REVISTA PSICOLOGÍA DE LA SALUD

Vol. 8. Núm. 1. 2021. Artículo 1
DOI: doi.org/10.21134/pssa.v9i1.702

QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE AND JOB SATISFACTION IN HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL WORKERS. ¿ARE THERE DIFFERENCES?

Beatriz Rodríguez, Juan Carlos Marzo and María Virtudes Pérez-Jover
University 'Miguel Hernández de Elche' (Spain)

Amparo Ramos
University of Valencia

Resumen

La mayoría de los estudios sobre la calidad de vida laboral (WLQ) muestran que la satisfacción laboral (JS) es una de las variables más importantes relacionadas con WLQ. Sin embargo, gran parte de la investigación no define con precisión estos dos conceptos y utiliza indistintamente ambos, o entiende la WLQ como una dimensión / determinante de JS, o la JS como una dimensión / determinante de la WLQ. Los numerosos estudios de la década de 1970 no resuelven estas cuestiones. Por lo tanto, es necesario aclarar la relación entre JS y WLQ, particularmente en empreas de servicios. Para hacerlo, realizamos un estudio transversal para establecer: 1) si las características sociodemográficas y laborales implican diferencias entre JS y WLQ; 2) si hay diferencias entre JS y WLQ y si el sector laboral implica alguna diferencia; y 3) si el JS es un buen predictor del WLQ. Método: 395 trabajadores de la salud y empleados educativos de la provincia de Alicante (España) ingresaron al estudio de forma aleatoria. Utilizamos para la recolección de datos un formulario de información (variables sociodemográficas y de trabajo), la Escala de satisfacción en el trabajo de Font-Roja y el Cuestionario de calidad de vida laboral de Cabezas. Resultados: No hubo diferencias en WLQ ni en JS entre hombres y mujeres. Las mujeres solo se sentían más satisfechas que los hombres en relación con la JS asociada con la carga de trabajo. Tampoco hay diferencias entre hombres y mujeres en WLQ. No se encontraron diferencias en JS entre los trabajadores de salud y los empleados de educación, excepto en el caso de la JS asociada con la Presión Laboral (los trabajadores de salud tenían más JS que los empleados de educación). Estos profesionales de la salud también percibían mejor su WLQ. WLQ y JS estaban positivamente relacionados. Los mejores pronosticadores del WLQ fueron el sexo, el sector laboral, JS total y JS relacionados con la competencia laboral, relacionados con la carga de trabajo y relacionados con la presión laboral. Conclusiones: Hemos obtenido resultados empíricos que permiten afirmar que la JS es un determinante importante (pero no una dimensión) de la WLQ y que estas dos variables no pueden ser confundidas. En ese sentido, este trabajo ayuda a clarificar los conceptos de WLQ y JS y sus relaciones, en el ámbito específico de las empresas de servicios.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Calidad de vida laboral, satisfacción laboral, sexo, empresas de servicios, trabajadores educativos, trabajadores sanitarios.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to
rodriguezjarabo.beatriz@gmail.com

Abstract

Most studies on quality of working life (WLQ) shown that job satisfaction (JS) is one of the most important variables related to WLQ. However, much of the research does not accurately define these two concepts and use indistinctly both of them, or to understand WLQ as a dimension/determinant of JS, or JS as a dimension/determinant of WLQ. Numerous studies from the 1970s do not resolve these questions. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between JS and WLQ, particularly in service companies. For do it, we conducted a cross-sectional study to establish: 1) if socio-demographic and work characteristics imply differences between JS and WLQ; 2) if there are differences between JS and WLQ and if working sector entails any differences; and 3) if the JS is a good predictor of the WLQ. Method: 395 health workers and educational employees of the province of Alicante (Spain) were entered the study through a random mode. We used for data collection an Information form (socio-demographic and work variables), the Font-Roja Job Satisfaction Scale, and the Cabezas Quality of Work Life Questionnaire. Results: There were no differences in WLQ nor JS between men and women. Women felt more satisfied than men only relating to JS associated with the workload do. There were also no differences between men and women in WLQ. Not found differences in JS between health workers and educational workers, except in the case of the JS associated with the Labour Pressure (health workers had more JS than educational workers did). These professionals Health workers also perceived better WLQ. WLQ and JS were positively related. The best predictors of the WLQ are gender, the working sector, total JS, and JS related to Job Competency, related to the workload, and related to work pressure. Conclusions: We have obtained empirical results that allow us to affirm that the JS is an important determinant (but not a dimension) of the WLQ, so these two variables cannot be confused. In this sense, this work helps to clarify the concepts of WLQ and JS and their relationships, in the particular subsector of services companies.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Quality of work life, job satisfaction, service companies, gender, educational workers, health workers.

I. Introduction

The quality of working life (WLQ) and job satisfaction (JS) are important variables that organizations must use to achieve greater productivity and better quality of services. WLQ is one of the most important factors for human motivating and improving JS (Royuela, Jordi, and Jourdi, 2009). It is related to organizational success, workers (Hodson and Roscigno, 2004), to quality of the services (Dabholkar, Thorpe and Rentz, 1996), to organizational commitment, to workers' productivity (Ashwini, Vafaeian and Farshbaf, 2015), and many others organizational factors, especially in the case of the service sector. In addition, many studies show that there is a direct, positive, and close, relationship between JS and WLQ (Gröpel and Kuhl, 2009).

However, these concepts (WQL and JS) are not accurately defined, and have been used indistinctly. In other cases claim that WLQ is a determinant of JS, and finally, on the contrary, other studies maintain that JS is a determinant of the WLQ.

Walton (1973) defined WLQ as the personnel reaction to work, especially as an outcome from job needs satisfaction and psychological health. According to Walton, and other different studies, JS is an important determinant of WLQ (Walton, 1973; Testa and Ehrhart, 2005; Bhavani & Jegadeeshworan, 2014); but according to other authors, WLQ has a positive impact on JS (Kermansaravi, Navidian, Navabi Rigi & Yaghoubinia, 2014; Hossein Nekouei, Othman, Masud, & Ahmad, 2014; Bhatnagar & Soni, (2015); Jahanbani, Mohammadi, Noori Noruzi, & Bahrami, 2018). The dimensions of JS, such as stress in working life, conflicts in working life, and work overload, have a great impact on the WLQ and quality of personal life (Purohit, 2013). Years later Hackman and Odham (1975), Seashore (1975), Sheppard (1975) and Trist and Wesley (1981) presented a concept of WLQ involving the satisfaction and motivation in the workplace and the JS as a construct indissociable from QWL, both in research and in theory, that it must be considered as a cause and not a consequence of WLQ. Lawler (1975) suggested that it was necessary to consider JS as an important part of QWL. Warr and colleagues (Warr et al., 1979) considered JS as a relevant factor associated with WLQ. From 1980 to 2018, many studies have been conducted about QWL and its results revealed that there is a positive relationship between WLQ and JS (Kermansaravi, Navidiam, Rigi, and Yaghoubinia, 2015).

In relation to JS, the two most common definitions are "the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values" (Locke, 1976); and "the extent to which people like (is s satisfied with) or dislike (is dissatisfied with) their jobs "(Spector, 1997).

Due to this close relationship between JS and WLQ, it is interesting to clarify this relationship. It is relevant to know if JS is a component of the WLQ or one of its determinants, or WLS is a determinant factor of JS. Therefore, we focus this study on finding relationships between QWL and JS and identifying if any dimensions of JS has impact on QWL, in the field of health care and education companies.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that a large part of the current literature uses a wide range of samples, from Arab and Indian workers to Americans and Europeans, but a large majority of the studies have been conducted in Arab or Indian countries. The diversity of samples suggests

that the association between JS and WLQ is robust and likely not limited to specific populations. However, it was disappointing to discover that there were few representative studies of the population of Spain, especially in the field of service companies.

So, our specific objectives were to find out: 1) if socio-demographic and work characteristics imply differences between JS and WLQ; 2) if there are differences between JS and WLQ and if working sector entails any differences; and 3) if the JS is a good predictor of the WLQ.

II. Method

SUBJECTS

In this transversal descriptive-analytic study, 395 workers from educational and sanitary enterprises participated in the study. Table 1 depicts the demographic details. We did not find significant differences in the distribution of the subjects by working fields, nor by gender, age, and marital status. We also did not find significant differences by age between the two fields.

Table 1. Demographic details of the respondents

Table 1. Demographic details of the respondents

	N	Percentage	Mean	SD
Working field				
Healthcare	185	46,80		
Education	210	53,20		
Gender				
Male	217	54.97		
Female	178	45.03		
Age			40,31	11,80
20-30 yrs.	154	38.60		
31-45 yrs.	158	39.77		
>46	83	21.64		
Marital Status				
Single	93	23.30		
Married	271	68.60		
Divorced, Separated or Widowed	31	08.10		
Number of children				
0	163	41,30		
1	60	14,90		
2	116	29,60		
3	47	11,90		
4	7	1,80		
=>5	2	0,60		
Qualification				
Primary School Diploma	7	01,80		
High School Diploma	10	02,50		
Vocational training	38	09,60		
Bachelor Degree	144	36,50		
Master Degree	175	44,30		
Doctoral Degree	21	05,30		
Workplace				
Support staff	45	11,40		
Technician	11	02,80		
Professional	300	75,90		
Manager	39	09,90		
Work Shift				
Morning	161	40,80		
Afternoon	23	05,80		
Morning and afternoon	190	48,10		
Evening and night	21	05,30		
Working Time				
Fixed schedule	298	75,40		
Not fixed schedule	97	24,60		
Working Years in the workplace			11,99	10,25
Working years in the company			11,75	10,15
=<2 yrs.	170	43		
2-10 yrs.	225	57		
Employment contract				
Stable	324	75,40		
Temporary	97	24,60		

Procedure.

To select individuals we used a convenience sample from health workers and education workers in the public and private services companies in the Alicante province. Trained psychology students recruited potential participants; they identified themselves, explained the purpose of the study, and asked if the respondent wanted to answer. When they accepted, the interviewer proceeded to deliver a copy of the questionnaire for self-application, indicating to subjects where he had to send it once completed. 500 questionnaires were distributed, of which we obtained a return of 395 usable questionnaires, which represents a global response rate of 79%. We assured of confidentiality and anonymity of respondents

and considered ethical aspects.

Variables and instruments.

Sociodemographic and working variables were collected using a questionnaire that was designed 'ad-hoc' for the present study. We collected 12 variables: 5 sociodemographic (gender, age, marital status, number of children, and education level) and 7 working variables (activity sector, workplace, years worked in the company, years worked in the workplace, work shift, contract type/employment status, and working time).

For assessing JS we use the Font Roja Questionnaire (FRQ) (Aranaz, Mira and Rodríguez-Marín, 1987). The Font Roja Questionnaire is consisting of 23 items and has been designed using 5-point Likert scale (from minimal to maximal labor satisfaction). The overall score of this scale will be in rage of 23-115. These 23 items were grouped into nine dimensions, which explained 69.12% of the variance in a sample of healthcare professionals. Many studies have confirmed validity and reliability of this questionnaire (Fernández San Martín et al., 2000; López-Soriano, Bernal, and Cánovas, 2001; Mira et al., 1994; Núñez González et al., 2007; Vitaller, 1994). Using the results of our study, firstly we perform an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and then a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). According results from EFA, and retaining factors that are above the 0.50, as point of inflexion, we can conclude that FRQ measure seven dimensions: JS related to Job Competency (16.37% of variance; = 0.571), JS related to Workload (12.77%; = 0.707), JS related to Routine (7.76; = 0.521), JS related to Valuation of Work (6.69%; = 0.592), JS related to Worker Recognition (5.45%; = 0.705), JS related to Labor Pressure (5.13; = 0.543), and JS related to Personal Relationships (4.46; = 0.536). The JS total score reliability (α) was 0.678. The reliability values obtained can be considered sufficient (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Three items did not enter the model because they did not surpass the point of inflexion (0.50).

For measuring QWL, we use the Quality of Work Life Questionnaire (CVP-35) (Cabezas, 2000; Alonso, Iglesias and Franco, 2002). CVP-35 is composed by 35 items, which has been designed in a 10-point answer scale: to not at all (1 & 2), barely (3, 4 & 5), a fair extent (6, 7, & 8) and a large extent (9 & 10). Thus, the overall score of this questionnaire will be in range of 35–350. This questionnaire assesses four dimensions: WLQ-related Social Support, WLQ-related to Workload, WLQ related to Intrinsic Motivation and WLQ Total. Validity and reliability of questionnaire (=0.84) have been reported in several studies (Cabezas, 2000; Martin et al., 2004). In this paper, content validity was reviewed through the literature, and construct validity is established through the factorial analysis. We perform a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) following the initial three factors grouping proposed by the authors (Martín et al., 2004). According to our analysis results, we find a questionnaire that, while maintaining the distribution of the items of the initial questionnaire (Martín et al., 2004) for each factor, constitutes a set of three independent scales. Consequently, we would not be able to work with a total score of the questionnaire. However, for practical purposes, we have considered item 34, which is not part of any factor, and which evaluates the "general quality of work life", as an indicator of the Total Quality of Working Life (Total-QWL).

Data Analysis.

We analyze data using IBM SPSS 22. We performed a descriptive analysis of the items; we eva-

luated compliance with the statistical assumptions of normality (univariate and multivariate); and we evaluated the existence of atypical cases (univariate and multivariate) and the pattern of missing values, to verify that these did not disturb the subsequent statistical analyses. We used the descriptive statistics (percentages, frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviations), and inferential statistics (Pearson's correlation coefficient, factorial analysis, and multiple regression analysis) for analyzing data. DeVellis (2003) suggests a Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 as a reliable metric to be considered for high internal consistency. The Cronbach's alpha value for the current study ranged from 0.67 to 0.81, which suggests the existence of internal consistency among the items of the constructs, according to those standard measures.

Results

1. Socio-demographic and work characteristics related to the JS and QWL variables.

1.1. *Gender.* No significant differences in any of the dimensions of WLQ between men and women were found; and neither between men and women in JS, except in the case of JS-Workload (F=4.482, p<0. 05), in which women feel more satisfied than men do.

1.2. *Age.* We only found a significant negative correlation between JS and age in the cases of JS-Workload (-.126, p < .05), and JS-Routine and the age (Pearson correlation: - .105, p < .05). With regard to the WLQ, we only found a significant negative correlation between age and with the WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation (Pearson correlation = -.139, p < .01): the older age the less WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation.

1.3. *Marital status.* According to our results there were significant differences between both workers' groups due to marital status in the case of JS-Total (F = 2.52, p< .05), of JS-Job Competency (F = 2.809, p< .05), and of JS-Worker Recognition (F = 3.022, p <0.01). People married had higher JS-Total than the rest of the subjects, and higher JS-Job Competency than the single people did. In the case of JS-Worker Recognition, all other groups report more JS than single subjects. As far as WLQ is concerned, in relation to marital status, we only found differences in WLQ-Total (WLQ-item 34) (F = 2.275, p< .05). Singles perceive a lower WLQ-Total.

1.4. *Number of children.* We found significant negative correlations between the number of children and the JS-Workload (-.127, p <0.05) and the JS-Labour Pressure (-.120, p < .05). On the other hand, the number of children did not correlate significantly with any of the WLQ variables.

1.5. *Education Level.* People with Primary and High School diploma scored more in JS-Routine (F=2.502; p < . 05). People with Bachelor, Master and Doctoral degrees scored more in WLQ-Social support (F=2.887); and WLQ-Workload (F=2.621, p < .05).

1.6. *Activity sector*. In the analysis by activity sector, we found significant differences in JS-Labour Pressure. Health workers reported more JS-Labour Pressure than education workers did (F=8.370; p< .05). In the case of WLQ, Education workers reported more WLQ-Social Support (F=7.988, p < .005), more WLQ-Workload (F=15.417, p< .000), and more WLQ-Total (F=5.628, p< .18), than health workers. We found no significant differences regarding the WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation.

1.7. *Workplace*. We found that managers reported better WLQ-Social Support than the other

groups (F = 4.504, p < .05); and all groups reported higher WLQ-Total than auxiliary personnel did (F = 2.920, p <0.05).

1.8. *Work shift*. We did not find significant differences in JS due to the work shift. In the case of the WLQ, we only found significant differences with respect to the WLQ-Social support (F = 2.632, p <0.05): Subjects who have morning, afternoon, or morning and afternoon shifts reported a better WLQ-Social support than those who have an afternoon and evening shift.

1.9. *Working Time*. We found significant differences in JS in the case of the JS-Job Competency (F = 9.580, p < .05) and in the case of the JS-Workload (F = 4.652, p < .05): The subjects that have a fixed schedule are more satisfied in what refers to the JS-Job Competency and in related to Workload. With regard to WLQ, the type of time schedule introduces differences in WLQ-Social Support (F = 3.906, p < .05), WLQ-Workload (F = 19.433, p < .001) and WLQ- Total (F = 6.775, p < .01): Subjects who had a fixed schedule reported a better WLQ in those WLQ dimensions than subjects with a rotating schedule.

1.10. *Years working in the workplace*. We only found a significant negative correlation between the years worked in the work place and the JS-Routine (-.146, p < .01). The more years worked in the position less JS related to the Routine). We also found that the number of years worked in the job position only have a significant relationship (negative) with the WLQ-Intrinsic motivation (-.117; p < .05). The more years worked the less quality of life related to the intrinsic motivation experienced by the subjects.

1.11. *Years working in the company*. There was no significant relationship between the JS and the years worked in the company. In contrast, the number of years worked in the company correlated significantly (negatively) with the WLQ-intrinsic motivation (-.134; p <.01). That is, more years of work in the company less WLQ-internal motivation.

1.12. *Contract type (employment status)*. In the case of the type of contract, we did not find any significant differences in JS and WLQ. The only dimension in which we found any mentionable difference (not significant) was in WLQ-Workload: Subjects with a contract of indefinite duration reported a greater WLQ- Workload than subjects with a contract of definite duration.

2. Differences in the level of JS and QWL between education and health workers.

We found no significant differences in JS between health and education workers, except in the case of JS-Labour Pressure (F=8.370; p < .004): health workers have more JS than education workers (See Table 2).

Table 2. ANOVA for activity sector on JS.

Source		Suma de cuadrados	gl	Media cuadrática	F	Sig.
JS-Total	Between subjects	.065	1	.065	.376	.540
	Within subjects	67.536	393	.172		
JS-Job Competency	Between subjects	.304	1	.304	.534	.465
	Within subjects	223.627	393	.569		
JS-Workload	Between subjects	2.295	1	2.295	2.250	.134
	Within subjects	400.935	393	1.020		
JS-Routine	Between subjects	.000	1	.000	.000	.993
	Within subjects	209.416	393	.533		
JS-Valuation of Work	Between subjects	.260	1	.260	.464	.496
	Intra-grupos	220.044	393	.560		
JS-Worker Recognition	Between subjects	.124	1	.124	.204	.651
	Within subjects	238,561	393	,607		
JS-Labour Pressure	Between subjects	7.506	1	7.506	8.370	.004*
	Within subjects	352.428	393	.897		
JS-Personal Relationships	Between subjects	.705	1	.705	1.516	.219
	Within subjects	182.829	393	.465		

*p < ,05.

There were significant differences in two dimensions of WLQ between the subjects of the two labor sectors. Education workers report better WLQ-Social Support and WLQ-Workload than health workers do (F=7.988, p<.005), (F=15.417, p < .000). Differences do not appear in WLQ-Total nor WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation (See Table 3).

Table 3. ANOVA for Activity Sector on WLQ.

Source		df	Root mean square	F	p.
WLQ-Social Support	Between subjects	1	11.688	7.988	.005*
	Within subjects	393	1.463		
WLQ-Workload	Between subjects	1	23.702	15.417	.000*
	Within subjects	393	1.537		
WLQ-Intrinsic motivation	Between subjects	1	0.283	.377	.540
	Within subjects	393	0.749		
WLQ-Total (WLQ-34)	Between subjects	1	13.957	5.628	.018
	Within subjects	393	2.480		

*p<.05.

3. Relationship between JS and QWL.

We found significant positive correlations between WLQ and JS in the entire random sample, including both activity sectors: WLQ-Social Support correlates significantly and positively with JS-Total, and with all dimensions of JS, except with JS-Labor Pressure. The WLQ-Workload only have no significant correlations with JS-Routine and JS-Worker Recognition. The WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation is positive and significantly related to JS-Total and all dimensions of JS, except with JS-Labor Pressure. (See Table 4).

Table 4. Relations between WLQ and JS (total sample)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. WLQ-Total (WLQ 34)	1											
2. WLQ – Social Support.	.45**	1										
3. WLQ – Workload.	.35**	.18**	1									
4. WLQ – Intrinsic Motivation.	.36**	.55**	.17**	1								
5. JS- Job Competency.	.25*	.24*	.49*	.32*	1							
6. JS-Workload.	.26**	.29**	.52**	.15**	,27**	1						
7. JS-Routine.	.14**	.44**	.05	.25**	.11*	.04	1					
8. JS-Valuation of work.	.31**	.54**	.14*	.38**	.24**	.17**	.35**	1				
9. JS-Worker Recognition.	.24**	.63**	.04	.32**	.15**	.14**	.20**	.38**	1			
10. JS-Labor pressure.	.08	- .02	.29**	.02	.13**	.18**	-.17**	- .03	.00	1		
11. JS-Personal Relationships.	.29**	.47**	.19**	.37**	.26**	.09	.19**	.35**	.27**	- ,05	1	
12. JS-Total	.41**	.65**	.48**	.47**	.62**	.48**	.47**	.62**	.61**	.31**	.51**	1

*p<. 05; **p<. 01.

Considering the results by sectors (see Table 5), in the Health Activity Sector, WLQ-Social Support only have no significant correlation with JS-Job competency. WLQ-Workload correlates significantly with all dimensions of JS and with JS-Total. In addition, WLQ-Total correlates with all JS except with JS Labor pressure.

In the Education Activity Sector, WLQ-Social Support correlates with all JS dimensions except JS Labor pressure. WLQ-Workload only have no correlation with JS worker recognition. In addition, WLQ-Total correlates with JS-Job Competency, JS-Workload, JS-Work Valuation, JS-Worker Recognition, JS-Personal Relationships and JS-Total.

In both activity sectors, WLQ-Workload correlates with the same dimensions of the JS, with the only difference that in the educational sector WLQ-Workload also correlates with JS-Assessment. There are also no differences in the correlations of each sector with the total sample. In both sectors, WLQ-intrinsic motivation correlates with the same dimensions of JS, with the exception that in the educational sector it also correlates with the JS-Workload. There are also no differences in relation to the total sample. Finally, the WLQ-Total (WLQ-34) correlates in both sectors with the same dimensions, although in the educational sector it also correlates with JS-Worker Recognition and JS-Labour Pressure. There are no important differences with respect to the total sample, in which WLQ Total correlates with practically the same dimensions of the JS as in the two sectors.

Considering the results by sectors (see Table 5), in the Health Activity Sector, WLQ-Social Support only have no significant correlation with JS-Job competency. WLQ-Workload correlates significantly with all dimensions of JS and with JS-Total. In addition, WLQ-Total correlates with all JS except with JS Labor pressure.

In the Education Activity Sector, WLQ-Social Support correlates with all JS dimensions except JS Labor pressure. WLQ-Workload only have no correlation with JS worker recognition. In addition, WLQ-Total correlates with JS-Job Competency, JS-Workload, JS-Work Valuation, JS-Worker Recognition, JS-Personal Relationships and JS-Total.

In both activity sectors, WLQ-Workload correlates with the same dimensions of the JS, with the only difference that in the educational sector WLQ-Workload also correlates with JS-Assessment. There are also no differences in the correlations of each sector with the total sample. In both sectors, WLQ-intrinsic motivation correlates with the same dimensions of JS, with the exception that in the educational sector it also correlates with the JS-Workload. There are also no differences in relation to the total sample. Finally, the WLQ-Total (WLQ-34) correlates in both sectors with the same dimensions, although in the educational sector it also correlates with JS-Worker Recognition and JS-Labour Pressure. There are no important differences with respect to the total sample, in which WLQ Total correlates with practically the same dimensions of the JS as in the two sectors.

Table 5. Correlations between JS and WLQ in the two different labor sectors.

		WLQ-Social Support	WLQ-Workload	Intrinsic Motivation	WLQ-TOTAL (WLQ-34)
Health	JS-Job Competency	.117	.510**	.211**	.283**
	JS-Workload	.218**	.570**	.098	.259**
	JS-Routine	.421**	.014	.154*	.155*
	JS-Valuation of work	.510**	.119	.243**	.294**
	JS-Worker Recognition	.596**	-.001	.214**	.112
	JS-Labor Pressure	-.114	.319**	.025	.122
	JS-Personal Relationships	.384**	.214**	.257**	.222**
	JS-Total	.586**	.523**	.324**	.402**
Education	JS-Job Competency	.324**	.511**	.402**	.220**
	JS-Workload	.164*	.466**	.199**	.243**
	JS-Routine	.461**	.081	.312**	.12
	JS- Valuation of work	.579**	.138*	.480**	.333**
	JS-Worker Recognition	.673**	.107	.382**	.378**
	JS-Labor Pressure	.112	.377**	.001	.090
	JS-Personal Relationships	.527**	.152*	.451**	.342**
	JS-Total	.725**	.497**	.562**	.432**

*p<. 05; **p<.01.

4. Is JS a good predictor of the QWL?

To determine if JS is a good predictor of the QWL we choose a multiple linear regression (Criterion: Prob. of F to enter <=. 70, Prob. of F to exit> =. 10) that incorporated as independent variables all those that had correlated better with the variables of WLQ. According to the results (see Table 6), the only predictor for WLQ-Total (WLQ-34) was JS-Total explaining 20.3% of its variance.

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression on WLQ-Total (WLQ-34).

Table 6. Multiple Linear Regression on WLQ-Total (WLQ-34).

Source	*B*	SE *B*	Beta		
JS-Total	1.428	.175	.374	8.152	.000

Independent variable: WLQ-Total (WLQ-34).

R=0.450; R^2=0.203; R^2corregida=0,197; F=33.099; p<0.01.

In the case of the WLQ-Social Support, in the fifth step, we obtained a more efficient model, explaining 59% of the variance of that dimension, including: JS-Total, JS-Labor Pressure, JS-Job Competency, Sector, and Gender (see table 7).

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression on WLQ-Social Support.

Source	B	SE B	Beta	t	p.
(Constant)	-1.253	.476		-2.629	.009
JS-Total	2,.994	.140	1.016	21.459	.000
JS-Labor Pressure	-.284	.045	-.222	-6.251	.000
JS-Job Competency	-.482	.068	-.297	-7.076	.000
Activity Sector	.397	.084	.162	4.754	.000
Gender	-.250	.081	-.102	-3.075	.002

Independent variable: WLQ-Social Support.

R=0.767; R^2=0.589; R^2adjusted=0.581; F=78.948; p≤.. 01.

For WLQ-Workload, we obtained a similar model in the fourth step, which explains 55.10% of that variable, including as predictors the following variables: JS-Workload, JS-Job Competency, Sector, and JS-Labor pressure (see Table 8).

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression on WLQ-Workload.

Source	B	SE B.	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.449	.415		5.899	.000
JS-Workload	.410	.046	.329	8.915	.000
JS-Job Competency	.519	.061	.309	8.449	.000
Activity Sector	.447	.093	.176	4.812	.000
JS-Labour pressure	.265	.047	.200	5.594	.000

Independent variable: WLQ-Workload.

R=0.742; R^2=0.551; R^2adjusted=0.544; F=79.201;p< .01.

Finally, in the case WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation dimension the results showed a poor model, which explained, to the fifth step, only 27.7% of the variance of the dependent variable, including: JS-Total, JS-Personal relationships, Age, JS-Work Valuation, and JS-Job Competency (See Table 9).

Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression on WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation.

Source	B	St Error.	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	4.919	.365		13.487	.000
JS-Total	.384	.158	.184	2.429	.016
JS-Personal Relationships	.228	.064	.180	3.564	.000
Age	-.010	.003	-.138	-3.148	.002
JS-Work Valuation	.189	.066	.163	2.879	.004
JS-Job Competency	.157	.066	.137	2.387	.017

Independent: WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation.

R=0.526; R^2=0.277; R^2adjusted=0.267; F=29.569;p< . 01.

Discussion.

Job Satisfaction.

According to our results, we can consider that the population studied is moderately satisfied.

The average score in JS reflects an acceptable level in all groups. Although it may require a deeper analysis, it is possible to think that this fact may be due to the economic crisis that we are experiencing since 2010. This situation can promote the subjects to report a higher JS simply for having work in a time with high rate of unemployment, especially in two sectors that have a very stable job (Rico, 2012). However, we have found some technical notes from the National Institute for Safety and Hygiene in the Spanish Work (INSHT) of the 90s, reporting an average of 70.53 (range 15-105) in general JS (Pérez and Fidalgo, 1999); that indicates that the general JS expressed by the workers is medium-high, also outside crisis times. We have found similar results in some of the works reviewed (Bòria-Reverter, Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró, 2012, Ripoll, Falguera and Urrutia, 2006, ECVT, 2010; 2011).

Gender: We have not found differences between women and men in JS than men, except in the JS-Workload. That is, women are more satisfied with the time to do their job and with the amount of work, they have to do. Our results coincide with studies that do not find an association between JS and gender (Gámez et al., 1999; Mira et al., 1994; Vitaller, 1994; Varela-Centelles et al, 2004). However, others studies find higher JS in men than women (Olivar, González and Martínez, 1999) or other which find that women have a higher level of JS than men (Alonso, 2008; Clark, 1997; Piko, 2006; Sánchez, Fuentes and Artacho, 2007; Sibbad et al., 2000; Soane and Williams, 2000). Some studies show a positive relationship of women and a higher level of JS, specifically in the education sector workers (Dinham and Scott, 2000, Evans, 2001, Fraser and Hodge, 2000, Holdaway, 1978, Tait, Padgett and Baldwin, 1989), and in health workers, especially in general practitioners.

Age: According to our results, the older and the younger people report more JS-Workload and less JS-Routine. This results are consistent with authors such as Herzberg (1966) and Sánchez Cañizares, Fuentes and Artacho (2007) in a general population, Adams and Bond (2000), Olivar, González and Martínez (1999) and Uriarte (2012), Wetterneck et al. (2002) and Yang and Chang (2008) in nurses, and Vitaller (1994) in primary care physicians. However, our results do not correspond with others such as those described by Alonso (2008) in a population of administration and services personnel of a public university, more similar to the results of work in Anglo-Saxon populations. In this case, the most usual result is a non-linear U-shaped function, with its minimum around 35 years (Clark, 1997, Clark and Oswald, 1994, 1996, Clark, Oswlad and Warr, 1996; Varela-Centelles, 2004). These authors explain this relationship by pointing out that older workers had more time to find the job that satisfies them. Probably, this explanation is not so applicable to the activity sectors that we have studied, in which the people with permanent jobs are the most represented.

Level of education: Subjects with High School Grade or Vocational Training report less JS-Routine. Although the differences according to the type of occupation are not significant, we founded a repeated pattern of a lower JS with a lower academic and professional category, and a higher JS with a higher academic and professional qualification, in accordance with to previous studies (Bòria-Reverter, Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró, 2012; Cooper, Rout and Faragher, 1989; Klien and Maher, 1992; Meng 1990; Pichler and Wallace, 2009; Piko, 2006; Ripoll, Falguera and Urrutia, 2006; Ross and Reskin, 1992). However, there are also studies with opposite results (Clark, 1996, Clark and Oswald, 1996; Sloane and Williams, 2000).

The explanation of this phenomenon can be related to the expectations of the workers. In addition, the lack of adaptation between the job position and the qualification of the worker can also play a role, an aspect that is evident in several studies in Spain (Sanromá and Ramos, 2003).

Marital status: Married people and those living as a couple report higher JS than the rest of the subjects. These results coincide with other studies (Alonso, 2008; Diaz, 2005; Ripoll, Falguera and Urrutia, 2006), although there are other (Vitaller, 1994) that do not find significant differences on the base of the civil status. There are studies that indicate that the existence of a network of social relationships is very relevant for life satisfaction (subjective well-being, happiness) (Argyle, 1992, Lee et al., 1999; Ahn and Mochón, 2010); and there are many studies that have found positive relationships between JS and general life satisfaction (Tail, Padgett and Baldwin, 1989; Steiner and Truxillo, 1987; 1989).

Activity sector: We have not found relevant differences in JS between the two activity sectors studied. The only difference between health workers and education workers is that the former have more JS-Labour Pressure than the latter. We consider, therefore, that there are no differences in JS between both activity sectors, with the exception mentioned. Our results are similar to other studies. Tejedo (2013) show that JS differences appear between public administration workers and the rest, which the author relates to the large percentage of workers in that sector who have a stable job. In the same line, the study by of Bòria-Reverter, Crespi-Vallbona and Mascarilla-Miró (2012) shows that the type of work activity does not condition the JS. Likewise, the Randstad Workmonitor study (2015), developed from more than 15.000 international surveys, showed similar results: education (74%), health (73%) and financial services (69%) are the sectors with a higher JS, without finding significant differences among them. Type of contract: We found no significant differences in JS by type of contract within the activity sectors, nor between the sectors. These results coincide with other old ones, such as Fernández and collaborators (Fernández et al., 1995).

Working Life Quality.

The WLQ of our subjects is moderately high. The items with higher scores are related with family support, competency and training for work, the importance of work for the subject, the clarity of their tasks, their motivation to do them, the absence of conflict with colleagues and their satisfaction with the type of work they perform. That is, most of the highest scores correspond to the factors Social Support and Internal Motivation. The items with the lowest score have to do with the WLQ, which depends on the amount of work, psychological stress and work pressure; that is; they correspond to the dimension WLQ-Workload.

Considering the socio-demographic and working variables, our results showed the following:

Gender: We did not find significant differences in WLQ between men and women, as in the case of the JS: Women do not have worse WLQ than men. These results are similar to many of the studies reviewed (Da Silva, 2006).

Age: the younger age the less WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation. These results are also consistent with those of other studies, although most of them do not offer WLQ-Total scores, and distinguish only according to the different dimensions of the WLQ (Da Silva, 2006). However, the most com-

mon results are adjusted to a non-linear U-shaped function, with a minimum around 35 years, as already mentioned for the case of the JS (Clark and Oswald, 1994).

Level of education: We found significant differences by the level of studies: Those who have Bachelor and Doctorate degrees score more in WLQ-Social support. On the other hand, those with primary and high school degrees score more in WLQ-Workload. Similar results are found in Da Silva (2006). Most likely, this different perception of the group with a low level of education is based on a different "perceived reality" of the amount of work, and of the pressure received to cope the workload, lack of time, physical discomfort, etc. Particularly, in the activity sectors that we have studied, which are characterized by being located in bureaucratized organizations, the group with low level of studies has as a "reference group" the group of "professionals", which may be affecting their perception of their working conditions, generating a worse WLQ experience. These results are similar to those presented in terms of the JS.

Marital status: As in the case of the JS, also in WLQ we find that single people living alone experience a lower WLQ. Our results are consistent with studies that relate life satisfaction, subjective well-being or happiness with the fact that the person is married (Argyle, 1992; Lee et al., 1999); Tait, Padgett y Baldwin, 1989; Steiner y Truxillo, 1989; Blanchflower y Oswald, 2004; Peiró, 2004). Other authors point out that, in particular, marital status is a very determining factor: on average, married people are happier than single, separated or widowed (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004, Peiró, 2004). In fact, for a long time, sociologists have conducted studies that link life satisfaction, happiness or quality of life with marital status, indicating that married people have a better quality of life or are happier than those who are not married (for example, Durkheim (1976), in the 19th century).

Activity sector: According our results, activity sector implies significant differences. Education workers rapport more WLQ-Social Support, WLQ-workload, and WLQ-Total, than health workers did. Our results coincide with studies that compare the WLQ by sectors. These results are partially agreeing with those indicated by different works. For example, Sturman (2004) indicates that primary and secondary teachers show a higher level of WLQ than the rest of the professionals surveyed, from other activity sectors.

Workplace: We found that managers experience better WLQ-Social Support than the other groups and all groups experience higher WLQ than auxiliary personnel. Similar results were also found in Da Silva (2006). These differences are clearly related to those that we also find in the case of age and are coherent with the results referring to the years worked in the position or in the company. Indeed, according to our results, the more years worked the less WLQ-Intrinsic Motivation experienced by the subjects. In the case of the health sector, these results are similar to those found referring to resident physicians, whose WLQ appears significantly lower than that of specialist physicians. (Fernández Martínez et al., 2007; Menéndez –González, Ryan y García, 2005: Cohen y Patten, 2005).

Work shift: Subjects that were being in the morning, afternoon, or morning and afternoon shift, reported a better WLQ-Social Support than those who were in the afternoon and evening shift. We can explain this result thinking that working in that work shift hinders personal relationships both family, friendship, and even among

the professionals themselves. These results agree with those indicated by different authors (Costa, 2003; Di Milia, 2006; Durán, 2007; Fernández et al., 1995; Folkard & Tucker, 2003; Nogareda & Nogareda, 1999; Shen et al., 2006).

Type of contract: We found not significant differences in WLQ by type of contract within the activity sectors, nor between the sectors. However, generally in WLQ studies, workers in permanent employment report a higher WLQ.

Time Schedule: Subjects who have a fixed schedule report a better WLQ, related to workload and social support, than those with a rotating schedule. These results are related to those mentioned in the previous section, since the schedule has to do with work shifts.

Working Life Quality and Job Satisfaction.

We have found a significant positive correlation of the WLQ-Total with the JS-Total and all the dimensions of the JS.

In addition, there is a significant positive correlation between the JS and the WLQ in the total group of subjects studied, and in both sectors.

These results are consistent with those of Mira and colleagues (Mira et al., 1994) according to which, in the hospital environment, relations with colleagues and heads, the feeling of being able to work and the aspects of intrinsic job satisfaction, are the main elements to enjoy the job.

The prediction of the WLQ.

According to our results, we can affirm that Gender, Activity sector, JS-Total, JS- Job Competency, JS-Workload, and JS-Labor pressure, are the best predictors of the WLQ (in particular WLQ-Social Support and WLQ-Workload). In sum, our results confirm that the level of JS experienced by workers is one of the main predictors the level of WLQ.

In any case, these results were quite similar to those of the many other studies showing that the WLQ is positive and strongly associated with the JS (Aketch et al., 2012; Baba and Jamal, 1991; Drobnic, Beham , and Präg, 2010); Ortiz and Arias, 2009; Peiró and González-Romá, 1990; Pérez-Zapata and Zurita 2014; Pérez-Zapata, Peralta-Montecinos and Fernández-Davila, 2014); Pichler and Wallace, 2009; Sirgy et al., 2001; Van Laar, Edwards and Easton, 2007; Warr, Cook and Waal, 1979).

Conclusions.

This study has shown that:

1. The level of JS and WLQ is similar in men and women. Women are more satisfied than men only concerning the JS related workload.
2. We found no differences in JS between the health workers and the education workers, except in the case of JS related to work pressure. The formers report more satisfaction than the latter.
3. There are significant differences in WLQ among professionals in the two sectors studied. Education workers report better WLQ than health workers, specifically in terms of the support that they receive in and out of their work and the work pressure and the job stress (workload).
4. The WLQ and JS are positively related in all the subjects studied, and in both sectors.
5. The best predictors for WLQ are jointly gender, activity sector, total JS, JS related to labor competition, JS related to workload, and JS related to work pressure.

6. We understand that this study provides explanatory variables to be taken into consideration in future research about the relation between WLQ and the JS of workers in service companies, and in other different activity sectors.

Limitations and Future Directions.

This study has several limitations that should be mentioned:

1) For the selection of the sample, we use the convenience sampling. In this type of sampling subjects are not chosen strictly at random, although it is assumed that these individuals are representative of the population studied. This assumes a bias of the sample that reduces its representativeness. It would not be entirely correct to extrapolate the results to the general population.

2) The sample only included workers from two the province of Alicante (Spain). Therefore, the results of this study cannot be extrapolated to other companies elsewhere.

3) As the study is transversal, we cannot establish causal relationships, so in the future longitudinal studies should be carried out, given the importance of the topic.

Conflict of Interest

The authors of this paper declare no conflict of interest.

References.

Adams, A., & Bond, S. (2000). Hospital nurses' job satisfaction, individual and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *32* (3), 536-543.

Ahn, N. & Mochón, F. (2010). La felicidad de los españoles: factores explicativos. *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, *18* (54), 5-31.

Aketch, J. R., Odera, O., Chepkuto, P., & Okaka, O. (2012). Effects of quality of work life on job performance: theoretical perspectives and literature review. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(5), 383-388.

Alonso Fernández, M., Iglesias Carbajo, A.I., & Franco Vidal, A. (2002). *Percepción de la calidad de vida profesional en un área sanitaria de Asturias. Atención Primaria*; *30*: 483-89.

Alonso Martín, P. (2008). Estudio comparativo de la satisfacción laboral en el personal de administración. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, *24* (1), 25-40.

Aranaz, J., Mira, J., & Rodríguez-Marín J. (1987). La satisfacción de los profesionales como un aspecto más del control de calidad en los hospitales. *Todo Hospital 47*: 53-60.

Argyle, M. (1992). *La psicología de la felicidad.* Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Baba, V. V., & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinisation of job context and job content as related to workers' quality of working life: a study of psychiatric nurses. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *12*, 379-386.

Blanchflower, D.G. & Oswald, A. J. (2004). Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Public Economics*, *88*, 1359-1386.

Bòria-Reverter, S., Crespi-Vallbona, M., & Mascarilla-Miró, O. (2012). Variables determinantes de la satisfacción laboral en España. *Cuadernos de*

Economía, *35*, 9-16.

Cabezas, C. *La calidad de vida de los profesionales.* (2000). FMC, 7, 53-68.

Clark, A. E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, *4*(4), 341-372.

Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A.J. (1994). Unhappiness and unemployment. *Economic Journal*, *104*, 648-659.

Clark, A. E., & Oswald, A.J. (1996). Satisfaction and comparison income, *Journal of Public Economics*, *61*, 359-381.

Clark, A.E., Oswald, A.J. & Warr, P.B. (1996). Is job satisfaction U-shaped in age? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *69*, 57-81.

Costa, G. (2003). Shift-work and occupational medicine: an overview. *Occupational Medicine*, *53*, 83-88.

Cooper, C. L., Rout, U., & Faragher, B. (1989). Mental health, job satisfaction, and job stress among general practitioners. *British Medical Journal*, *298*(6670), 366-370.

Da Silva, M. (2006). *Nuevas perspectivas de la Calidad de Vida Laboral y sus relaciones con la eficacia organizacional.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universidad de Barcelona, España. https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/2669.

Dabholkar, P.A., Thorpe, D.I., & J.O. Rentz (1996). A measure of service quality for retail stores: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *24(1)*, 3-16.

DeVellis, R. (2003). *Scale development: theory and applications.* Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Díaz, C.Z. (2005). *Estilos de vida y satisfacción laboral.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid. http://biblioteca.ucm.es/tesis/fsl/ucm-t28680.pdf.

Di Milia, L. (2006). Shift work, sleepiness and long distance driving. Transportation Research Part F: *Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, *9*, 278-285.

Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (2000): Moving into the third, outer domain of teacher satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(4), 379-396.

Drobnic, S., Beham, B., & Präg, P. (2010). Good Job, Good Life? Working Conditions and Quality of Life in Europe. *Soc Indic Res*, *99*, 205-225. DOI 10.1007/s11205-010-9586-7.

Durán, M.A. (2007). *El valor del tiempo. ¿Cuántas horas te faltan al día?* Madrid: Editorial Espasa Calpe.

Durkheim, É. (1976 [1897]). *El suicidio.* Madrid: Akal.

ECVT. (2010). *VII Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales (Subdirección General de Estadísticas Sociales y Laborales).* Madrid. Recuperado de http://www.empleo.gob.es/estadisticas/ecvt/Ecvt2010/index.htm.

ECVT. (2011). *VIII Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales (Subdirección General de Estadísticas Sociales y Laborales).* Madrid. Recuperado de http://

www.empleo.gob.es/estadisticas/ecvt/Ecvt2011/index.htm.

Evans, L. (2001). Delving deeper into morale, job satisfaction and motivation among education professionals. *Educational Management y Administration*, *29(3)*, 291-307.

Fernández Mundet, F., González García-Portilla, P., Sáiz Martínez, P.A., Hinojal Fonseca, R., Bousoño García, M. & Bobes García, J. (1995). Calidad de vida en trabajadores de un hospital general con horario a turnos de noches. *Medicina de Empresa*, *24* (2), 436-438.

Fernández San Martín, M.I., Villagrasa Ferrer, J.R., Gamo, M.F., Vázquez Gallego, J., Cruz, C., Aguirre, M.V., et al., (1995). Estudio de la satisfacción laboral y sus determinantes en los trabajadores sanitarios de un área de Madrid. *Revista Española de Salud Pública 69*(6), 487-497.

Fernández San Martín, M.I. Moinelo Camporro, A.,Villanueva Guerra, A., Andrade Rosa, C., Rivera Teijido, M., Gómez Ocaña, J.M. & Parrilla Ulloa, O. (2000). Satisfacción laboral de los profesionales de atención primaria del área 10 del INSALUD de Madrid. *Revista Española de Salud Pública,74* (2), 139-147.

Folkard, S. & Tucker, P. (2003). Shift work, safety and productivity. *Occupational Medicine*, *53*, 95-101.

Forgionne, G. A. & Peeters, V. E. (1982). Differences in job motivation and satisfaction among female and male managers. *Human Relations*, *35* (2), 101-118.

Fraser, J.; y Hodge, M. (2000). Job satisfaction in higher education: Examining gender in professional work settings. *Sociological Inquiry*, *70(2)*, 172-188.

Gámez Perales, M., Santano Magariño, A., Matías Benayas, S., Roca Sánchez, M., & Tomey Soria, J. (1999). Estudio de clima laboral en cuatro unidades de críticos de un hospital. *Enfermería Intensiva*, *10*, 120-8.

Gröpel, P. & Kuhl, J. (2009). Work-life balance and subjective well-being: the mediating role of need fulfilment. *Br J Psychol. 100* (Pt 2):365-75. doi: 10.1348/000712608X337797.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: The World Publishing.

Hodson, R. & Roscigno, V.J. (2004). Organizational success and worker dignity: Complementary or contradictory? *American Journal of Sociology*, *110(3)*, 672-708.

Holdaway, E. A. (1978). Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *14(1)*, 30-47.

Kaiser, L.C. (2002). Job satisfaction: A comparison of standard, non-standard, and self-employment patterns across Europe with a special note to the gender/job satisfaction paradox. *EPAG Working Papers*, *27*, Colchester: University of Essex.

Kermansaravi, F., Navidian, A., Navabi Rigi, Sh., & Yaghoubinia, F. (2014). The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction of Faculty Members in Zahedan University of Medical Sciences. *Global Journal of Health Science*, *7* (2), 228-234. doi:10.5539/gjhs.v7n2p228.

Klien, S.M. & Maher, J.R. (1992). Education

level and satisfaction with pay. *Personnel Psychology*, *196*(19), 195-208.

Lee, D. Y.; Park, S. H.; Uhlemann, M. R. & Pat-Sula, P. (1999). What Makes You Happy? A Comparison of Self-reported Criteria of Happiness between Two Cultures. *Social Indicators Research*, *50*, 351-362.

Linz, S.J. (2003). Job satisfaction among Russian workers. *Journal of Manpower*, *24* (6), 626-645.

Locke, E.A. (1976). 'The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction'. In M. P. Dunnette, (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1297-1350 (p. 1342).

López-Soriano, F., Bernal, L., & Cánovas, A. (2001). Satisfacción laboral de los profesionales en un Hospital Comarcal de Murcia. *Rev. Calidad Asistencial; 16*, 43-246.

Martín, J., Cortés, J. F., Morente, M., Caboblanco, M., Garijo, J. & Rodríguez, A. (2004). Características métricas del Cuestionario de Calidad de Vida Profesional (CVP-35). *Gaceta Sanitaria*, *18* (2): 129-36.

Meng R. (1990). The relations between unions and job satisfaction. *Applied Economics*, *22*, 1635-1648.

Mira, J.J, Vitaller, J., Buil J.A., Aranaz, J., & Rodríguez Marin, J. (1994). Satisfacción y estrés laboral en médicos generalistas del sistema público de salud. *Atención Primaria*, *14* (10), 67-73.

Nogareda, C. & Nogareda, S. (1999). *Trabajo a turnos y nocturno: aspectos organizativos. NTP455*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales de España. Instituto Nacional de Seguridad e Higienes en el Trabajo.

Núñez González, E., Estévez Guerra, G.J., Hernández Marrero, P. & Marrero Medina, C.D. (2007). Una propuesta destinada a complementar el cuestionario Font-Roja de satisfacción laboral. *Gaceta. Sanitaria*, *21*(2), 136-141.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Olivar Castrillón, C., González Morán, S. & Martínez Suárez, M. M. (1999). Factores relacionados con la satisfacción laboral y el desgaste profesional en los médicos de atención primaria de Asturias. *Atención Primaria*, *24*, 352-359.

Ortiz, J. A., & Arias, F. (2009). El desgaste profesional (burnout) y calidad de vida laboral como predictores de la búsqueda de otro trabajo en profesionales de la salud y de la educación en el occidente de México. *Ciencia y Trabajo*, *34*, 222-226.

Peiró, A. (2004). Condiciones socioeconómicas y felicidad de los españoles. *Tribuna de Economía*, *816*, 179-194.

Peiró, J.M. & González-Romá, V. (1990). *Clima y satisfacción laboral en los equipos de atención primaria*. Valencia: Conselleria de Salut i Consum. Generalitat Valenciana.

Pérez, J. & Fidalgo, M. (1999). *Satisfacción laboral: Escala general de satisfacción*. NTP 394. Madrid: INSHT.

Pérez-Zapata, D. & Zurita, E. (2014). Calidad de vida laboral en trabajadores de salud pública en Chile. *Salud y Sociedad*, *5*(2), 172-180.

Pérez-Zapata, D., Peralta-Montecinos, J. & Fernández-Davila, P. (2014). Influencia de variables organizacionales en la calidad de vida laboral de funcionarios del sector público de salud en el extremo norte de Chile. *Universitas Psychologica*, *13*(2). doi:10.11144/Javeriana.UPSY13-2.ivoc.

Pichler, F., & Wallace, C. (2009). What are the reasons for differences in job satisfaction across Europe? Individual, compositional, and institutional explanations. *European Sociological Review*, *25*, 535-549.

Piko, B.F. (2006). Burnout, role conflict, job satisfaction and psychological health among Hungarian health care staff: A questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *43*, 311-318.

Purohit, M. (2013). A comparative study of work life balance in various industrial sectors in Pune region. International Journal of Marketing, *Financial Services and Management Research*, *2*(3), 2013.

Rico, P. (2012). Satisfacción laboral de los asalariados en España. *Revista de métodos cuantitativos para la economía y la empresa*, *14*, 137-158.

Ripoll, E., Falguera, M., & Urrutia, J. (2006). Factores determinantes de la satisfacción en el trabajo: cinco años del barómetro laboral. Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, *Revista Índice 14*, 14-16.

Ross, C.E. & Reskin, B.F. (1992). Education, Control at Work and Job Satisfaction. **Social Science Research, 21**,134-148.

Royuela, V., Jordi, L. T. & Jourdi, S. (2009). Result of Quality of Work Life Index in Spain a Comparison of Survey Result and Aggregate Social Indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, *90*, 225-241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9254-3.

Sánchez Cañizares, S. M., Fuentes, F.J., & Artacho, C. (2007). La perspectiva de género en el análisis de la satisfacción laboral: una aplicación empírica mediante modelos logit y probit. *Cuadernos de Gestión*, *7* (2), 55-67.

Sanromá, E. & Ramos, R. (2003), *Sobreeducación y mercados de trabajo locales en España. En San Segundo, M. J. y Zorrilla, R. (eds.), Economía de la Educación. Actas de las XII Jornadas de la AEDE, 18- 19/9/2003, DL M-39456-2003* (pp. 220-239). Madrid: Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

Seashore, S. E. (1975). Defining and measuring the quality of work life. In L. E. Davis & A. B. Cherns (Eds.), *Quality of working life: Volume 1*, pp. 93-110. New York: Free Press.

Sheppard, H. L.: 1975, 'Some indicators of quality of working life: A sim-plified approach to measurement', in L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns (eds.), **The Quality of Working Life (Free Press, New York),** pp. 119–122.

Shen, J., Botly, L., Cheng, S., Gibbs, A., Sabanadzovic, S. & Shapiro, C. (2006). Fatigue and shift work. *Journal of Sleep Research*, *15*, 1-5.

Sibbald, B., Enzer, I., Cooper, C., Rout, V., & Sutherland, V. (2000). GP job satisfaction in 1987, 1990 and 1998: Lessons for the future? *Family Practice*, *17*(5): 364-371.

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. (2001). A new measure of quality-of-work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spill over theories. *Social Indicators Research*, *55*, 241-302.

Sloane, P. & Williams, H. (2000). Job satisfac-

tion, comparison earnings and gender. *Labour*, *14*, 473-502.

Sousa-Poza, A. & Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2000). Taking another look at the gender/job satisfaction paradox. *Kyklos*, *53*, 135-152.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*, London: Sage, p.2.

Steiner, D. D., & Truxillo, D. M. (1987). Another look at the job satisfaction and life satisfaction relationship: A test of the disaggregation hypothesis. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *8*, 71-77.

Steiner, D. D., & Truxillo, D. M. (1989). An improved test of the disaggregation hypothesis of job and life satisfaction. J*ournal of Occupational Psychology*, *62*, 33-39.

Tait, M., Padgett, M. & Baldwin, T. (1989) Job and Life Satisfaction: A Reevaluation of the Strength of the Relationship and Gender Effects as a Function of the Date of the Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 502-507.

Tejedo Benedicto, E. (2013). Satisfacción laboral y su relación con variables sociodemográficas y laborales y con parámetros de riesgo cardiovascular en trabajadores de Baleares. *Medicina Balear*, *28 (2)*, 29-34.

Trist, E. and W. A. Westley: 1981, *La qualité de la vie au travail dans la fonction publique federale* (Travail Canada, Ottawa).

Uriarte, L. (2012). *Factores que influyen en la Satisfacción Laboral de enfermería en el Complejo Hospitalario de Navarra.* Master Thesis. Universidad Pública de Navarra. http://academica-e.unavarra.es/bitstream/handle/2454/6156/TFM.pdf?sequence=1

Varela-Centelles, P.I. (2004). Satisfacción laboral de los odontólogos y estomatólogos del servicio gallego de salud. *Revista Española de Salud Pública*, *78*, (3): 399-402.

Vitaller, J. (1994). *Relación entre satisfacción laboral, fuentes de estrés y actividad asistencia en médicos generalistas del nuevo modelo de Atención Primaria del Sistema Sanitario Público en la provincia de Alicante.* Doctoral Thesis unpublished. Universidad de Alicante. With the kind permission of the author.

Walton, R. E. (1973). *Quality of Working Life: What Is It? Sloan Management Review 15*(1): 11-21.

Van Laar, D., Edwards, J.A. & Easton, S. (2013). *User Manual for the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale.* University of Portsmouth. UK. http://www.qowl.co.uk/researchers/WRQoL%20User%20manual%20v38%20ebook%2003%20Nov14.pdf.

Ward, M. E. & Sloane, P.L. (2000). Non-pecuniary advantages versus pecuniary disadvantages: job satisfaction among male and female academics in scottish universities. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, *47*, 3, 273-303.

Warr P., Cook J., & Wall T. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *52*, 129-148.

Wetterneck, T.B., Linzer, M., McMurray, J.E., Douglas, J., Schwartz, M., Bigby, J., et al. (2002). Worklife and satisfaction of general internist. A*rch*

Intern Med, *162*, 649-56.

Yang, F. H., & Chang, C.C. (2008). Emotional labour, job satisfaction and organizational commitment amongst clinical nurses: A questionnaire survey. International Journal of Nursing Studies (45), 879-887.

Jahanbani, E., Mohammadi, M., Noori Noruzi, N., & Bahrami, F. (2018). *Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction Among Workers of Health Centers in Ahvaz, Iran Jundishapur J Health Sci*. Published online 2018 January 1. 1-7. doi: 10.5812/jjhs.14381.

Hossein Nekouei, M., Othman, M., BT, Masud, J. Bt. & Ahmad, A. Bt., (2014). Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction among employee in government organizations in Iran. J. Basic. *Appl. Sci. Res.*, *4*(1), 217-229.

Bhatnagar, T. & Soni, H. (2015). Impact of Quality of work life on Job satisfaction of School Teachers in Udaipur city. IOSR *Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM*, *17* (3), pp. 10-14. DOI: 10.9790/487X-17321014.

Bhavani, M. & Jegadeeshworan, M. (2014). Job satisfaction and quality of working life. A case study of women teachers in higher education. *SDMIMI Journal of Management*, *5*(2), 1-12.

Warr, P, Cook, J and Wall, T (1979). "Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological wellbeing". *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. *52*, 129-148.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60(2)*, 159. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546

Lawler, E. E. (1975). Measuring the psychological quality of working life: The why and how of it. *The quality of working life*, *1*, 123-133.

Walton, R. E. (1975). Criteria for Quality of Working Life. In L.E. Davis, A.B. Cherns and Associates (Eds.).The Quality of Working. New York: *The FreePress*, *Life*, *1*, 91-104.