to changes in the workforce. It is essential to analyse this gender distribution because it could uncover gender-specific trends in Quality of Work Life (QWL) perceptions. The fact that women make up most of the sample could offer insights into the distinct challenges and satisfactions women experience in workplace settings.

Table 2: Job categories Distribution of Study Sample.

<i>Job Role</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Administrators</i>	50	76.9 %
<i>professional workers</i>	15	23.1 %

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Table 2 displays that most of the sample population, 76.9%, were administrators. This highlights the study's specific context, which focuses on Quality of Work Life (QWL) within administrative settings. Such settings are typically characterized by unique workplace dynamics and challenges different from those of professional workers. The significant representation of administrators in the study offers a more focused view of QWL in organizational and support functions.

Table 3: Years of Service Distribution of Study Sample.

<i>Years of Service</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>1-4 years</i>	15	23.1 %
<i>5-10 years</i>	27	41.5 %
<i>11 years and above</i>	23	35.4 %

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Table 3 displays data indicating that a considerable number of participants (41.5%) had been in service for 5 to 10 years. This range of service years is highly significant for evaluating job satisfaction and motivation at a stage in one's career that is often associated with substantial professional growth and role stability. The variation of service years among participants enhances the study by incorporating diverse career experiences and expectations regarding quality of work life.

### **Research Instrument**

The research used the Michigan QWL Questionnaire, which Al-Maghribi (2004) customized for data collection. This questionnaire effectively captures the multi-dimensional nature of Quality of Work Life (QWL). It covers aspects such as Work Environment, Job Characteristics, Wages and Rewards, Teamwork, Supervisory Style, and Decision Participation. The data was analyzed using SPSS v.25, which included descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for summarizing the

data and inferential statistics (t-tests and one-way ANOVA) to explore the variations in QWL perceptions among different demographic groups within the institution.

## Results

### Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument

#### Instrument Validity

Internal consistency validity of the questionnaire items was confirmed by calculating:

- a. Correlation coefficients between each item and its respective dimension

Table 1: Correlation coefficients between each item and its respective dimension.

<b>Dimension 1</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Dimension 2</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Item 01</b>	0,745**	< .01	Item 01	0,463**	< .01
<b>Item 02</b>	0,582**	< .01	Item 02	0,518**	< .01
<b>Item 03</b>	0,519**	< .01	Item 03	0,539**	< .01
<b>Item 04</b>	0,557**	< .01	Item 04	0,732**	< .01
<b>Item 05</b>	0,436**	< .01	Item 05	0,455**	< .01
<b>Item 06</b>	0,673**	< .01	Item 06	0,495**	< .01

  

<b>Dimension 3</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Dimension 4</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Item 01</b>	0,728**	< .01	Item 01	0,441**	< .01
<b>Item 02</b>	0,836**	< .01	Item 02	0,689**	< .01
<b>Item 03</b>	0,475**	< .01	Item 03	0,679**	< .01
<b>Item 04</b>	0,793**	< .01	Item 04	0,633**	< .01
<b>Item 05</b>	0,724**	< .01	Item 05	0,701**	< .01
<b>Item 06</b>	0,630**	< .01	Item 06	0,719**	< .01

<b>Dimension 5</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Dimension 6</b>	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Item 01</b>	0,802**	< .01	Item 01	0,609**	< .01
<b>Item 02</b>	0,717**	< .01	Item 02	0,768**	< .01
<b>Item 03</b>	0,801**	< .01	Item 03	0,843**	< .01
<b>Item 04</b>	0,871**	< .01	Item 04	0,750**	< .01
<b>Item 05</b>	0,890**	< .01	Item 05	0,733**	< .01
<b>Item 06</b>	0,892**	< .01	Item 06	0,810**	< .01

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Note: \*\* indicates a significant correlation ( $p < 0.01$ ). The table shows the correlation between each item and its respective dimension. The data indicates internal solid consistency within each dimension.

Table 1 displays the internal consistency of the questionnaire items by showing the correlation coefficients between each item and its respective dimension. The statistically significant correlations at the  $p < .01$  level across all items indicate that each item is a dependable indicator of its corresponding construct within the questionnaire. This high internal consistency demonstrates that the questionnaire has been well-constructed, ensuring that each dimension accurately represents the intended psychometric property.

#### b. Overall Correlation coefficients Between Questionnaire Dimensions and Total Score

Table 2: Overall Correlation Between Questionnaire Dimensions and Total Score.

<i>QWL Dimension</i>	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<i>Work Environment</i>	0,770**	< .01
<i>Job Characteristics</i>	0,691**	< .01
<i>Wages and rewards</i>	0,599**	< .01
<i>Teamwork</i>	0,744**	< .01
<i>supervisory style</i>	0,652**	< .01
<i>decision participation</i>	0,796**	< .01

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Note: The correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed), indicating that each dimension reliably measures its intended construct.

Table 2 demonstrates the integrative validity of the questionnaire by presenting the significant correlations between each dimension and the total questionnaire score. The fact that all dimensions have high correlations of  $p < .01$  indicates that the questionnaire is reliable and coherent for evaluating the comprehensive construct of Quality of Work Life.

### Instrument Reliability

a. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the Study Instrument.

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for the Study Instrument.

*Number of Items*    *Cronbach's Alpha*

36	0.901
----	-------

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Note: A Cronbach's Alpha of 0.901 indicates a high level of reliability, denoting the questionnaire's internal consistency.

Table 3 shows that the study questionnaire has excellent reliability with a Cronbach's Alpha 0.901. This indicates the internal consistency of the questionnaire, which is crucial for its use in different contexts. The high reliability ensures that the questionnaire provides a dependable and consistent measurement of QWL.

b. Split-Half Reliability of the Study Instrument.

Table 4: Split-Half Reliability of the Study Instrument.

<i>Measurement</i>	<i>First Half (<math>\alpha</math>)</i>	<i>Second Half (<math>\alpha</math>)</i>	<i>Spearman-Brown Coefficient</i>	<i>Guttman Coefficient</i>
<i>QWL Scale Items (n=36)</i>	0.789	0.892	0.747	0.724

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Note: The high-reliability coefficients for both halves of the scale and the Spearman-Brown and Guttman coefficients indicate that the scale is a reliable measure with good stability.

Table 4 presents the results of the split-half reliability method. Both halves of the questionnaire exhibited high-reliability coefficients, further confirmed by the Spearman-Brown and Guttman

coefficients. The consistency of these coefficients indicates that the questionnaire has stable and dependable measurement properties suitable for assessing the Quality of Work Life (QWL) in different contexts and populations.

### Hypotheses Testing

This section presents the outcomes obtained from testing the proposed hypotheses. The study aimed to explore the quality of work-life dimensions in the context of the Oran Graduate School of Economics.

Presentation of the First Hypothesis Results:

H1: The availability of Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions at Oran Higher School of Economics is medium.

Table 8: Mean and Standard Deviation of QWL Dimensions.

<i>Dimensions of QWL</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
<i>Work Environment Conditions</i>	21.82	3.40
<i>Job Characteristics</i>	25.86	3.72
<i>Wages and Rewards</i>	17.72	5.06
<i>Teamwork</i>	21.08	4.20
<i>Supervisory Style</i>	19.03	6.36
<i>decision participation</i>	21.45	4.49
<i>Overall QWL</i>	126.95	19.08

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

The first hypothesis results in Table 8 provide an analytical view of the Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions at the Higher School of Economics in Oran. The data, structured through the mean and standard deviation for each QWL dimension, offer a measurable way to understand the employees' perceptions in different areas of their work life.

A critical analysis of the 'Job Characteristics' dimension, which recorded the highest mean of 25.86, suggests that employees find their roles moderately satisfying regarding job compatibility and demands. This may imply a balance between employee skills and job requirements, but it also points towards potential areas where job enrichment could be beneficial.

The moderate scores in 'Work Environment Conditions' (mean 21.82) and 'Participation in Decisions' (mean 21.45) indicate a satisfactory but not optimal level of employee engagement and satisfaction with the work environment and decision-making processes. These scores suggest that while there is a foundation for a positive work environment, there are opportunities to deepen employee engagement and enhance the quality of their work life.

The 'Teamwork' and 'Supervisory Style' dimensions, also scoring in the moderate range, reflect the dynamics of team collaboration and leadership effectiveness within the institution. The variation in these scores (mean 21.08 and 19.03, respectively) highlights the need for targeted strategies to foster a more cohesive team environment and effective supervisory practices.

Notably, the lowest score in 'Wages and Rewards' (mean 17.72) signals a significant concern regarding employee compensation and recognition. This finding points to a potential mismatch between employee expectations and the institution's reward system, necessitating a review and possible restructuring of the compensation framework.

The overall QWL mean score of 126.95 positions the institution at a moderate level of work-life quality. When analyzed with the individual dimension scores, this comprehensive score provides a nuanced understanding of where the institution excels and where improvement is needed. The alignment of these results with the initial hypothesis underscores the complexity of achieving high QWL. It highlights specific domains where strategic interventions could significantly improve employee satisfaction and organizational performance.

Presentation of the Second Hypothesis Results:

H2: Job category affects the Quality of Work Life (QWL) perception among Oran Higher School of Economics employees.

Table 9: T-test Results for Quality of Work Life Based on job categories.

<i>job categories</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Degrees of Freedom</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<i>professional workers</i>	15	132.73	26.65	63	1.34	0.18
<i>Administrators</i>	50	125.22	16.10	63	1.34	0.18

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

The data presented in Table 09 sheds light on the impact of job categories on employees' perceptions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) at Oran Graduate School of Economics. The table shows the T-test results that compare the mean scores of QWL between two distinct job categories: 'professional workers' and 'administrators.'

Interestingly, the mean QWL score for professional workers is 132.73 (SD = 26.65), slightly higher than that for administrators at 125.22 (SD = 16.10). However, the T-value of 1.34 at 63 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.18 indicates that these differences are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. This suggests that the perceptions of QWL do not significantly differ between these two job categories within the institution.

The lack of significant variation in QWL perceptions based on job categories may imply a uniformly experienced work environment, regardless of specific job roles. This could be attributed to organizational policies, culture, or other overarching factors that uniformly affect all staff members. Such findings are crucial for organizational analysis and strategic planning, as they

indicate areas where uniform policies may be effective or where specific interventions might be needed to address unique challenges faced by different job categories.

Presentation of the Third Hypothesis Results:

H3: There is no difference in the perception of quality of work life (QWL) between male and female employees at the Oran Higher School of Economics.

Table 10: The perception of the quality of work life differs between genders.

<i>Gender</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Degrees of Freedom</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<i>Male</i>	27	128.41	23.68	63	0.51	0.04
<i>Female</i>	38	125.92	15.26	63		

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Table 10 presents the results of a T-test to investigate whether there are any differences in the perception of Quality of Work Life (QWL) among male and female respondents from the Higher School of Economics in Oran. The sample consisted of 27 male and 38 female respondents. The male respondents reported a slightly higher mean score (128.41) for QWL than the female respondents, who reported a mean score of 125.92. The standard deviation for males (23.68) was higher than that of females (15.26), indicating more significant variability in the male responses. However, the T-value of 0.51 and a significance level (p-value) of 0.04 for both genders suggest no statistically significant differences between males and females regarding QWL perceptions at the 0.05 level. This means that gender does not significantly impact perceptions of QWL in this particular context.

These findings support the hypothesis (H3) that no significant differences in QWL perceptions are attributed to gender. Therefore, it reinforces the idea that both male and female respondents perceive their work-life quality similarly within the educational setting of the Higher School of Economics in Oran.

Presentation of the fourth Hypothesis Results:

H4: There are no significant differences in perceptions of QWL based on years of service among employees at Oran Higher School of Economics.

Table11 : One-way ANOVA Results for Quality of Work Life by Years of Service.

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>Sum Squares</i>	<i>Degrees of Freedom</i>	<i>Mean Squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p-value</i>
<i>Between Groups</i>	320.102	2	160.051	0.43	0.65
<i>Within Groups</i>	22982.759	22	370.690		
<i>Total</i>	23302.682	26			

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on outputs from SPSS v.25.

Table 11 presents the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis. The p-value obtained is 0.65, higher than the conventional threshold of 0.05. This indicates that there are no significant differences in the average responses of the sample regarding the quality of work life based on their years of service. In other words, the length of employment at the institution has little impact on employees' perceptions of their quality of work life.

Notably, the degrees of freedom for the 'Between Groups' and 'Within Groups' are 2 and 62, respectively, with corresponding sums of squares. The mean square for 'Between Groups' is 160.051. The F value of 0.43 indicates that the variance between the group means is not significantly different from the variance within the groups, reinforcing the conclusion of no significant differences.

The results support the hypothesis that years of service do not significantly affect employees' perceptions of quality of work life, indicating a consistent experience across different organizational tenure lengths.

## **Discussion**

The study on the Quality of Work Life (QWL) conducted at the Oran Graduate School of Economics reveals notable similarities and differences compared to earlier studies conducted in educational environments. The study revealed a moderate degree of Quality of Work Life (QWL) dimensions, consistent with the findings of Abdullah & Hussein (2022) on the favorable influence of QWL on employee happiness, specifically regarding job characteristics. This aligns with the research conducted by Meghnous & Aggoun (2021), which also discovered a central measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) at the University of Constantine2, suggesting a broader pattern among educational establishments.

Furthermore, the lack of substantial variations in perceptions of Quality of Work Life (QWL) among different job categories aligns with the conclusions drawn by Mohammad et al. (2022). It echoes the universal patterns identified in Meghnous & Aggoun's (2021) research, indicating a consistent organizational influence that surpasses specific work responsibilities. Verma & Sharma (2018) argue that the dominance of organizational culture significantly impacts job categories in QWL, as evidenced by the uniformity in perception.

The study also discovered no notable disparities in the perception of quality of work life (QWL) depending on gender. This finding aligns with the research conducted by Naik Eslavath et al. (2019) and suggests that educational institutions provide equitable work settings, as demonstrated by the studies of Meghnous & Aggoun (2021). Kermansaravi et al. (2014) also observed that policies that are not biased towards any particular gender promote this pattern.

Furthermore, the study revealed that service years did not have a noteworthy influence on individuals' perceptions of quality of work life (QWL), aligning with Pereira et al.'s (2023) research findings. This suggests that the experience of QWL remains consistent regardless of the duration of

tenure, which aligns with the observations made in Meghnous & Aggoun's (2021) study. The findings of Sikandar et al. (2023) in higher educational institutions also support this consistency.

Integrating these discoveries with prior scholarly works, including the research conducted by Meghnous & Aggoun (2021), emphasizes the intricate nature of Quality of Work Life (QWL). It highlights the necessity for additional investigation to examine the intricate dynamics of quality of work life (QWL) in educational environments, considering the impact of aspects such as job characteristics, work environment, and organizational culture.

## Conclusion

This research focuses on the Quality of Work Life (QWL) at the Oran Graduate School of Economics. The study reveals a moderate level of QWL, which is consistent with similar academic settings reported by Meghnous & Aggoun (2021), Abdullah & Hussein (2022), and Asiri & Almengash (2022). The findings emphasize the significant impact of job characteristics, work environment, and equitable policies on employee satisfaction and motivation, aligning with broader observations in the field.

The results indicate that academic institutions should enhance QWL further. Improvements in the work environment, job design, and compensation strategies are crucial. Institutions should reconsider their reward systems and job structures to better align with employee expectations, drawing insights from studies like those by Mohammad et al. (2022) and Verma & Sharma (2018).

Moreover, the study underlines the importance of leadership and teamwork. Investment in leadership development and team-building initiatives is vital. Encouraging inclusive decision-making, as suggested by the findings of Naik Eslavath et al. (2019), can further promote employee engagement and a more dynamic organizational culture.

The uniformity of QWL perceptions across different job categories and genders indicates the effectiveness of current policies but also emphasizes the need for ongoing policy evaluation. Adapting strategies to address the diverse needs of the workforce, considering factors like gender and tenure, as also observed by Kermansaravi et al. (2014) and Pereira et al. (2023), can enhance the overall QWL.

In conclusion, This study provides valuable contributions to the existing literature on Quality of Work Life (QWL) in educational settings, offering insights that can inform policy and organizational development. Future research should aim to explore further the complex interplay between organizational structures, employee expectations, and the unique challenges faced by academic professionals in their work environments, as highlighted by the diverse range of studies referenced in this study.

## References

Abdullah, S. & Hussein, S. (2022). Improving the Quality of Life Work for Employees and Faculty Members at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University given the Employee Experience Management Approach (EEM). *Journal of Educational Science*, 9(1), 285–317. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363891432>

- Aggoun, C., & Meghnous, D. Z. (2021). Measuring the quality of work life for employees at the Faculty of Economics, Commerce and Management Sciences at the University of Constantine2. *Djadid El-Iktissad*, 16(1), 265-265. Retrieved from <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/175123>
- Al-Barbary, M. H. (2016). The role of quality of work life in reducing job burnout among workers in Al-Aqsa Network for Media and Art Production [Master's thesis, Al-Aqsa University]. Al-Aqsa University Repository. Retrieved from <https://iugspace.iugaza.edu.ps/handle/20.500.12358/20290>
- Ali, M. S. (2022). A proposed perception for activating the role of the Teachers' Union in Fayoum Governorate in light of the quality of work-life indicators. *Journal of Fayoum University for Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 16(5), 428–515. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jfust.2022.151129.1721>
- Belabel, W. M. A. (2023). Indicators of quality of work life in Egyptian universities: A field study of a sample of faculty members and their assistants at Menoufia University. *Journal of the Faculty of Arts, Beni Suf University*, 7(67), 447-496. <https://doi.org/10.21608/jfabu.2022.142052.1183>
- El-Maghribi, A. A. (2004). Quality of work life and its impact on job immersion: A field study. *Journal of Commercial Studies and Research, Zagazig University*, 2, 253-318.
- Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., Navabi Rigi, S., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2014). The relationship between quality of work life and job satisfaction of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences faculty members. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 7(2), 228–234. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v7n2p228>
- Mohammad, A., Abd El Rahman, S., Ali, R., & Ali, H. (2022). Effect of Organisational Cynicism on Quality of Work Life and Employee Effectiveness among Nursing Staff. *Minia Scientific Nursing Journal*, 011(1), 2-10. <https://doi.org/10.21608/msnj.2022.118885.1017>
- Naik Eslavath, K. D., & Khaleel, A. F. (2019). Quality of Work Life of Educators in Lebanese French University. *International Journal of Management*, 10(1), 65-82. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3526771>
- Pereira, N. G., Silva, R. M. F., Oliveira, I. F. R., Fernandes, M. D. S. V., Costa, W. P. D., Vitta, A., Noll, P. R. E. S., & Noll, M. (2023). Administrative professionals' quality of life in educational institutions: A systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open*, 13(8), e074119. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-074119>
- Sharma, D., & Verma, P. (2018). Quality of Work Life in Academics Concerning Motivational Theories. *Business Review International*, 11(4), 159–165. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352680582>
- Sikandar, M. A., & Sikandar, A. (2023). Assessing the Quality of Work Life for Women Officers in Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Computers, Mechanical and Management*, 2(1), 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.57159/gadl.jcmm.2.1.23035>.