

Quality of Life and its Components Measurement

Juozas Ruževičius, professor

Dalia Akranavičiūtė, quality management master student

Vilnius University

Saulėtekio str. 9, LT-10222, Vilnius

The objective of this paper is to define the quality of life (QOL) and the quality of working life (QOWL) conceptions and their components, to establish the quality of life evaluation and to report the results of the employee's quality of working life research.

Quality of life is influenced by an individual's physical and mental health, the degree of independency, the social relationship with the environment and other factors. Quality of life could be defined as an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life. Evaluation of the quality of life depends on one's value system.

The quality of working life could be defined as work place's strategies, processes and environment's combination, which stimulates employee's job satisfaction. It also depends on work conditions and organization's efficiency.

The quality of life model includes seven factors and indicators to represent these factors. This model was used in the study. The objective of the study was to evaluate the quality of life and the quality of working life value of the particular organization's employees.

26 men and 15 women working in the middle-sized industrial organization were surveyed. They were asked to evaluate seven domains of QOL and QOWL: physical state, material state, emotional state, social relationship, education and self-improvement, self-expression and leisure, safety and environment.

The study enabled to find out that the employees are more satisfied with quality of life (3,47 points) than quality of working life (3,45 points). The respondents are least satisfied with their material state. Quality of life directly correlates with quality of working life ($r = 0,76$). Employees quality of working life value and seven their factors have a moderately correlation ($r = 0,55-0,66$). While quality of life highly correlate with physical state ($r = 0,84$), material state ($r = 0,71$). Social – demographic elements have less influence on quality of life and quality of working life estimation.

The research findings show that studied organization has possibilities to increase their employee's quality of life and loyalty by improving working conditions and environment. High value of the quality of working life directly influences the higher quality of life.

Keywords: quality of working life, quality of life, satisfaction, spillover theory, evaluation, model.

Raktažodžiai: gyvenimo darbe kokybė, gyvenimo kokybė, pasitenkinimas, pertekliaus teorija, vertinimas, modelis.

Introduction

The quality of life is an area of study that has attracted an ever increasing amount of interest. Quality of life conceptual models and instruments for research, evaluation and assessment have been developed since the middle of last century (McCall, 2005; Ruževičius, 2006). However, Greek philosophers were searching for meaning of life which could help people look for a higher existential level of their life. In the past century quality of life was determined as material welfare or wealth. Later, the perception's changes of the meaning of life and values influenced the quality of life conception and all factors changes (Ferrer, 2002; Juozulynas, 2004). Evaluation of the quality of life must encompass all elements. The quality of working life is the important component of the quality of life. This aspect of quality of life has not been analysed in the scientific literature ever. The quality of working life includes such work areas like workers health and well-being, guarantee of employment, career planning, competence development, life and work balance and other. The results of evaluation of quality of working life factors could be possibility for social programs establishment, implementation and development in organizations, in national or international level (Van de Looij, Benders, 1995, Ruževičius, 2006c).

The problem of the study is to adjust the quality of working life evaluation method improving organization's activities results.

The object of the study is the middle-sized industrial organization's the quality of life and the quality of working life.

The objective of the study is to evaluate employee's quality of working life using survey's results.

Methodology. This article is worked out by using the analysis of scientific and methodical literature and the methodology of social research. The research data was analysed using descriptive and statistical methods. The data analyse was performed using standard questionnaire data treatment software: *Microsoft Excel 2000* and *SPSS (SPSS 15.0 for Windows Evaluation)* packets.

The quality of life factors and indicators

The main problem is that there is no universal quality of life determination. The World Health Organisation (WHO) determination of the quality of life is used in general. The quality of life is defined as an individual purpose-aligned cultural and values system by which a person lives, relative to their aims, hopes, living standards

and interests (Furmonavičius, 2001). Quality of life is influenced by individual's physical and mental health, the degree of independency, the social relationship with the environment and other factors (Ruževičius, 2006a-2006c; Shin, 1979) (fig. 1 and 2).

Quality of life could be defined as an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life. Evaluation of the quality of life depends on individual's value system and on the cultural environment where he lives (Gilgeous, 1998).

Suber P. (1996) proposes that quality of life also depends on the external factors. Good living conditions or

circumstances will determine high quality of life, but if these conditions are vary, the individual's satisfaction of the quality of life will vary too. Quality of life is influenced by many various factors and conditions like: accommodation, employment, income, material welfare, moral attitudes, personal and familial life, social support, stress and crisis, health-related quality of life, health service, working conditions, nourishment, education opportunities, relationships with environment, ecological factors and other (fig. 1 and 2) (Juozulynas, Čemerych, 2005; Rugienė, 2005).




Figure 1. Factors which make up quality of life

<i>QOL domains</i>	<i>QOL components</i>	
Physical state (health, working load, stamina, nourishment)	Health-related QOL	<i>Q</i>
Material state (welfare, living conditions)	Material QOL	<i>U</i>
Psychological state (emotions, attitudes, values, self-esteem, job satisfaction, stress)	Mental QOL	<i>A</i>
Education and self-improvement (learning, education, skills and knowledge appliance)	Quality of working life	<i>L</i>
Social relationships (relationships with people, family, society, support)	Family QOL	<i>I</i>
Self-expression and leisure (recreation, hobby, creation, entertainments)	Quality of social life	<i>T</i>
Safety and environment (physical security, work environment, economical, political, juridical environment)	Leisure QOL	<i>Y</i>
	Environment-related quality of life	<i>O</i>
		<i>F</i>
		<i>L</i>
		<i>I</i>
		<i>F</i>
		<i>E</i>

Figure 2. The quality of life model (Source: Chung, 1997; Cummins, 2005; Olfert, 2005; Sirgy, 2001; Shin, 1979; Ruževičius, 2006a-2006c.)

The quality of working life concept and evaluation rates

The quality of working life could be defined as work place's strategies, processes and environment's combination, which stimulates employee's job satisfaction. It also depends on work conditions and organization's efficiency (Considine, Callus, 2002). Individual's quality of working life directly influences the quality of life value. Generally, quality of life is also determined as employee's and his or her work environment's relationship quality (Schoepke, 2003). All quality of life components are interdependent and influence individual's satisfaction with quality of life.

The quality of working life concept encompass following factors: job satisfaction, involvement in work performance, motivation, efficiency, productivity, health, safety and welfare at work, stress, work load, burn-out etc. these mentioned factors could be defined as physical and psychological results of the work which affect employee (Arts, Kerksta, 2001). Other authors suggest to involve in this concept more work factors: fair compensation, safe and hygienic working and psychological conditions, knowledge and skills appliance opportunities, social integration and relationship, life and work balance, work planning and organization (Van de Looij, Benders, 1995). Some quality of working life factors are the same as in quality of life, only they are related with employee's working environment and job.

The quality of working life domains and factors are:

1. Consideration of work (material and immaterial);
2. Emocional state (appreciation, esteem, stress, self-motivation, job satisfaction, safety for job);
3. Learning and improvement (career opportunities, acquirement of new knowledge's and skills);
4. Social relationship in the organisation (maintenance of colleagues and supervisor, delegation, communication, command, division of work);
5. Self-realization (career opportunities, involvement in decisions making, self-sufficiency in one's workplace);
6. Physical state (stress, fatigue, burn-out, work load);
7. Safety and work environment (Gilgeous, 1998; Juniper, 2002; Arts, 2001; Schoepke, 2003; Ruževičius, 2006a).

Quality of life and quality of working life research

Quality of life must be measured by subjective and objective criteria. Objective criteria could be measured, counted, supervised. While subjective quality of life criteria exist in the individual's conscious, the researchers are able to identify them from the individual's answers. Comprehensive research must involve both criteria (Juniper, 2002). This principle is also obtained in the other mentioned domains of quality of life researches. In the quality of working life studies must be evaluated objective factors (working conditions and environment) and subjective factors (satisfaction with quality of working life factors) which concernment depends on the individual.

Work and working environment directly influence employee's quality of working life. High quality of working life level induces employee's loyalty to the organisation and decision to work in it (Quality..., 2003).

Quality of working life has not one research methodology and model, even one determination which cause problems in quality of working life evaluation. Quality of life and quality of working life are measured according subjective and objective criteria. The study must give following answers: how are important particular factors of quality of life for an individual and how is individual satisfied with these factors. Dissatisfaction in one domain of quality of life may not influence individual's quality of life in general, if only this domain is less significant that over life domains. Contrarily, significant and worse evaluated quality of life factor work against general quality of life level. In the scientific literature quality of life is analysis applying the spillover theory. Spillover theory states that satisfaction in one quality of life domain may influence satisfaction's level in another. Quality of life domains set hierarchical in person's conscious. The general quality of life is at the top and all domains of quality of life are situated subject to individual (Sirgy, Efraty, 2001). Greater satisfaction in one domain increases satisfaction level in the domain above (the spillover moves from bottom to top). For example, high quality of working life increases general quality of life. However, dissatisfaction in one quality of life domain may have no influence on other domains. If person is dissatisfied with his work he will compensate it with larger attention to the family and social relationship (Furmonavičius, 2001).

The authors suggest to measure quality of life using following formula:

$$QOL = a*Sph + b*Sm + c*Se + d*Ss + e*Si + f*SI + g*Sse \quad (1).$$

QOL – quality of life value, Sph - physical state value, Sm – material state value, Se - emotional state value, Ss - social relationship value, Si - self-improvement value, SI - self-expression and leisure value, Sse – safety and environment value, a-g – quality of life domains weight coefficients (sum total is 1). (Shin, 1979; Sirgy, Efraty, 2001; Scoring..., 2001).

Quality of working life value is calculated similarly.

Study questionnaire was designed according to mentioned above seven factors. The first section of questionnaire able to find out the most important respondents life domains (physical state, material state, emotional state, social relationship, education and self-improvement, self-expression and leisure, safety and environment). The weight coefficients were given to these domains according to the responses. Quality of life value was derived through a simple means of the seven life domains values. Total score of quality of working life was obtained in the same way. The questionnaire consists of 19 items about quality of life and 21 items about quality of working life. The 5-point Likert response format was used, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Total scores reflect higher degrees of quality of life and quality of working life. In the second section of questionnaire were used demographic-social questions to collect the information about respondents' characteristics, including: age, gender, education, income.

The study able to approve the designed research method and to evaluate organisation's employees' quality of life and quality of working life. After the responses analyse, the quality of life and quality of working life domains weight coefficients were determined:

$$QOL = 0,3 * Sph + 0,2 * Se + 0,18 * Sm + 0,12 * Si + 0,1 * Ss + 0,05 * Sl + 0,05 * Sse \quad (2).$$

Quality of life domains have the same weight coefficients.

The data analysis was performed using descriptive and statistics methods and statistical analysis software: *Microsoft Excel 2000* and *SPSS (SPSS 15.0 for Windows Evaluation)* packets.

The results showed that the surveyed employees most satisfied with their social relationship (average evaluation is 4,02 points) and education and self-improvement (3,79 points) of seven quality of life domains. The higher evaluation of quality of working life domains accrued also to education and self-improvement domain (3,57 points) and to self-expression and leisure domain (3,54 points). Respondents were dissatisfied with their material state (2,44 and 2,8 points) (fig. 3) especially with their material income, compensation of work and living conditions. These findings might be attributed to the facts that most employees have high education, but they earn an average payment. The employees expectations of fair compensation did not match with real situation.

Many respondents pointed out that they are discontent with career opportunities and work related stress. Male's quality of life was higher quality of working life (QOL is 3,2 points; QOWL – 3,23 points) than female's (QOL – 3,15 points; QOWL – 3,23 points). Exhaustive study will point out the reasons of these evaluations.




Figure 3. Evaluation of quality of life and quality of working life domains.

The strength of relationship between quality of life and quality of working life, their domains and demographic-social characteristics were analysed. A strength correlation was found between quality of life and quality of working life ($r = 0,76$). However, employees demographic - social characteristics weakly correlated with both quality of life and quality of working life (r vary from $-0,79$ to $0,39$). Very positive correlation was found between quality of life and it's domains: physical state ($r = 0,84$) and material state ($r = 0,71$). Weakest correlation was found between quality of life and education and self-improvement domain ($r = 0,48$), also safety and environment domain ($r = 0,48$) (table 1).

Relationships between QOL and QOWL and their domains

Table 1

		Physi c. stat	Mat. state	Emot state	Soc. relat.	Educ ation	Leisu -re	Safe- ty
Q O L	Pearson correlat. coeffic.	0,84	0,71	0,67	0,51	0,48	0,67	0,48
	p-value	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
	Covaria.	0,41	0,33	0,25	0,17	0,20	0,30	0,24
Q O W L	Pearson correlat. coeffic	0,64	0,66	0,55	0,60	0,65	0,66	0,65
	p-value	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
	Covaria.	0,24	0,28	0,20	0,20	0,22	0,23	0,30

Source: Research questionnaires.

Results showed that quality of working life moderately correlated with material state ($r = 0,66$) and education and self-improvement domain ($r = 0,66$). The remaining domains were also moderately related.

The regression analysis was used to predict the value of quality of life based on quality of working life value. The dependent variable (quality of life) was significantly associated with quality of working life ($R = 0,758$; $R^2 = 0,574$; $R^2 \text{ adj} = 0,563$). Linear equation was found:

$$QOL = 0,74 + 0,85 * QOWL \quad (3).$$

The analysis results showed that the design model is suitable for forecast even if independent variable (quality of working life) was explained 57,4 % of the quality of life variance. Other 42,6 % of the quality of life variance was determined by unknown factors.

The research findings showed that studied organization has possibilities to increase their employee's satisfaction of quality of life and loyalty by improving working conditions and environment. High quality of working life evaluation can influence higher quality of line in general.

Conclusion

The integrated evaluation of quality of life must include all domains and components, also quality of working life. The quality of life concept is related to various working life factors like: job satisfaction, involvement in work performance, motivation, efficiency, productivity, health, safety and welfare at work, stress, work load, burn-out etc.

The research results pointed out that employees are more satisfied with their general quality of life than quality of working life. Consequently, organisation's leadership is required to improve working conditions and environment. Thus, investing in personnel management programs can be mutual benefit to the individual and to the organisation. That may also influence individual's quality of life positively.

The findings suggest that designed research method is suitable for quality of working life and quality of life evaluation. Consequently, albeit the fact that the data used for this study originates from a single source, it cannot be invoked in future studies because of this study meteorological limitation.

References

1. Arts, E. J. *Quality of working life and workload in home help services* / E. J. Arts, A. Kerksta, J. Van der Zee. Nordic College of Caring Sciences, 2001, p. 12-22.
2. Beržinskas, G. (2004). *Moralinis ir etinis asmenybės ugdymas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 2004. 274 p.
3. Chung, M. Ch. A critique of the concept of quality of life // *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 1997, No.10 (2), p. 80-84.
4. Considine, G. *The Quality of Work Life of Australian Employees – the development of an index* / G. Considine, R. Callus, University of Sydney, 2002. 215 p.
5. Cummins, R. A. Moving from the quality of life concert to a theory // *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 2005, No. 49, p. 699-706.
6. Ferrer, A. *Happiness Quantified: A Satisfaction Calculate Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 312 p.
7. Furmonavičius, T. Gyvenimo kokybės tyrimai medicinoje // *Biomedicina*, 2001, Nr. 2 (1), p. 128-132.
8. Gilgeous, V. Manufacturing managers: their quality of working life // *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 1998, No. 9, p. 173-181.
9. Juniper, E. F. Can quality of life be quantified? // *Clinical and Experimental Allergy Reviews*, 2002, No. 2, p. 57-60.
10. Juozulynas, A. Gyvenimo kokybė ir sveikata // *Sveikatos mokslai*, 2005, Nr. 1, p. 71-74.
11. Juozulynas, A. Visuomenės sveikatos darbuotojų gyvenimo kokybė // *Sveikatos mokslai*, 2005, Nr. 2, p. 76-80.
12. Juozulynas, A. Dirbančiųjų ekologijos ir ergonomikos bei gyvenimo kokybės tyrimai / A. Juozulynas, A. Marcijonas, A. Jurgenėnas, K. Kaminskas, K // *Sveikatos mokslai*, 2002, Nr. 6, p. 58-61.
13. McCall, S. *Quality of life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 315 p.
14. Olfert, S. *Quality of life leisure indicators*. Community–University Institute for Social Research, 2005. 244 p.
15. Quality of life in New Zealand's large urban areas. Prieiga per internetą: <<http://bigcities.govt.nz/indicators.htm>>
16. *Quality of Working Life Survey Report*. Curtin University of Technology, 2003 (5), p. 50.
17. Rugienė, R. Gyvenimo kokybės klausimyno adaptavimas, jo tinkamumo kontrolinei grupei ir reumatoidiniu artritu sergantiems ligoniams įvertinimas / R. Rugienė, J. Dadonienė, A. Venalis // *Medicina*, 2005, Nr. 41, p. 232-239.
18. Ruževičius, J. *Kokybės vadybos modeliai ir jų taikymas organizacijų veiklos tobulinimui*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2006a, 216 p.
19. Ruževičius, J. Quality models and their application for the improvement of organizations activities // *Forum Ware International*, 2006b, No. 1, p. 16-24.
20. Ruževičius, J. Quality of education as a factor of life's quality / J. Ruževičius, R. Adomaitienė, D. Serafinas, D. Daugvilienė // *Global safety of commodity and environment life. Quality of life: proceedings of the 15th symposium of IGWT*. Kyiv, 2006c, Vol. 1, p.50-54.
21. Schoepke, J. *Quality of working life among women and men in the information technology workforce* / J. Schoepke, P. L. T. Hoonakker, P. Carayon // *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 46th Annual Meeting*, Baltimore, 2003, p. 1379-1383.
22. *Scoring the Quality of Life Profile*. University of Toronto, 2003.
23. Shin, D. The concept of quality of life and the evaluation of developmental effort // *Comparative politics*, 1979, No.2, p. 299-304.
24. Sirgy, M. J. A new measure of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories / M. J. Sirgy, D. Efraty, Ph. Spiegel, D. Lee // *Social Indicators Research*, 2001, No. 55, p. 21-32.
25. Srinivasant, S. The quality of life in England and Wales / S. Srinivasant G. Stewart // *Oxford bulletin of economics and statistics*, 2004, No. 66, p. 1-22.
26. Van de Looij, F. Not just money: quality of working life as employment strategy / F. Van de Looij, J. Benders // *Health Manpower Management*, 1995, No. 21, p. 27-33.

Juozas Ruževičius, Dalia Akranavičiūtė

Gyvenimo darbe kokybė ir jos vertinimas

Santrauka

Gyvenimo kokybės (GK) matavimo ir vertinimo sisteminiai tyrimai pradėti palyginti neseniai – praėjusio šimtmečio viduryje. Tačiau dar senovės graikų filosofai ieškojo gyvenimo gairių ir prasmės, kurios padėtų žmonėms pasiekti aukštesnę egzistencijos lygį. Praėjusio amžiaus pradžioje gyvenimo kokybė buvo suvokiama daugiausia kaip materialinė gerovė ar pinigai. Vėliau, keičiantis gyvenimo prasmės suvokimo ir vertybių turiniui, keitėsi ir gyvenimo kokybės samprata bei jos sudedamosios dalys. Gyvenimo kokybės kompleksinis vertinimas turėtų apimti visus jo komponentus, jų tarpe ir gyvenimo darbe kokybę (angl. Quality of working life). Šis gyvenimo kokybės aspektas dar nebuvo sistemškai nagrinėtas mūsų šalies mokslinėje literatūroje. Šio kokybės aspekto svarbą patvirtina ir tai, kad gyvenimo kokybės teorinių ir taikomųjų klausimų nagrinėjimui ir gyvenimo darbe kokybės (GDK) gerinimui yra parengtos ir įgyvendinamos kelios Europos Sąjungos finansuojamos programos. Gyvenimo darbe kokybė (GDK) apima tokias sritis kaip darbuotojo sveikata ir gerovė, užimtumo garantijos ir profesijos planavimas, kompetencijos ugdymas, darbo sąlygos, pusiausvyra tarp gyvenimo darbe ir gyvenimo po darbo ir kt. Šių kokybės aspektų vertinimas suteikia galimybes socialinių programų kūrimui, įgyvendinimui ir jų tobulinimui organizaciniu, nacionaliniu ir tarptautiniu lygiu.

Straipsnio tikslas – išanalizuoti gyvenimo kokybės ir gyvenimo darbe kokybės sampratą, jų sudedamąsias dalis ir sritis, atskleisti jos vertinimo ypatumus, parengti GK modelį ir pateikti konkrečios įmonės darbuotojų gyvenimo darbe kokybės tyrimo rezultatus. *Metodologija*. Straipsnis parengtas remiantis mokslinės ir metodinės literatūros bei organizacijų veiklos logine analize, ekspertinio vertinimo ir sociologinių tyrimų metodologija. Tyrimo duomenims apibendrinti ir analizuoti buvo naudoti aprašomosios bei statistinės analizės metodai, naudojant programinius Microsoft Excel 2000 ir SPSS (SPSS 15.0 for Windows Evaluation) paketus. Nėra visuotinai pripažinto gyvenimo kokybės apibrėžimo. Literatūroje plačiai remiamasi Pasaulio sveikatos organizacijos teikiamu gyvenimo kokybės apibrėžimu – tai individualus kiekvieno žmogaus materialinės, fizinės, psichologinės ir socialinės gyvenimo gerovės suvokimas ir jos vertinimas kultūros vertybių sistemos kontekste, siejant tai su asmens tikslais, viltimis, standartais ir interesais. Gyvenimo kokybei įtakos turi asmens fizinė, dvasinė bei sveikatos būklė, nepriklausomumo lygis, socialinis ryšys su aplinka ir kiti veiksniai. Paprasčiau gyvenimo kokybę galima apibūdinti kaip žmogaus pasitenkinimą esamo gyvenimo rodikliais, lyginant su jo siekiamu ar idealiu gyvenimo lygiu. GK vertinimas priklauso ir nuo žmogaus vertybių sistemos ir kultūrinės aplinkos, kuriai jis priklauso. Gyvenimo kokybės koncepcija teigia, kad ji priklauso nuo išorinių aplinkybių. Gyvenimo aplinkybės ar sąlygos gali lemti aukštą gyvenimo vertę, tačiau nors kiek pakitus aplinkybėms, keičiasi ir asmens gyvenimo kokybės suvokimas ir vertinimas. Gyvenimo kokybę (GK) lemia daugybė veiksnių ir aplinkybių: būstas, užimtumas, pajamos ir materialinis gerbūvis, moralinės nuostatos, asmeninis ir šeimyninis gyvenimas, socialinė parama, stresas ir krizės darbe, asmeniniame gyvenime ir socialinėje aplinkoje, sveikatos kokybė, sveikatos priežiūros galimybės, darbo sąlygos, mityba, išsilavinimo galimybės, santykiai su aplinka, ekologiniai veiksniai ir kita.

Gyvenimo darbe kokybę galima apibrėžti kaip darbo vietos strategijos, procesų, darbo fizinės ir psichologinės aplinkos, darbuotojų motyvavimo ir ugdymo sistemą, kuri skatina ir palaiko darbuotojų

pasitenkinimą, nuolat gerinant darbo sąlygas ir organizacijos veiksmingumą. GDK koncepcija taip pat apima darbuotojų pasitenkinimą darbu, mokymo ir karjeros galimybes, įtraukimą į atliekamas užduotis, produktyvumą, sveikata, darbo saugą, mikroklimatą, teisingą kompensavimą už darbą, tobulėjimo galimybes, gebėjimų panaudojimo veiksmingumą, socialinę integraciją ir ryšius, darbo ir asmeninio gyvenimo suderinamumą, darbo organizavimą ir intensyvumą ir kt. Individo pasitenkinimo gyvenimo darbe kokybės lygis lemia pasitenkinimą gyvenimu apskritai. GDK - tai iš esmės darbuotojo santykių su darbo aplinka kokybė. Gyvenimo kokybė vertinama tiek objektyviais, tiek ir subjektyviais rodikliais. Objektyvūs rodikliai egzistuoja visuomenėje ir jie gali būti stebimi bei matuojamas jų kiekis ar pasikartojimo dažnumas. Tuo tarpu subjektyvūs bruožai egzistuoja individo sąmonėje ir jie identifikuojami tik iš individo atsakymų rūpinomomis temomis. Išsamus gyvenimo kokybės tyrimas turi apimti abiejų rūšių rodiklius. Šis vertinimo principas galioja ir kitų gyvenimo kokybės sudedamųjų dalių vertinime: tiriant gyvenimo darbe kokybę turi būti vertinami darbo sąlygų ir aplinkos objektyvūs veiksniai ir subjektyvūs, kiekvienam darbuotojui svarbūs veiksniai (pasitenkinimas gyvenimo darbe kokybės sritimis). Darbuotojo pasitenkinimo gyvenimo darbe kokybe lygį lemia įvairūs darbo ir darbo aplinkos veiksniai. Savo ruožtu darbuotojo pasitenkinimas gyvenimo darbe kokybe įtakoja jo atsidavimą organizacijai ir apsisprendimą joje dirbti.

Gyvenimo kokybė dažniausiai vertinama laikantis pertekliaus teorijos, kuri teigia, kad žmogaus pasitenkinimas vienoje gyvenimo kokybės srityje įtakoja pasitenkinimo lygį kitose srityse. Asmens sąmonėje gyvenimo sritys išsidėstę tam tikra hierarchija: aukščiausiai yra bendrai suvokiama visa gyvenimo kokybė, po to individualiai išsidėsto kitos gyvenimo kokybės sudedamosios dalys (šeima, darbas, sveikata, laisvalaikis ir pan. Didesnis pasitenkinimas vienoje gyvenimo srityje didina pasitenkinimo lygį pagal svarbumą aukščiau esančioje srityje, pavyzdžiui, aukšta gyvenimo darbe kokybė didina pasitenkinimą viso gyvenimo kokybe (perteklius kyla iš apačios į viršų). Tačiau jaučiamas nepasitenkinimas viena gyvenimo sritimi gali beveik neįtakoti kitų sričių pasitenkinimo lygio arba didinti pasitenkinimo lygį vienoje srityje. Į visą tai buvo atsižvelgta rengiant GK modelį. Šis modelis sujungia septynias gyvenimo sritis ir jų sudedamąsias dalis, įskaitant ir GDK. Remiantis šiuo modeliu, buvo parengta metodika ir atliktas tyrimas, kuriuo siekta nustatyti konkrečios organizacijos darbuotojų pasitenkinimą gyvenimo ir gyvenimo darbe kokybe.

Tyrimui buvo atrinkta vidutinio dydžio gamybinė organizacija. Jos darbuotojai, atsakydami į anketos ir struktūrizuotų interviu klausimus vertino tokias jų gyvenimo kokybės ir GDK sritis: fizinę, materialinę, emocinę būklę, socialinius santykius, asmenybės tobulėjimo, mokymosi karjeros, saviraiškos ir poilsio galimybes, darbo aplinką, intensyvumą ir saugą. Bendras pasitenkinimo gyvenimo kokybe (PGK) rodiklis apskaičiuotas pagal formulę:

$$PGK = a * Sf + b * Sm + c * Se + d * Ss + e * St + f * Sp + g * Sa \quad (1)$$

Čia: PGK – pasitenkinimo gyvenimo kokybe rodiklis, Sf - fizinė būklės vertinimas, Sm – materialinė būklės vertinimas, Se - emocinė būklės vertinimas, Ss - socialinių santykių vertinimas, St - asmenybės tobulėjimo ir mokymosi vertinimas, Sp - saviraiškos ir poilsio vertinimas, Sa – saugumo ir aplinkos vertinimas, a-g – gyvenimo kokybės sričių svarumo koeficientai.

Pagal šiuos gyvenimo kokybės vertinimo rodiklius buvo sudaryta šio tyrimo anketa. Pirmoji klausimyno dalis buvo skirta identifikuoti svarbiausias respondentų gyvenimo kokybės sritis (fizinę, emocinę ir materialinę būklę, socialinius santykius, asmenybės tobulėjimą ir mokymasis, saviraiška ir poilsis, saugumas ir aplinka ir kt.). Siekiant apibūdinti sukurtą tyrimo metodiką ir nustatyti GK ir GDK sudedamųjų dalių svarumo koeficientus, pradžioje buvo atliktas preliminarus organizacijos tyrimas. Remiantis atsakymais į pirmąjį klausimyno dalį, kiekvienai gyvenimo sričiai buvo suteiktas tam tikras svarumo koeficientas, o bendras pasitenkinimo rodiklis skaičiuotas kaip visų gyvenimo darbe kokybės rodiklių vertinimų vidurkis. Pagrindinę anketos dalį sudarė 19 struktūrizuotų klausimų, susijusių su gyvenimo kokybe, ir 21 teiginys – su gyvenimo darbe darbe. Pateikti teiginiai vertinti penkiabalėje Likerto skalėje. Demografinių – socialinių anketos duomenų dalis sudaryta siekiant išsiaiškinti netiesioginę informacijos apie asmenį: lytį, amžių, pajamas bei išsilavinimą. Preliminarus tyrimo rezultatai ir ekspertų vertinimai leido nustatyti GK sudedamųjų dalių svarumo koeficientus ir detalizuoti pagrindinio organizacijos tyrimo planą ir metodiką. Taigi, bendras pasitenkinimo gyvenimo kokybe (PGK) rodiklis apskaičiuotas pagal tokią formulę:

$$PGK = 0,3 * Sf + 0,2 * Se + 0,18 * Sm + 0,12 * St + 0,1 * Ss + 0,05 * Sp + 0,05 * Sa \quad (2)$$

Panašiai skaičiuotas ir bendras pasitenkinimo GDK rodiklis.

Nustatyta, kad tirtos organizacijos darbuotojai yra daugiau patenkinti savo gyvenimo kokybe (3,47 balo), negu gyvenimo darbe kokybe (3,45 balo). Mažiausias pasitenkinimas jaučiamas materialine būkle. Pasitenkinimo gyvenimo kokybe lygis tiesiogiai priklauso nuo pasitenkinimo gyvenimo darbe kokybe ($r = 0,76$). Darbuotojų bendras gyvenimo darbe kokybės vertinimo lygis vidutinio stiprumo priklausomybe susijęs su visomis septyniomis tirtomis GK sritimis ($r = 0,55-0,66$). Tuo tarpu pasitenkinimas gyvenimo kokybe stipriai priklauso nuo pasitenkinimo fizine ($r = 0,84$) ir materialine ($r = 0,71$) sritimis. Tyrimo dalyvavę vyrai tiek gyvenimo darbe kokybę, tiek ir GK vertina palankiau, negu moterys (GDK moterys įvertino 3,21 balo, vyrai – 3,23; GK moterys įvertino 3,20 balo, vyrai – 3,15 balo). Šio statistikai reikšmingų vertinimo skirtumų priežasčių identifikavimui yra reikalingi papildomi tyrimai. Kitai socialiniai – demografiniai veiksniai beveik neįtakoja darbuotojų gyvenimo kokybės ir gyvenimo darbe kokybės vertinimų.

Tyrimas atskleidė tirtos organizacijos tobulintinas sritis ir problemas, kurias išsprendus būtų galima ženkliai padidinti jos darbuotojų pasitenkinimą gyvenimo darbe kokybe ir tuo pačiu skatinti darbuotojų lojalumą. Aukštai vertindamas GDK, žmogus tuo pačiu jaučia ir didesnę pasitenkinimą savo bendrąja gyvenimo kokybe. Tyrimas parodė, kad parengta tyrimo metodika yra tinkama vertinti tiek gyvenimo kokybę visuomenėje, tiek ir gyvenimo darbe kokybę.

Raktažodžiai: gyvenimo darbe kokybė, gyvenimo kokybė, pasitenkinimas, pertekliaus teorija, vertinimas, modelis.

Юозас Ружявичюс, Даля Акранавичюте

Качество жизни на работе и ее оценка

Резюме

Системные исследования, направленные на измерение и оценку качества жизни (КЖ) начались сравнительно не давно – в середине прошлого века. В начале прошлого века основными показателями КЖ были материальное благосостояние и деньги. Со временем менялось понятие смысла жизни и ее ценности, тем самым изменилось содержание понятия КЖ, возросло число ее составляющих компонентов. В нынешних условиях комплексная оценка качества жизни должна охватывать все ее составные, включая качество жизни на работе (англ. *quality of working life*). Цель данной работы – раскрыть сущность и содержание качества жизни и качества жизни на работе (КЖР), изучить и обобщить особенности их оценки и представить результаты исследования КЖР работников конкретного предприятия. *Методология* – статья подготовлена на основе обобщения научной и методологической литературы, результатах изучения практики деятельности организаций и структурированного опроса руководителей и работников конкретного предприятия.

В работе представлены определения и раскрыта сущность понятий КЖ и КЖР. По мнению авторов, основными составными КЖ являются материальная среда, безопасность (физическая, юридическая, социальная) конкретного человека и общества в целом, качество окружающей среды, качество здоровья населения, качество образования, возможности самовыражения и морально-психологический климат (в обществе, в государстве, в организации и в семье). Качество жизни на работе можно определить как систему стратегии обустройства рабочего места, процессов, окружающей среды и микроклимата на предприятии, которое поощряет и поддерживает удовлетворенность работающих и влияет на улучшение условий труда и эффективность организации. Концепция КЖР связана также с мотивацией, продуктивностью, здоровьем, безопасностью, справедливым вознаграждением за работу, возможностями учиться и совершенствоваться, продвигаться по служебной лестнице, физической и психологической усталостью, стрессом, социальной интеграцией, возможностями согласовывать личную и служебную жизнь и др.

Представлена модель качества жизни, включающая в себя семь областей и восемь составных КЖ. На основе данной модели разработана методика изучения КЖ и КЖР для работников конкретного предприятия.

Исследования показали, что работники исследованной организации больше всего удовлетворены такими областями КЖР, как социальные отношения, повышение профессиональных способностей и обучение. Наиболее низкие оценки как в КЖ, так в КЖР получила область, связанная с материальным благосостоянием. Респонденты не довольны своими финансовыми ресурсами,

заработной платой и условиями жизни. В месте с тем, работники данного предприятия низко оценивают возможности карьеры, не довольны высоким уровнем стресса на работе. Респонденты мужчины, по сравнению с женщинами, более высоко оценивают как КЖ, так и КЖР. Для установления глубинных причин отмеченных различий необходимы дополнительные исследования.

Установлено, что на исследованном предприятии имеются требующие совершенствования области и проблемы, решения которых может значительно повлиять на удовлетворения качеством жизни на работе и тем самым повлиять на лояльность сотрудников. Высоко оценивая КЖР, человек тем самым чувствует и более высокую удовлетворенность общим качеством жизни. Проведенное исследование подтвердило пригодность разработанной методики как для оценки качества жизни вообще, так и качества жизни на работе. Ключевые слова: качество жизни, качество жизни на работе, модель, оценка.

Juozas Ruževičius, Dalia Akranavičiūtė

Working life quality and its measurement

Summary

The aim of the paper is to define the quality of working life (QOWL) conception and their components, to establish the quality of life (QOL) evaluation and to report the results of the employee's quality of working life research. This article is worked out by using the analysis of scientific and methodical literature and the methodology of social research. The data analyse was performed using statistical analysis software: *Microsoft Excel 2000* and *SPSS (SPSS 15.0 for Windows Evaluation)* packets.

Quality of life is influenced by an individual's physical and mental health, the degree of independency, the social relationship with the environment and other factors. Quality of life could be defined as an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life. The evaluation of the quality of life depends on one's value system.

The quality of working life could be defined as work place's strategies, processes and environment's combination, which stimulates employee's job satisfaction. It also depends on work conditions and organization's efficiency. The quality of working life concept encompass following factors: job satisfaction, involvement in work performance, motivation, efficiency, productivity, health, safety and welfare at work, stress, work load, burn-out etc.

The quality of life model was designed which includes seven quality of life domains and their factors. This study was model was used in the study. The objective of the study was to evaluate the quality of life and the quality of working life value of the particular organization's employees.

The results showed that the surveyed employees most satisfied with their social relationship (average evaluation is 4,02 points) and education and self-improvement (3,79 points) of seven quality of life domains. The higher evaluation of quality of working life domains accrued also to education and self-improvement domain (3,57 points) and to self-expression and leisure domain (3,54 points). Respondents were dissatisfied with their material state (2,44 and 2,8 points) especially with their material income, compensation of work and living conditions. These findings might be attributed to the facts that most employees have high education, but they earn an average payment. The employees expectations of fair compensation did not match with real situation.

The strength of relationship between quality of life and quality of working life, their domains and demographic-social characteristics were analysed.

A strength correlation was found between quality of life and quality of working life ($r = 0,76$). However, employees demographic - social characteristics weakly correlated with both quality of life and quality of working life (r vary from $-0,79$ to $0,39$). Very positive correlation was found between quality of life and it's domains: physical state ($r = 0,84$) and material state ($r = 0,71$). Weakest correlation was found between quality of life and education and self-improvement domain ($r = 0,48$), also safety and environment domain ($r = 0,48$).

The research findings show that studied organization has possibilities to increase their employee's quality of life and loyalty by improving working conditions and environment. High value of the quality of working life directly influences the higher quality of life.

Keywords: *quality of working life, quality of life, satisfaction, spillover theory, evaluation, model.*