

## **The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment**

Dr. Heba Kamal Elqassaby

Lecturer of Business Administration in Delta Higher Institute for Computers, Delta Academy of science and Technology

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this research is to find the relationship between Quality of Work Life and organizational commitment. The data was collected from random governmental Saudi Arabian hospitals. This research was applied to a sample of 116 employees. The result of the study has indicated that there is a significant relationship between Quality of Work Life and organizational commitment. The research has recommended that organizations need to improve the Quality of Work Life in order to increase the employees' organizational commitment; thus, increase the organization's productivity.

**Key Words:** Quality of Work Life, Organizational Commitment.

### **1. Introduction**

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is a broad concept that involves salary, leave benefits, job stress, work load, nature of job, behavior of the employees, work-life balance, and such. This

concept has a great influence on the employees' work performance (Parameswari & Kadiravan, 2011). QWL can be referred to as the quality of employees' experience as they interrelate in a relationship with their organizations (Noor & Abdullah, 2012).

When organizations ignore improving the QWL of their employees, they will suffer from the poor performance of their dissatisfied employees. QWL is a reason for the employees to be motivated and do their work with satisfaction and commitment (Parameswari & Kadiravan, 2011). Therefore, organizations need to work on improving QWL of their workforce if they are willing to have high performance employees who will lead the organizations to increase their productivity. In addition, QWL is essential for the organization to keep and gain the highly qualified personnel (Normala, 2010).

Organizational commitment can be defined as the employee's faith in the goals and values of the organization. It is the willingness of the employee to spend more effort to achieve the organizational goals (Ashman, 2007). Another point of view was adopted by Meyer and Allen (1991), which introduced the three component model of organizational commitment. The three component model of organizational commitment consists of: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Each one of the three components conceptualizes a type of the individual's relationship with the organization.

Organizational commitment is the employees' behavior of being loyal to their organizations, which can be determined by including the employees in the process of organizational decision making, in addition of their well-being (Feizi, Ebrahimi, & Beheshti, 2014). The consequences of organizational commitment are: increased employee motivation, increased work performance, and decreased the intention to turnover (Berberoglu, 2018). Therefore, organizations need to have employees who are mentally connected to the organization, more productive, and highly qualified to perform the job.

QWL and organizational commitment are positively associated to each other. Organizations that offer better QWL have the advantage of gaining valuable workforce. Having better QWL with all of its dimensions is most likely to give the employees an impression of appreciation, which will make them become more attached and committed to the organization (Huang, Lawler, & Lei, 2007).

## 2. Literature Review

This section displays previous studies about quality of work life, organizational commitment, and quality of work life and organizational commitment. It provides what researchers have found through time about the two variables of the study and how they defined them.

## **2.1. Quality of Work Life**

Walton (1980) broke down the components of QWL into four categories which are: work social and organizational equilibrium, work meaningfulness, richness, and work challenge. QWL fulfills the conciliation interests of the employees and the organization. Therefore, it improves the employees' satisfaction and the productivity of the organization (Choudhury, 2015).

### **2.1.1. Definitions of Quality of Work Life**

Igbaria, Parasuraman, and Badawy (1994) pointed that QWL can be defined as the way in which employees of the Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs) are capable to fulfil their essential personal needs through their experiences at their work environments.

Allen (2001) defined QWL as a set of efforts that improve the organization's productivity through improving humans.

Lau, Wong, Chan, and Law (2001) described QWL as the good working environment that fosters employees' satisfaction by offering them with career growth opportunities, remunerations, and job satisfaction.

Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, and Dong-Jin (2001) outlined QWL as the individual's satisfaction with the different essentials through activities, outcomes, and resources. Hence, the

satisfaction needed from the workplace experiences affects job satisfaction and overall life satisfaction.

Rose, Beh, Uli, and Idris (2006) stated that QWL can be considered as a philosophy about how people are responsible, trustworthy, and have the ability to make valuable support to their organizations.

Huang et al. (2007) defined QWL as the work conditions and environments, and life facets that are favorable for employees such as self-actualization, family and work life balance, supervisory behavior, and compensation.

Rethinam and Ismail (2008) considered QWL as a wide scope term, which involves safe and healthy working environment, and adequate and fair compensation that supports the employees to improve and use their full capacities.

Dasgupta (2010) described QWL as the extent to which a work can help the employee to become satisfied and meet his/her needs. The QWL term is a broad term that involves the needs ranging from physical working conditions or fair compensation to social relevance of the work.

Normala (2010) defined QWL as the work conditions and environments that are favorable by the employees such as growth and development, physical environment, supervision, participation, work integration, social relevance, and pay and benefits.

Gayathiri, Ramakrishnan, Babatunde, Banerjee, and Islam (2013) stated that QWL elucidates the relationship between the employee and his/her environment, which includes different dimensions such as economic, technical, and social dimensions.

According to Surienty, Ramayah, Lo, and Tarmizi (2014), QWL provides a clarification of the relationship degree between the individual and his/her understanding of life that is related to the work environment.

Choudhury (2015) defined QWL as a multidimensional concept that involves security, growth opportunity, better pay, improved organizational productivity, and social integration.

According to Kochar (2015), QWL is a general term that involves processes and techniques which help in giving the employees more control on the work they do.

Ojedokun, Idemudia, and Desouza (2015) described QWL as a guide to the quality of the employee's experience in the work environment. Whether the experience was negative or positive, the ability of the organization to fulfill the employees' personal needs determines the employees' evaluation of their QWL experiences.

According to Sharma, Sharma, and Pandey (2016), QWL involves both mental and objective dimensions of work life. The programs of QWL concentrate on developing the employees' skills and decrease the occupational stress.

Rahmani and Eghbali (2018) stated that QWL can be defined as a set of outcomes for employees such as job security, job satisfaction, psychological growth opportunities, fewer accidents, and the good relations between the employee and the employer.

### **2.1.2. Importance of Quality of Work Life**

According to Lau and May (1998), offering a reasonable level of QWL such as better benefits and supportive working conditions would help the organization to become effective in hiring and maintaining valuable workforce. They described how QWL does not only contribute to the organization's recruitment ability, but also enhances its competitiveness through the human resources department. Lau and May (1998) concluded that QWL benefits both the organization and the employees since having a better reputation for rewarding employees will reward the organization by getting higher profitability and growth.

Rose et al. (2006) stated that the role of QWL programs is to provide both faculty and management with the advantage to mutually fix problems at work, restructure tasks carefully, build cooperation, and manage human resource outcomes fairly.

According to da Silva Timossi, Pedroso, de Francisco, and Pilatti (2008), QWL can bring benefits and competitiveness to the organization regarding its workers and products by the

development and application of programs that work on improving the work environment.

Cheung and Leung (2010) emphasized that QWL relates to job satisfaction and depends on employment, which results in making the quality to be responsive to societal quality of life and social change.

According to Normala (2010), it is essential to organizations to have a high QWL in order to retain and attract the employees.

Parameswari and Kadhiravan (2011) asserted that QWL has a significant influence on job performance of the employees; thus, employers need to improve their QWL in order to avoid poor performance of dissatisfied employees.

According to Gayathiri et al. (2013), it was observed by researchers that in order to attain growth and high performance in profitability, organizations have to provide high QWL.

Permarupan, Al-Mamun, and Saufi (2013) considered QWL as a basic tool that provides great organizational productivity and enhances working conditions from the perspective of the employee.

Chen, Yu, Chao, and Cheng (2014) found that negative QWL enhances turnover intention, and that work value has a

significant effect on QWL, and QWL on turnover intention. They suggested that work value is important in relation to QWL.

According to Torlak, Tiltay, Ozkaea, and Dogan (2014), QWL is involved in the satisfaction of the employees' needs at their work environment. Some examples of the other employees' needs are self-fulfillment, respect, health and security requirements, and information.

According to Choudhury (2015), QWL concentrates on the overall work environment that raises the involvement of the employees in decision making and problem solving of the organization.

Guha (2015) pointed that QWL is important to develop the excellent working conditions for the employees to be more productive and more satisfied and for the organization to become profitable. The study emphasized that there is a substantial relationship between QWL and organizational performance; thus, organizations need to provide healthy QWL for employees in order to get the best performance.

Gupta and Hyde (2016) suggested that good QWL results in reducing absenteeism and improving job satisfaction, which enhances the organizational competitiveness.

### 2.1.3. Improving Quality of Work Life

According to Sirgy et al. (2001), involving employees in decision making and role clarity affects QWL in a positive way. Also, higher levels of QWL and job satisfaction can be attained by providing higher levels of performance feedback.

da Silva Timossi et al. (2008) stated that QWL focuses on the individual by trying to offer a better working conditions in order to help them perform their assigned tasks with well-being and satisfaction.

Surienty et al. (2014) stated that QWL is related to turnover intention in a negative way. They concluded that organizations should work on improving the QWL of their employees. For this, Surienty et al. (2014) suggested some reward programs that involve the employees and their families, and how these programs can make them attached to the organization.

Torlak et al. (2014) stated that employees' job satisfaction and performance can be increased by a great QWL. In addition, QWL can cause a reduction in labor turnover and alienation.

Choudhury (2015) emphasized that all of the organizations around the world focus on improving QWL of their employees in order to keep them feel delighted by developing working environment.

Sharma et al. (2016) stated that QWL can be improved with the help of motivation theories along with designing reward system, work design, and empowering employees.

#### **2.1.4. Quality of Work Life in Relation to Other Concepts**

Sirgy et al. (2001) stated that the focus of QWL involves more than job satisfaction. QWL includes the influence of work environment on employee's job satisfaction, non-work life satisfaction, and the overall life satisfaction.

Cheung and Leung (2010) stated that social change experienced by the individual tends to sculpt social quality of life and QWL experienced, which can be forecasters of personal quality of life.

Dasgupta (2010) stated that emotional intelligence can help in achieving greater perceived happiness and higher QWL. In other words, individual with higher emotional intelligence experiences better QWL when compared to individual with lower emotional intelligence. This is because their optimistic manner towards life enhances their QWL in a positive way.

Parameswari and Kadiravan (2011) found that there is a great positive relationship between QWL and self-regulated behavior and the ability to solve problems.

Gayathiri et al. (2013) concluded that identifying QWL measures is not easy. There are factors that provide the setting of

the workplace, which are the physical and structural factors, as well as the factors that affect the employees' work processes.

## **2.2. Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment can be defined as the level of connection that the individuals feel towards their organization. Organizational commitment helps the organization to grow and attain competitiveness, which can be a key element in determining the individual's performance. Employees that have organizational commitment can help in adding value to their organizations as they are determined, pay attention to the quality, and are able to produce more (Sharma et al., 2016).

Ketchand and Strawser (2001) implied that greatly committed employees have a strong ambition to stay with their present organization, which decreases their turnover intention. This is because developing a better level of organizational commitment will make them less likely to think about another jobs.

Organizational commitment has a great attention to be examined in the literature. According to Djafri and Noordin (2017), this can be due to the organizational commitment effect on behaviors and attitudes such as: keeping high level performance in the organization and attitudes toward organizational changes, as well as organizational citizenship behaviors and turnover intention.

### **2.2.1. Definitions of Organizational Commitment**

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) defined organizational commitment as the individual's willingness to spend efforts for the organization, the desire to keep working for it, and accepting its values and goals.

Upadhyay (2011) stated that organizational commitment is a broad term that involves the individual's loyalty to the organization and willingness to spend effort and keep working for that organization.

According to Kankaanranta (2013), organizational commitment can be defined as the psychological connection of the individuals and their long-term intention to keep that valued job.

According to Banerjee-Batist and Reio (2016), organizational commitment involves the loyalty and willingness of the employee to spend more effort for the organization.

According to Tan (2016), organizational commitment can be defined as the relationship between the employee and the organization that decreases the employee's desire to leave the organization voluntarily.

Hafiz (2017) stated that organizational commitment is considered as an important behavior that helps to assess the employees' intention to leave as well as their contributions in the

organization. Organizational commitment depends on the internal motivation and competence of the employee. Whenever the employee is committed with the organization, the commitment works as a great incentive for him/her to work for the organization and achieve its goals.

### **2.2.2. What Influences Organizational Commitment**

Bruning (2005) stated that the 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce have found that individuals who receive better quality jobs and more supportive work environment tend to have: 1) more commitment to the success of their organization, 2) higher levels of job satisfaction, 3) strong intention to remain with the organization, and 4) greater loyalty to their organizations.

Normala (2010) stated that the causes for organizational commitment differ from person to another. Organizational commitment can be basically determined by the rewards that the organization offer to the employees, specifically, the financial rewards.

According to Bagtasos (2011), organizational commitment has caught the researchers' attention. This is because individuals with high organizational commitment mostly work on achieving the organizational goals. However, individuals with low organizational commitment focus on accomplishing their own goals.

Caykoylu, Egri, Havlovic, and Bradley (2011) found that satisfaction with supervisor and job satisfaction with career advancement had a direct influence on organizational commitment. In addition, job motivating, employee empowerment, acceptance by co-workers, effective leadership, role conflict and role ambiguity are all determining the organizational commitment. However, satisfaction with co-workers had only an indirect impact on organizational commitment. The study has supported previous studies that found how organizational commitment is positively interrelated with job performance, job involvement, job satisfaction, and coping with job tension; and negatively related to absenteeism and employee turnover.

Upadhyay (2011) indicated that quality circles membership undoubtedly have some effects on the level of organizational commitment of the individuals and the efficiency and productivity of the organization.

Surienty et al. (2014) pointed that enhancing the work environment will give employees the impression that they are appreciated and this will make them feel more committed to their organization.

Ojedokun et al. (2015) found that employees are more likely to be more committed when they find that their organizations are being attractive to strangers or have convenient

external prestige. Hence, in order for the organizations to build organizational commitment, they need to understand what comprises external prestige.

According to Singh and Gupta (2015), organizational commitment is considered to be one of the most reviewed phenomena in the literature of organizational behavior. This is because of its relationships with job performance, absenteeism, and turnover. In addition, it has been reported that organizational commitment is related to different behaviors of employees such as job satisfaction and citizenship behavior.

Banerjee-Batist and Reio (2016) stated that mentoring in the work environment is considered as an influential tool of human resource development, which helps in increasing the organizational commitment and reducing turnover. In their study, Banerjee-Batist and Reio (2016) have found that the junior faculty's secure attachment was related to their organizational commitment in a positive way, while it was negatively related to turnover intent.

Gupta and Hyde (2016) emphasized that organizational commitment is important to both the employee and the organization. This is because the committed employee will work hard, which gives him/her an internal satisfaction; and in turn, increasing the organization's productivity.

Tan (2016) stated that organizational commitment is influenced by the tendency to experience activation and positive affect; and while alienation refers to the inability to experience positive affect, it was presumed that alienation impacts the organizational commitment in a negative way.

Djafri and Noordin (2017) have found that the dimensions of workplace spirituality are strongly associated to organizational commitment in a positive way. Accordingly, they suggested that spiritual practices can be applied in the workplace in order to improve the individuals' well-being, which will help in maintaining a high level of organizational commitment.

Sabir and Bhutta (2018) found that motivating language of leaders influences the organizational climate positively, which enhances the teacher's commitment. The study suggests that the schools' management need to use influential language strategically in order to keep and increase the teacher's commitment by maintaining a healthy school climate.

### **2.2.3. Components of Organizational Commitment**

Meyer and Allen (1991) have developed the components of the organizational commitment. The affective component is the positive feelings of involvement in and attachment of the employee to the organization. The normative component refers to the individual's sense of obligation to stay with the organization. Finally, the continuance component is when the employee feels

committed to the organization because of the costs of leaving it such as the lack of the attractive alternatives.

Colakoglu, Culha, and Atay (2010) stated that organizational commitment has three dimensions: affective, normative, and continuance components. Those three components are separated conceptually and empirically. Specifically, affective commitment leads to more meaningful contributions and better performance, then normative commitment, then continuance commitment.

**Affective commitment.** Colakoglu et al. (2010) stated that the affective component is the individual's emotional connection to and contribution to the organization. When employees have high level of affective commitment, they will stay with the organization because they want to. Colakoglu et al. (2010) found that perceived organizational support significantly affects the affective commitment in a positive way. This means that when individuals receive support from their organizations, they will feel more attached to it.

Chinomona and Dhurup (2014) emphasized that affective commitment is about the employee's desire to keep his/her current job because he/she likes the organization, enjoys the working relationship, and feels attached and is loyal to the organization.

**Continuance commitment.** Colakoglu et al. (2010) stated that the continuance component is the commitment of the individual that is based on the costs of leaving the organization. When employees have high level of continuance commitment, they will stay with the organization because they need to.

**Normative commitment.** McConnell (2006) suggested that normative organizational commitment exists when the employee feels committed to stay with his/her organization. This feeling of commitment to stay becomes stronger when the values of the employee and the organization are similar.

Colakoglu et al. (2010) stated that the normative component is the individual's feeling of obligation to stay with the organization. When the individuals have high level of normative commitment, they will stay with the organization because they feel they ought to. Also, perceived organizational support has a positive effect on normative commitment, which means that perceiving the support from the organization will make the employees feel more obligated to keep working for the organization.

#### **2.2.4. Importance of Organizational Commitment**

Kanungo (1992) stated that the organizational commitment of an employee increases when he/she is allowed to participate in setting the goals, which makes him/her accept the goals of the organization.

Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001) stated that job commitment of an employee shows how the job is important in the organization where he/she works. It also reflects the employee's intention to keep working for this organization in the future.

Hunjra (2010) stated that employees with high organizational commitment are greatly motivated to dedicate their time and effort to achieve the organizational objectives. Committed employees are also increasingly identified as the major asset of the organization.

Chinomona and Dhurup (2014) stated that organizational commitment has been found to be the key element in forming and maintaining the relationship between organizations and their employees.

According to Hafiz (2017), organizational commitment has been an interesting subject for scholars of human resource management to study. This is because of its influence on the employee's performance in addition to the organizational performance. Hafiz (2017) found that the employees' performance in banks is influenced by the organizational commitment dimensions, jointly and independently. This means that the individuals are willing to work for the organization and achieve its objectives as they have the same values and objectives of the organization.

### **2.3. Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment**

Farh, Podsakoff, and Organ (1990) stated that organizations can influence behaviors such as organizational commitment by structuring jobs in a way that give the employees meaning and fulfilment.

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that when the organization rewards its employees fairly according to their work inputs, this can boost their perception of QWL and thus will make them willing to show commitment behaviors toward their organizations.

Zin (2004) found that the respondents of the study indicated that growth and development dimension of QWL as a significant antecedent for the normative and affective commitment. Hence, it was suggested that organizations need to provide more opportunities for the employees to develop their skills in order to develop a sense of commitment among the organization.

Huang et al. (2007) found that the different dimensions of QWL result in distinguishing effects on organizational commitment, career commitment, and the intension to turnover. Also, Huang et al. (2007) suggested for managers that the different practices of QWL need to be combined together in order to have the best results in the individuals' talent retention and commitment.

Koonmee, Singhapakdi, Virakul, and Lee (2010) discussed how QWL impacts job-related outputs positively. These outputs can be employee's organizational commitment, employee's satisfaction, and building team spirit.

Normala (2010) presumed that there is a positive and strong relationship between QWL and organizational commitment. This means that the better the QWL the greater will be the employees' organizational commitment.

According to Ma, Ma, Yu, and Hao (2011), when the employees feel that their organizations offer them high QWL, they will feel more obligated to perform with better work outcomes such as organizational commitment.

Parameswari & Kadhiravan (2011) stated that providing a reasonable level of QWL will motivate the employees to work on achieving the organizational goals, which results in having employees with high organizational commitment.

Chinomona and Dhurup (2014) found that QWL influences job satisfaction and job commitment positively and significantly, and therefore influences tenure intention of the employees in a positive way.

Sabarirajan & Srivanidevi (2014) found that there is a positive relationship between QWL and the different constructs of employee moral such as work meaningfulness, intrinsic motivation, work pride, and organizational commitment.

Surienty et al. (2014) stated that it was proven by studies the influence of providing better QWL by organizations in hiring and maintaining their valuable workforce. They concluded that offering a reasonable level of QWL would have a major influence on the organizational commitment of the individual.

Arndt, Singhapakdi, and Tam (2015) indicated that Higher-order QWL means how employees are satisfied with the knowledge needs, actualization needs, and aesthetics needs. They found that corporate social responsibility results in higher-order QWL, which results in higher organizational commitment.

Choudhury (2015) asserted that conducive working conditions that help the employees in learning, growth, and living are created by QWL, which utilizes the human potentiality and thus increases the employees' loyalty and commitment beyond their responsibility and role prescription.

Ojedokun et al. (2015) stated that the employees consider work-life balance, challenging work environments, work experience, and organizational support as essential aspects to their organizational commitment. Organizations concentrate on QWL as the work experience of the employees since it is presumed that happy employees are more likely to have great levels of commitment.

Sharma et al. (2016) found that motivation and QWL have a significant and positive impact on the individuals'

organizational commitment.

Chinomona (2017) found that the managers of Gauteng province companies have to put more effort on the strategies that reinforce QWL. This is because QWL is likely to proceed the desired better long-term career commitment when compared to other constructs of the study such as perception to work life and expectations towards work.

According to Rahmani and Eghbali (2018), QWL and organizational commitment have a positive significant relationship, which means that higher QWL leads to better organizational commitment.

### **3. Research Methodology**

In this section, the researcher presents the research methodology. It includes a discussion of the importance of the research, the research questions, the objectives of the research, and the hypothesis of the research. In addition, this section involves a discussion of the population and sample that were used for the research, the collection of data, and finally the data analysis.

#### **3.1. Importance of Research**

This research examines the relationship between QWL and organizational commitment. It emphasizes this relationship and its strength, which can help the researchers who are looking for a

better understanding of the connection between QWL and organizational commitment. In this research, the researcher discusses the different dimensions of QWL and connects them to the organizational commitment components, which provides a wide and detailed assessment of the relationship between the two variables of the study.

Moreover, this research can be considered as a great tool for the organizations that are willing to develop and improve the QWL of their employees in order to increase their organizational commitment. This is because the research examines how improving QWL by the organization can create a win-win relationship with its employees since improving their QWL will result in raising their organizational commitment, thus increasing the organization's productivity. Therefore, the contributions that this research make are:

- 1- Helping researchers to have a better and detailed understanding of the relationship between QWL and organizational commitment.
- 2- Providing a great tool to the organizations that are aiming to improve their organizational commitment and productivity through improving their employees' QWL.

### **3.2. Research Question**

Organizations have been working on improving QWL of their employees as they believe that happy individuals are more

productive and highly committed to their organizations. Organizational commitment of the individuals can be increased by the involvement of QWL that allows those employees to rise their control over making decisions that affect their work. This kind of participation will make them feel attached to the organization, which influences their organizational commitment accordingly (Fields & Thacker, 1992).

When reviewing the literature, QWL can be found to have an influence on the individuals' organizational commitment. This effect is significant and positive. However, the previous studies did not precisely focus on the level of significance of this effect. In addition, there were only few studies that examined the effect of each factor of QWL on the employee's organizational commitment.

This research investigates the effect of eight factors of QWL. These factors were first categorized and proposed by Walton (1973) as: 1) fair compensation, 2) working conditions, 3) the use of capacities at work, 4) opportunities at work, 5) social integration at work, 6) constitutionalism at work, 7) occupied space by work in life, and 8) social relevance and importance of work.

This research focuses on answering the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between QWL and organizational commitment?
2. What is the effect of QWL on the employee's organizational commitment?

### **3.3. Research Objectives**

This research attempts to achieve the following objectives:

1. Find the relationship between QWL and employee's organizational commitment.
2. Investigate the effect of QWL on the employee's organizational commitment

### **3.4. Research Hypothesis**

Based on the research objectives mentioned earlier, the researcher proposes the following research hypothesis:

- H1: There is no significant relationship between QWL and employee's organizational commitment.
- H2: There is no significant effect of QWL on employee's organizational commitment.

### **3.5. Population and Sample**

The researcher has collected the data of the research from random Saudi Arabian governmental hospitals. In Saudi Arabia, the number of hospitals have reached 487 hospitals by the year 2017. Some of these hospitals are from the private sectors, and 329 are governmental hospitals distributed around the country

(MOH, 2017). The population of the study is the Saudi Arabian governmental hospitals, and the participants are: physicians, nurses, pharmacists, allied health personnel, administrative personnel, and workers. The researcher has selected the study sample by using simple random sample.

Table 1 displays the number of employees in each category in the Saudi Arabian governmental hospitals. However, the numbers of employees in the administrative personnel and workers' categories represent the employees of the governmental hospitals affiliated to the Ministry of Health, and do not include the employees of other governmental sector hospitals.

**Table 1**

*Number of Employees in Saudi Arabian Governmental Hospitals*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of Employees</b>
Physicians	64,234
Nurses	139,798
Pharmacists	6,157
Allied Health Personnel	89,860
Administrative Personnel	30,473
Workers	11,254

Source: Ministry of Health Statistical Yearbook 2017

For this study, the researcher distributed an online questionnaire survey by using Google Forms among the targeted participants. The data collection process was done in the period from 13 November 2019 to 21 November 2019. The researcher has received 116 valid forms.

### **3.6. Data Collection**

The survey of the research was given to a number of the employees who are working at Saudi Arabian governmental hospitals. For the purpose of measuring the responses, a Likert scale was used. This scale uses 5-point responses scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied or strongly disagree) to 5 (very satisfied or strongly agree).

The survey included two questionnaires in the same form. The first questionnaire was first proposed by Walton (1973) and it consisted of 35 items to measure QWL. The items of this questionnaire tests eight factors of QWL: 1) fair and adequate compensation, 2) working conditions, 3) the use of capacities at work, 4) opportunities at work, 5) social integration at work, 6) constitutionalism at work, 7) occupied space by work in life, and 8) social relevance and importance of work. For this questionnaire, the responses were measured in the scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

The second questionnaire measured employee's organizational commitment with the use of 15-item scale

of Mowday et al. (1979). The items of this scale were categorized by Meyer and Allen (1991) into three components: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. For this questionnaire, the responses were measured in the scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The QWL questionnaire and organizational commitment questionnaire that were used in this research are commonly and widely used for the purposes of measuring these two variables.

### **3.7. Data Analysis**

For the purpose of analyzing data, the researcher used different statistical approaches. The approaches that were used in this research are:

- Descriptive statistics to demonstrate the mean, median, and standard deviation of all the items of the survey.
- Pearson correlation to find the strength of the relationship between QWL and employee's organizational commitment.
- Multiple regression analysis to measure the relationship between QWL and employee's organizational commitment. Also, the researcher used this analysis to examine the statistical implications of the research hypotheses.

## **4. Statistical Analysis of the Research**

In this section, the researcher has conducted descriptive analysis for all of the eight dimensions of QWL and the three components of organizational commitment. In addition, the researcher has conducted Pearson's correlation and multiple regression analysis for these variables.

### **4.1. Descriptive Analysis**

In this section, the researcher has conducted a descriptive analysis of the items of QWL and organizational commitment questionnaires with the help of the program (SPSS). The researcher has computed the statistical concepts for QWL questionnaire and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire that were filled by 116 employees from different Saudi Arabian governmental hospitals. Table 2 demonstrates the mean, median, and standard deviation of the first dimension of QWL; Adequate and Fair Compensation.

**Table 2**  
*Mean, Median, and Standard Deviation for QWL Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Components*

Items	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
<b>Quality of Work Life (QWL)</b>	3.15	3.5	1.200
Adequate and Fair Compensation (AFC)	2.70	3	1.217
Working Conditions (WC)	3.32	4	1.250
Use of Capacities at Work (UCW)	3.39	4	1.155
Opportunities at Work (OW)	2.85	3	1.224
Social Integration at Work (SIW)	3.49	4	1.125
Constitutionalism at Work (CW)	3.32	4	1.187
Occupied Space by the Work in Life (OSWL)	2.93	3	1.279
Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW)	3.23	3	1.166
<b>Organizational Commitment</b>	3.41	4	1.178
Affective Commitment (AC)	3.52	4	1.179
Continuance Commitment (CC)	3.58	4	1.167
Normative Commitment (NC)	3.13	3	1.187

Table 2 demonstrates the overall mean scores and standard deviation of the eight dimensions of QWL and the three components of organizational commitment. From Table 2, it can be seen how the 116 employees have under-rated Adequate and Fair Compensation with a score of 2.70 out of five, 54%. This dimension is the least rated one among QWL eight dimensions. In addition, employees have under-rated Opportunities at Work dimension (2.85 out of five, 57%), which indicates how dissatisfied are they with their opportunities at work. When looking at the Use

of Capacities at Work, it can be noted how employees have rated it high on average with score 3.39 out of five, 67.8%. Also, it is important to mention that the top-rated QWL dimension is Social Integration at Work (3.49 out of five, 69.8%). The other components (namely Working Conditions, Constitutionalism at Work, Occupied Space by the Work in Life, and Social Relevance and Importance of Work) were rated fairly good.

Regarding the components of organizational commitment, the employees have top-rated Continuance Commitment (3.58 out of maximum five, 71.6%), which is high on average. Affective commitment is fairly good rated by the employees with score 3.52 out of five, 70%. Finally, it can be seen from Table 13 that Normative Commitment is the least rated component of organizational commitment (3.13 out of five, 62.6%).

To sum up, the employees' quality of work life across the governmental Saudi Arabian Hospitals is sought to be good in average (overall score 3.15 out of five, 63%). The top-rated dimensions were Social Integration at Work, and Use of Capacities at Work. In addition, the employees' organizational commitment is higher on average (overall score 3.41 out of five, 68.2%), especially for the Continuance Commitment component.

## 4.2. Correlation Analysis

For the purpose of measuring the strength and direction of the correlation relationship between QWL and organizational

commitment, the researcher used Pearson Correlation Analysis.

**Table 3**

*Correlations between the Eight Dimensions of QWL and the Three Components of Organizational Commitment*

	AFC	WC	UCW	OW	SIW	CW	OSWL	SRIW	AC	CC	NC
AFC	1										
WC	.258**	1									
UCW	.270**	.378**	1								
OW	.395**	.237**	.238**	1							
SIW	.366**	.253**	.247**	.392**	1						
CW	.271**	.368**	.493**	.335**	.477**	1					
OSWL	.404**	.462**	.480**	.398**	.321**	.462**	1				
SRIW	.394**	.408**	.396**	.366**	.340**	.434**	.535**	1			
AC	.297**	.222**	.120**	.284**	.355**	.168**	.131*	.296**	1		
CC	.281**	.326**	.446**	.347**	.374**	.488**	.375**	.503**	.261**	1	
NC	.120**	.106*	.134**	.227**	.175**	.204**	.170**	.154**	.318**	.197**	1
** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).											
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).											

The correlations between the eight dimensions of QWL and the three components of organizational commitment are

shown in the correlation matrix in Table 3. All of these correlations are positive and significant at 0.01 or 0.05 level of significance. Among the correlations, Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) have a moderately positive linear relationship ( $r=0.503$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.1. Adequate and Fair Compensation and Organizational Commitment**

By using Pearson correlation coefficient, the researcher computed the correlation between Adequate and Fair Compensation (AFC), and Affective Commitment (AC). The correlation between these variables is very weak but significant ( $r=0.297$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Next is the correlation between Adequate and Fair Compensation (AFC) and Continuance Commitment (CC), which is found to be very weak but significant ( $r=0.281$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Furthermore, the correlation between Adequate and Fair Compensation (AFC) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.120$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.2. Working Conditions and Organizational Commitment**

The second dimension of QWL is Working Conditions (WC). The correlation between Working Conditions (WC) and Affective Commitment (AC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.222$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Then, the correlation between

Working Conditions (WC) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is found to be weak but significant ( $r=0.326$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Also, the correlation between Working Conditions (WC) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.106$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

#### **4.2.3. Use of Capacities at Work and Organizational Commitment**

For the third dimension of QWL (Use of Capacities at Work (UCW)), the researcher has computed its correlation with each one of the three components of organizational commitment. The correlation between Use of Capacities at Work (UCW) and Affective Commitment (AC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.120$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Next, the correlation between Use of Capacities at Work (UCW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is weak but significant ( $r=0.446$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Then, the correlation between Use of Capacities at Work (UCW) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.134$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.4. Opportunities at Work and Organizational Commitment**

Opportunities at Work (OW) is the fourth dimension of QWL. The correlation between Opportunities at Work (OW) and Affective Commitment (AC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.284$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Next, the correlation between

Opportunities at Work (OW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is found to be weak but significant ( $r=0.347$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Also, the correlation between Opportunities at Work (OW) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.227$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.5. Social Integration at Work and Organizational Commitment**

The fifth dimension of QWL is Social Integration at Work (SIW). The researcher has computed the correlation between Social Integration at Work (SIW) and the three components of organizational commitment. The correlation between Social Integration at Work (SIW) and Affective Commitment (AC) is found to be weak but significant ( $r=0.355$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The correlation between Social Integration at Work (SIW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is weak but significant ( $r=0.374$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). However, the correlation between Social Integration at Work (SIW) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.175$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.6. Constitutionalism at Work and Organizational Commitment**

For the sixth dimension of QWL (Constitutionalism at Work (CW)), the researcher has computed its correlation with each one of the three components of organizational commitment. The correlation between Constitutionalism at Work (CW) and

Affective Commitment (AC) is found to be very weak but significant ( $r=0.168$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The correlation between Constitutionalism at Work (CW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is weak but significant ( $r=0.488$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), which can be considered good correlation. The correlation between Constitutionalism at Work (CW) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.204$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.7. Occupied Space by the Work in Life and Organizational Commitment**

The seventh dimension of QWL is Occupied Space by the Work in Life (OSWL). From Table 14, it can be seen that the correlation between Occupied Space by the Work in Life (OSWL) and Affective Commitment (AC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.131$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). The correlation between Occupied Space by the Work in Life (OSWL) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is weak but significant ( $r=0.375$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Moreover, the correlation between Occupied Space by the Work in Life (OSWL) and Normative Commitment (NC) is very weak but significant ( $r=0.170$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

#### **4.2.8. Social Relevance and Importance of Work and Organizational Commitment**

Last but not least, the eighth dimension of QWL is Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW). The researcher has computed the correlation between this dimension and the three

components of organizational commitment. The correlation between Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW) and Affective Commitment (AC) is found to be very weak but significant ( $r=0.296$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). On the other hand, the correlation between Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW) and Continuance Commitment (CC) is found to be moderately good and significant ( $r=0.503$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). However, the correlation between Social Relevance and Importance of Work (SRIW) and Normative Commitment (CC) is found to be very weak but significant ( $r=0.154$ ,  $N=116$ ,  $p<0.01$ ).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that there is no significant relationship between Quality of Work Life dimensions and Organizational Commitment. The researcher has tested hypothesis 1 by using Pearson's correlation and found that there is a relationship between Quality of Work Life dimensions and Organizational Commitment. Consequently, hypothesis 1 is rejected.

### **4.3. Multiple Regression Analysis**

In this section, the researcher has used multiple regression analysis for the purpose of examining the statistical implications of the research hypotheses. In addition, this analysis helped the researcher to measure the relationship between QWL and organizational commitment.

The dimensions of QWL were computed by summing up all the items from QWL questionnaire that was used for this research. The eight dimensions of QWL are: 1) adequate and fair compensation, 2) working conditions, 3) use of capacities at work, 4) opportunities at work, 5) social integration at work, 6) constitutionalism at work 7) occupied space by the work in life, and 8) social relevance and importance of work.

On the other hand, organizational commitment was also computed by summing up the items of the used questionnaire with three components which are: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment). The model suggested that there is a significant relationship between each one of the dimensions of QWL and organizational commitment.

Table 4

## Organizational Commitment and Adequate and Fair Compensation

The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Adequate and Fair Compensation

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.329 <sup>a</sup>	.108	.106	.779	.108	56.163	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Adequate and Fair Compensation

Table 4 demonstrates the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Adequate and Fair Compensation (as independent variable).

R=0.329 means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Adequate and Fair Compensation. The coefficient of determination R square=0.108, which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 10.8% of the strength of the effect of Adequate and Fair Compensation (the independent variable) on Organizational Commitment (the dependent variable).

Table 5

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Adequate and Fair Compensation on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.857	.088		32.428	.000
Adequate and Fair Compensation	.223	.030	.329	7.494	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

According to Table 5, beta coefficient of Adequate and Fair Compensation is 0.223, t= 7.494, which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between Adequate and Fair Compensation and Organizational Commitment.

This result agrees with the result of (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), which stated that when the organization rewards its employees fairly according to their work inputs, it boosts their perception of QWL, which will make them willing to show commitment behaviors toward their organizations.

Table 6

## Organizational Commitment and Working Conditions

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Working Conditions

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.338 <sup>a</sup>	.114	.112	.776	.114	59.662	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Working Conditions

Table 6 shows the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Working Conditions (as independent variable).  $R=0.338$  means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Working Conditions. The coefficient of determination  $R$  square= $0.114$ , which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 11.4% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Working Conditions) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 7

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Working Conditions on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.729	.101		26.993	.000
Working Conditions	.222	.029	.338	7.724	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

According Table 7, beta coefficient of Working Conditions is 0.222,  $t=7.724$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between Working Conditions and Organizational Commitment.

This result agrees with the result of Choudhury (2015), which stated that conducive working conditions that help the employees in learning, growth, and living can increase the employees' loyalty and commitment beyond their responsibility and role prescription.

Table 8

Organizational Commitment and Use of Capacities at Work

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Use of Capacities at Work

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.371 <sup>a</sup>	.138	.136	.766	.138	73.937	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Use of Capacities at Work

Table 8 displays the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Use of Capacities at Work (as independent variable).  $R=0.371$  means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and the Use of Capacities at Work. The coefficient of determination  $R$  square= $0.138$ , which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 13.8% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Use of Capacities at Work) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 9

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Use of Capacities at Work on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.582	.108		23.919	.000
Use of Capacities at Work	.264	.031	.371	8.599	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

When looking at Table 9, beta coefficient of Use of Capacities at Work is 0.264,  $t= 8.599$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between Use of Capacities at Work and Organizational Commitment.

Table 10

Organizational Commitment and Opportunities at Work

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Opportunities at Work

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.403 <sup>a</sup>	.162	.161	.755	.162	89.563	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Opportunities at Work

Table 10 express the regression analysis for the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment) and independent variable (Opportunities at Work). R=0.403 means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Opportunities at Work. The coefficient of determination R square=0.162, which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 16.2% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Opportunities at Work) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 11

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Opportunities at Work on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.686	.089		30.221	.000
Opportunities at Work	.271	.029	.403	9.464	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

Table 11 shows that beta coefficient of Opportunities at Work is 0.271, t= 9.464, which is significant at 0.05 level of

significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between Opportunities at Work and Organizational Commitment.

This result agrees with what Zin (2004) has found that growth and development dimension of QWL as a significant antecedent for the normative and affective commitment. Accordingly, it was suggested that organizations need to provide more opportunities for the employees to develop their skills in order to develop a sense of commitment among the organization.

Table 12

## Organizational Commitment and Social Integration at Work

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Social Integration at Work

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.426 <sup>a</sup>	.182	.180	.746	.182	102.568	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Integration at Work

Table 12 demonstrates the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Social Integration at Work (as independent variable).  $R=0.426$  means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Social Integration at Work. The coefficient of determination  $R$  square= $0.182$ , which means that the

Organizational Commitment describes 18.2% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Social Integration at Work) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 13

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Social Integration at Work on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.370	.113		20.989	.000
Social Integration at Work	.312	.031	.426	10.128	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

According to Table 13, beta coefficient of the Social Integration at Work is 0.312,  $t = 10.128$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between the Social Integration at Work and Organizational Commitment.

Table 14

Organizational Commitment and Constitutionalism at Work

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Constitutionalism at Work

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.403 <sup>a</sup>	.163	.161	.755	.163	89.786	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Constitutionalism at Work

Table 14 displays the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Constitutionalism at Work (as independent variable).  $R=0.403$  means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Constitutionalism at Work. The coefficient of determination  $R$  square= $0.163$ , which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 16.3% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Constitutionalism at Work) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 15

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Constitutionalism at Work on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.530	.104		24.300	.000
Constitutionalism at Work	.280	.030	.403	9.476	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

According to Table 15, beta coefficient of the Constitutionalism at Work is 0.280,  $t= 9.476$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between the Constitutionalism at Work and Organizational Commitment.

Table 16

Organizational Commitment and Occupied Space by the Work in Life

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Occupied Space by the Work in Life

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.302 <sup>a</sup>	.091	.088	.842	.091	34.680	1	346	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Occupied Space by the Work in Life

Table 16 demonstrates the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Occupied Space by the Work in Life (as independent variable). R=0.302 means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Occupied Space by the Work in Life. The coefficient of determination R square=0.091, which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 9.1% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Occupied Space by the Work in Life) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 17

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Occupied Space by the Work in Life on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.834	.113		25.300	.000
Occupied Space by the Work in Life	.208	.035	.302	5.889	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

From table 17, beta coefficient of the Occupied Space by the Work in Life is 0.208,  $t = 5.889$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between the Occupied Space by the Work in Life and Organizational Commitment.

Table 18

## Organizational Commitment and Social Relevance and Importance of Work

Multiple Linear regression: The results from analyzing Organizational Commitment and Social Relevance and Importance of Work

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.458 <sup>a</sup>	.209	.208	.733	.209	122.331	1	462	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Relevance and Importance of Work

Table 18 displays the regression analysis for the Organizational Commitment (as dependent variable) and Social Relevance and Importance of Work (as independent variable).  $R = 0.458$  means that there is a weak relationship between Organizational Commitment and Social Relevance and Importance of Work. The coefficient of determination  $R^2 = 0.209$ , which means that the Organizational Commitment describes 20.9% of the strength of the effect of the independent variable (Social Relevance and Importance of Work) on the dependent variable (Organizational Commitment).

Table 19

The Result of Regression Analysis for the effect of Social Relevance and Importance of Work on Organizational Commitment

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	2.341	.107		21.947	.000
Social Relevance and Importance of Work	.333	.030	.458	11.060	.000
Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

According to Table 19, beta coefficient of the Social Relevance and Importance of Work is 0.333,  $t = 11.060$ , which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The result means that there is a significant relationship between the Social Relevance and Importance of Work and Organizational Commitment.

Hypothesis 2 has predicted that there is no significant effect of Quality of Work Life dimensions on Organizational Commitment. The researcher has used Multiple Linear Regression Analysis and found that there is a significant effect of Quality of Work Life dimensions on Organizational Commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is rejected.

## 5. Results

1. The researcher has found that there is a significant relationship between Quality of Work Life dimensions and Organizational Commitment. Noteworthy, Social Relevance and Importance of Work has the highest correlation among all of the QWL dimensions. It has a moderately good, positive, and significant correlation with Continuance Commitment equal to 0.503 at the 0.01 level of significance.
2. Quality of Work Life dimensions have a significant correlation with Organizational Commitment. However, some of these correlations are weak and some are very weak. Working Conditions has a very weak but significant correlation with Normative Commitment equal to 0.106 at 0.05 level of significance. On the other hand, Constitutionalism at Work has a weak but significant correlation with Continuance Commitment equal to 0.488 at 0.01 level of significance.
3. There is a significant effect of Quality of Work Life dimensions on Organizational Commitment. The least effect rated was for Occupied Space by Work in Life, as  $t=5.889$  at 0.05 level of significant.
4. The researcher has found that Social Relevance and Importance of Work and Social Integration at Work have the strongest effect on Organizational Commitment among

the other QWL dimensions,  $t= 11.060$  and  $10.128$  at level of significant  $0.05$ .

## **6 Recommendations**

The research findings have essential suggestions for organizations.

- Organizations can increase their employees' organizational commitment by focusing on improving their QWL dimensions. One of the dimensions that needs more focus is Adequate and Fair Compensation. Organizations need to develop more recognition and financial rewards. In addition, organizations are suggested to offer more benefits to the employees in order to raise their organizational commitment and feeling of obligation to the organization.
- Human resources are suggested to control the workers' layoffs. This is because its effect is not only on the workers who are forced to leave, its effect reaches the other workers and make them feel insecure in their jobs. They would try to find alternative job, which would make them less committed to their organizations.
- Organizations need to involve the employees in the decision making and problem solving processes. In addition, more responsibility must be given to the employees. By doing so, the employees would be more

committed and attached to their organizations because they feel that their opinions are valued and that they share the same goals.

- Organizations must encourage respecting the employees' individuality in order to have highly committed employees who feel comfortable because their characteristics are respected at work. The same goes with respecting the variety of religious beliefs and race.
- It is very important for organizations to develop the work and rest schedules of the employees in a way that do not stress them out. When employees feel comfortable with their work and rest schedules, they would be more productive and committed.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

This research has encountered the following limitations.

- Although the data is considered to be appropriate for the quantitative analysis, the sample size was small when compared to the population. More data was going to provide clearer trends and more discrete effects.
- Since the survey was sent in a digital format, there is no clear picture of the name of hospitals that were included in the study. For future research, the researchers are suggested to get a report from the hospitals that participated and responded to the survey. This would help

the researchers to compare the QWL of the different hospitals.

- The survey did not specify the job title (the employee category) for the hospitals' employees. For future researchers, it is preferred to add the employee category to the survey in order to find out if there is a difference in the QWL and organizational commitment among the different employees' categories.
- Finally, the amount of survey questions was too much that made some of the employees to avoid participating in responding to the survey. For future research, researchers can reduce the questions by omitting the questions that are close in nature and would not affect the final result of the survey.

## References

- Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(3), 414-435.
- Arndt, A. D., Singhapakdi, A., & Tam, V. (2015). Consumers as employees: The impact of social responsibility on quality of work life among Australian engineers. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 11(1), 98-108.
- Ashman, I. (2007). An investigation of the British organizational commitment scale. *Management Research News*, 30(1), 5-24.
- Bagtasos, M. R. (2011). Quality of work life: A review of literature. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, 20(2).
- Banerjee-Batist, R., & Reio, T. G. (2016). Attachment and mentoring. *The Journal of Management Development*, 35(3), 360-381.
- Berberoglu, A. (2018). Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: Empirical evidence from public hospitals. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18.
- Bruning, K. (2005). Exploring the linkage of personnel practices and organizational commitment of the dual-career American family worker: A tool for human resource managers. *Allied Academies International Conference. Academy of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict. Proceedings*, 10(1), 7-15.
- Caykoylu, S., Egri, C. P., Havlovic, S., & Bradley, C. (2011). Key organizational commitment antecedents for nurses, paramedical professionals and non-clinical staff. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 25(1), 7-33.
- Chen, R., Yu, C., Chao, C., & Cheng, B. (2014). Relationships among work value, quality of work life, and turnover intention in nurses in Yunlin, Taiwan. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 6(4), 99-108.

- Cheung, C., & Leung, K. (2010). Ways that social change predicts personal quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 96(3), 459-477.
- Chinomona, E. (2017). Modelling the influence of workplace spirituality, quality of work life, expectations towards work on commitment to long-term career of employees in Gauteng province, South Africa. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 33(4), 693-704.
- Chinomona, R., & Dhurup, M. (2014). The influence of quality of work life on employee job satisfaction, job commitment and tenure intention in the small and medium enterprise sectors. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 17(4), 363-378.
- Choudhury, J. (2015). Quality of work life, employee commitment and organization citizenship behavior (A study of IT professionals in Odisha). *Journal of Commerce and Management Thought*, 6(4), 656-668.
- Colakoglu, U., Culha, O., & Atay, H. (2010). The effects of perceived organizational support on employees' affective outcomes: Evidence from the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 125-150.
- Dasgupta, M. (2010). Emotional Intelligence emerging as a significant tool for Female Information Technology professionals in managing role conflict and enhancing quality of Work Life and Happiness.
- da Silva Timossi, L., Pedroso, B., de Francisco, A. C., & Pilatti, L. A. (2008). Evaluation of quality of work life: an adaptation from the Walton's QWL model. In *XIV International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, <http://pg.utfpr.edu.br/dirppg/ppgep/ebook/2008/CONGRESSOS/Internacionais>.
- Djafri, F., & Noordin, K. (2017). The impact of workplace spirituality on organizational commitment. *Humanomics*, 33(3), 384-396.

- Farh, J. L., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of management*, 16(4), 705-721.
- Feizi, M., Ebrahimi, E., & Beheshti, N. (2014). Investigating the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment of the high school teachers in Gergy. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 3(1), 17-30.
- Fernandes, R. B., Martins, B. S., & Caixeta, R. P. (2017) Quality of Work Life: an evaluation of Walton model with analysis of structural equations.
- Fields, M. W., & Thacker, J. W. (1992). Influence of quality of work life on company and union commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(2), 439-450.
- Gayathiri, R., Ramakrishnan, L., Babatunde, S. A., Banerjee, A., & Islam, M. Z. (2013). Quality of work life–Linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Guha, B. (2015). Comparative study on male and female employees' perception on factors contributing quality of Work Life in banks. *Anvesha*, 8(3), 42-47.
- Gupta, B., & Hyde, A. M. (2016). Factors affecting quality of work life among academicians. *Anvesha*, 9(1), 8-19.
- Hafiz AZ (2017). Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Employee's Performance Evidence from Banking Sector of Lahore. *Arabian J Bus Manag Review* 7: 304.
- Huang, T. C., John Lawler, J., & Lei, C. Y. (2007). The Effects of Quality of Work Life on Commitment and Turnover Intention. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 35(6), 735–750.

- Hunjra, A. I., Ali, M., Chani, D., Khan, H., & Rehman, K. (2010). Employee voice and intent to leave: An empirical evidence of Pakistani banking sector.
- Igbaria, M., Parasuraman, S., & Badawy, M. K. (1994). Work experiences, job involvement, and quality of work life among information systems personnel. *MIS quarterly*, 175-201.
- Kankaanranta, T. (2013). Factors influencing economic crime investigators' job commitment. *Police Practice and Research*, 14(1), 53-65.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1992). Alienation and empowerment: Some ethical imperatives in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(5-6), 413-422.
- Kochar, D. (2015). Quality of work life and job satisfaction: A case of veterinary doctors in Punjab. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 4(1).
- Koonmee, K., Singhapakdi, A., Virakul, B., & Lee, D. J. (2010). Ethics institutionalization, quality of work life, and employee job-related outcomes: A survey of human resource managers in Thailand. *Journal of business research*, 63(1), 20-26.
- Lau, R. S. M., & May, B. E. (1998). A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3), 211-226.
- Lau, T., Wong, Y. H., Chan, K. F., & Law, M. (2001). Information technology and the work environment—does IT change the way people interact at work? *Human systems management*, 20(3), 267-279.
- Ma, Y., Ma, Q. H., Yu, H., & Hao, J. J. (2011). Quality of work life and employee outcomes: A survey of employees in hotel business. In *Advanced Materials Research* (Vol. 171, pp. 433-436). Trans Tech Publications.

- McConnell, C. J. (2006). *An Examination of the Relationships Among Person-organization Fit, Individual and Organizational Value Structures, and Affective, Normative, and Continuance Components of Organizational Commitment* (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University).
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- MOH. (2017). *Statistical Yearbook 1438H*. Retrieved from <https://www.moh.gov.sa/en/Ministry/Statistics/book/Documents/ANNUAL-STATISTICAL-BOOK-1438H.pdf>
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Noor, S. M., & Abdullah, M. A. (2012). Quality work life among factory workers in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 739-745.
- Normala, D. (2010). Investigating the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms. *International journal of business and management*, 5(10), 75.
- Ojedokun, O., Idemudia, E. S., & Desouza, M. (2015). Perceived external prestige as a mediator between quality of work life and organizational commitment of public sector employees in Ghana. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1), 1-10.
- Parameswari, J., & Kadhiravan, S. (2011). Quality of work life and self-regulated behavior among government and private school teachers. *International Journal of Management Prudence*, 3(1), 46-51.

- Permarupan, P. Y., Al-Mamun, A., & Saufi, R. A. (2013). Quality of work life on employees job Involvement and affective commitment between the public and private sector in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 9(7), 268.
- Rahmani, M., & Eghbali, A. (2018). Examining the moderating role of corporate social responsibility in the relationship between socially responsible consumption and quality of work life (QWL) of the staff in social security organization. *Marketing and Branding Research*, 5(1), 64-77.
- Rethinam, G. S., & Ismail, M. (2008). Constructs of Quality Of Work Life: A Perspective Of Information Technology Professionals. *European journal of social sciences*, 1.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 698.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), 825.
- 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.
- Sabarirajan, & Srivanidevi. (2014). A study on employee morale and its impact on QWL among the employees of spinning mills. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Management*, 9(2), 13-22.
- Sabir, S., & Bhutta, Z. M. (2018). Leader motivating language as predictor of organizational commitment among generation Y teachers: The mediating role of organizational climate. *NUML International Journal of Business & Management*, 13(1), 118-133.
- Sharma, R., Sharma, P., & Pandey, V. K. (2016). Motivation and quality of work life (QWL) programs as predictors of employee commitment:

- A study of service organization in gwalior region. *Journal of Organization and Human Behavior*, 5(1).
- Singh, A., & Gupta, B. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Benchmarking*, 22(6), 1192-1211.
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Dong-Jin, L. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3), 241-302.
- Surienty, L., Ramayah, T., Lo, M., & Tarmizi, A. N. (2014). Quality of work life and turnover intention: A partial least square (PLS) approach. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(1), 405-420.
- Tan, B. U. (2016). The role of work centrality in the relationship between work alienation and organizational commitment: A study of Turkish SMEs. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 21(1), 60-81.
- Torlak, O., Tiltay, M. A., Ozkara, B. Y., & Dogan, V. (2014). The perception of institutionalization of ethics and quality of work-life: The perspective of Turkish managers. *Social Business*, 4(2), 169-180.
- Upadhyay, B. K. (2011). Role of quality circle in enhancing organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *International Journal of Management Prudence*, 3(1), 77-83.
- Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: what is it. *Sloan management review*, 15(1), 11-21.
- Walton, R. E. (1980). Improving the QWL. *Harvard Business Review*, 19(12), 11-24.
- Zin, R. M. (2004). Perception of Professional Engineers toward Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment: A Case Study. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 6(3), 323-334.