The Role of Quality of Work Life in Achieving Job Satisfaction among Faculty Members at the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Ain Temouchent

Khatima Louati [*] *, University of Ain Temouchent (Algeria),*
khatima.louati@univ-temouchent.edu.dz
Menel Ibtissem Mankouri, University of Ain Temouchent (Algeria),
menel.mankouri@univ-temouchent.edu.dz

Received: 17/01/2026 *Accepted: 14/09/2026* *Published:30/09/2026*

Abstract:

This study aimed to examine the role of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and its dimensions in achieving job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences at the University of Ain Temouchent. The study sample consisted of 70 faculty members. Data were collected through a questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS v 26.

The results revealed a strong positive correlation between Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction. The study recommends decentralization, faculty involvement in decision-making, freedom of expression, and adequate moral support

Keywords: Quality of Work Life; Job Satisfaction; Salaries and Rewards; Empowerment; University of Ain Temouchent.

Jel Classification Codes : J28, J81, J31, M54, I23.

[*] *Corresponding author*

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality of Work Life (QWL) is a key motivating factor in modern organizations, particularly those focused on human resource development. It contributes to meeting employees' needs and enhancing their sense of security, stability, and well-being. QWL also helps create a positive and productive work environment that supports organizational goals. In a rapidly changing world, institutions—especially universities—seek to build resilient and adaptable organizations. The systematic implementation of QWL dimensions is considered an effective approach to achieving this aim. Job satisfaction is a vital indicator of organizational health and effectiveness. Organizations with low employee satisfaction are less likely to succeed. In academic settings, QWL plays a crucial role in ensuring faculty job satisfaction. It enables universities to benefit from faculty members' expertise and competencies. Fair compensation, incentives, promotion opportunities, and positive social relations significantly enhance job satisfaction.

Over the past decade, an extensive and growing body of literature has examined Quality of Work Life across diverse organizational settings, ranging from banking and retail to healthcare and manufacturing (Chanana & Gupta, 2016; Kumar & Kumar, 2023; Hidayaturrohmah et al., 2025). These studies consistently confirm a positive association between QWL and job satisfaction or performance; however, most adopt a general organizational lens and pay comparatively little critical attention to the specificities of higher education institutions, particularly within developing and Arab contexts. Within the more limited body of research addressing academic staff specifically, studies such as Tabassum (2012) in private Bangladeshi universities and Khalfi & Boukdroun (2021) in an Algerian university confirm that QWL dimensions are meaningfully related to faculty job satisfaction, while more recent contributions (Seghiri & Loukia, 2024; Aguwa et al., 2025) reaffirm the continuing relevance of the topic in Algerian and African academic settings. Nevertheless, a critical reading of this literature reveals that empirical, multidimensional studies combining rigorous multivariate analysis (simple and multiple regression) to disentangle the relative contribution of each QWL dimension remain scarce in the Algerian public higher-education context, and virtually absent within the specific field of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences.

This scarcity constitutes the principal research gap that the present study seeks to address: the lack of empirical evidence, within Algerian public universities, concerning which specific dimensions of Quality of Work Life most strongly predict faculty job satisfaction, and how such evidence can inform context-sensitive institutional policy. Accordingly, the present study differs from earlier research—largely conducted in commercial, industrial, or foreign academic settings—by focusing specifically on faculty members within a public Algerian university, situating the analysis within the university's own administrative, cultural, and organizational conditions, and deriving context-specific recommendations (e.g., decentralization and freedom of expression) rather than generic ones.

Study Problem:

This research is motivated by challenges that affect the professional development of university faculty members and consequently influence productivity, performance, and the quality of higher education. Job satisfaction reflects employees' perceptions of their work conditions and the support they receive in the workplace. For faculty members, job satisfaction is essential because it directly impacts the education of future generations and the effectiveness of the academic system. Accordingly, the main research problem can be formulated as follows:

To what extent does Quality of Work Life (QWL) influence job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent?

In addition to the main question, and in order to examine the specific contribution of each QWL dimension, the study addresses the following sub-questions:

- To what extent does the wages and rewards dimension affect job satisfaction among faculty members?
- To what extent does job security and stability affect job satisfaction among faculty members?
- To what extent do job characteristics affect job satisfaction among faculty members?

- To what extent do work teams and groups affect job satisfaction among faculty members?
- To what extent does work–life balance affect job satisfaction among faculty members?
- To what extent does empowerment affect job satisfaction among faculty members?
- To what extent does supervisory style affect job satisfaction among faculty members?

Study Hypotheses:

To address the research questions, the study tests the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1: There is a strong positive correlation between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent.
- Hypothesis 2: The dimensions of QWL—salaries and rewards, job security and stability, job characteristics, work teams and groups, work–life balance, empowerment, and supervisory style—have a significant effect on job satisfaction among faculty members at the same faculty.

Study Objectives:

The primary objective of this study is to assess the current state of QWL at the target faculty and examine its impact on faculty members' job satisfaction. Specifically, the study aims to:

- Determine the degree of correlation between QWL and job satisfaction;
- Examine the effect of QWL dimensions on job satisfaction;
- Provide practical recommendations to enhance both theoretical understanding and practical implementation of QWL among faculty members.

Importance of the Study:

This study is important because it highlights the impact of Quality of Work Life (QWL) on faculty job satisfaction, which directly affects productivity and institutional performance. It examines how QWL dimensions—such as salaries, job security, work-life balance, empowerment, and supervisory style—influence satisfaction, providing guidance for creating a supportive work environment. The findings contribute to the academic literature in the context of Algerian higher education and offer practical recommendations to enhance faculty well-being, engagement, and retention. Beyond its academic contribution, the study also carries a developmental significance: improving the quality of work life of faculty members constitutes an indirect but effective lever for enhancing the overall quality of higher education and scientific research output, thereby supporting the broader national objective of building a competitive and sustainable higher-education system in Algeria.

Research Limits :

- **Spatial limits:** This study is confined to the Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial Sciences, and Management Sciences at the University of Ain Temouchent, Algeria.
- **Human limits:** The study population comprises faculty members at the aforementioned faculty (96 members), with a final sample of 70 faculty members who provided valid responses.
- **Methodological limits:** The study relies exclusively on a structured questionnaire as the data collection tool, without complementing it with qualitative techniques such as interviews or direct observation, which may limit the depth of contextual interpretation of the findings.

Study Methodology and Tools:

The study employs a descriptive approach in the theoretical section to review relevant literature. In the empirical section, an analytical approach was adopted using a case study design. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS software (version 26).

Previous Studies:

Table 1. Comparative Summary of Previous Studies

Study (Author, Year)	Context / Sample	Method	Key Finding
Tabassum (2012)	Private universities, Bangladesh (n=72 faculty)	Questionnaire; correlation	Strong relationship between QWL dimensions and job satisfaction
Khalfi & Boukdroun (2021)	Public university, Algeria (Economic Sciences faculty)	Descriptive-analytical; questionnaire	Positive, significant effect of QWL on job satisfaction
Kumar & Kumar (2023)	General organizations (employees)	Questionnaire; correlation	Positive relationship between QWL and job performance
Seghiri & Loukia (2024)	Conceptual, Algeria	Theoretical/conceptual	QWL as a philosophy fostering professional satisfaction (no empirical test)
Hidayaturrohmah et al. (2025)	Retail company (n=82 employees)	Two questionnaires; correlation	Positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction
Aguwa et al. (2025)	Public universities, Nigeria (n=392 lecturers)	Cross-sectional survey	Positive, significant association between job satisfaction and quality of life
Current study (2025)	**Public university, Ain Temouchent, Algeria (n=70 faculty)**	**Questionnaire; correlation & simple/multiple regression**	**Strong effect of QWL on job satisfaction; job security, wages, and job characteristics as strongest predictors**

Source: Prepared by the researchers

The current study aimed to examine the role of Quality of Work Life (QWL) and its dimensions in achieving job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent, Algeria, using a sample of 70

faculty members, with data collected through a questionnaire and analyzed via SPSS v26. The results revealed a strong positive correlation between QWL and job satisfaction, recommending decentralization, faculty involvement in decision-making, freedom of expression, and adequate moral support. In comparison with previous studies, the current research aligns with Tabassum (2012), which found a strong relationship between QWL dimensions and job satisfaction among faculty members in private Bangladeshi universities, and with Hidayaturrohmah et al. (2025) and Kumar & Kumar (2023), which confirmed positive relationships between QWL and job satisfaction (or performance) in the retail sector and general organizations, respectively. It also converges with Khalfi & Boukdroun (2021), conducted in a comparable Algerian institutional context, and with Aguwa et al. (2025), which reported a similar positive association in an African public-university setting. While these earlier studies emphasized factors such as working conditions, organizational support, work-life balance, wages, and participation in decision-making, the current study differs by focusing on faculty members in a public Algerian university, highlighting context-specific recommendations like decentralization and freedom of expression, and by applying both simple and multiple regression to isolate the distinct contribution of each QWL dimension. As summarized in the table above, the research gap addressed by this study lies in the limited empirical evidence on the relationship between Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction among faculty members in Algerian public higher education institutions, particularly within the Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences field, where local administrative, cultural, and organizational factors may significantly influence the dynamics.

2. Theoretical Framework:

2.1 Definition of Quality of Work Life:

Quality of work life generally refers to the set of policies, conditions, and organizational practices that ensure employees a fair, humane, and motivating work environment, and that achieve a balance between job requirements and their psychological, personal, and social needs (Walton, 1973).

Chanana and Gupta (2016) defined it as the degree to which employees are able to shape their jobs effectively according to their requirements, choices, interests, and needs, and the degree of power granted to them by the organization.

2.2 Dimensions of Quality of Work Life

In general, the dimensions of Quality of Work Life differ from one study to another according to the type of organization, its size, the nature of its operations, and the number of its employees. Brooks (2007) pointed out that the dimensions of Quality of Work Life include work-life balance, supervisory style, employees' participation in decision-making, job characteristics, autonomy at work, workplace relationships, job security, and occupational safety and health.

Richard E. Walton (1973) proposed eight fundamental dimensions that constitute the core of quality of work life:

- **Job Security and Stability:** This dimension refers to the employee's feeling of security against arbitrary dismissal or the constant threat of losing their job. The greater this sense of security, the higher the level of reassurance and organizational belonging (Walton, 1973).
- **Fairness in Wages and Rewards:** This dimension means that wages should correspond to the effort exerted, experience, and comparison with colleagues in similar positions. Fairness is considered one of the most important sources of employee satisfaction and organizational commitment (Akar, 2018).
- **Appropriate Working Conditions:** This includes providing a safe and healthy physical work environment, such as proper lighting, ventilation, cleanliness, noise reduction, and the provision of appropriate work equipment.
- **Opportunities for Growth and Professional Development:** This dimension refers to opportunities for continuous training, promotions, and professional challenges that develop employees' skills and make them feel a sense of progress and career usefulness (Greenhaus & Collins, 2003).
- **Work–Life Balance:** This dimension relates to the ability to reconcile work requirements with family and social responsibilities. It includes flexible working arrangements, holidays, and leave systems (Greenhaus & Collins, 2003).

- **Participation in Decision-Making:** Employees feel valued when they are consulted and involved in decisions that affect their work, which enhances their sense of empowerment, appreciation, and belonging.
- **Organizational Justice:** This dimension includes distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. It is a key factor in building healthy relationships within the organization (Organ & Ryan, 1995).
- **Supportive Social Work Environment:** This refers to the existence of positive relationships between employees, their colleagues, and their supervisors, which reduces stress and enhances cooperation as well as professional and psychological support (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

2.3 Definition of Job Satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction refers to the feeling of equity, harmony, and comfort that employees derive from the outcomes of their job in relation to the efforts and tasks they exert or bear. In the same vein, job satisfaction represents the individual's personal evaluation of the working conditions, benefits, and rewards that the job offers upon accepting it (Sempane et al., 2002, p. 23).

Similarly, Brayer and Marcinowicz (2018, p. 231) defined job satisfaction as the feelings employees have toward their jobs, emphasizing its critical role in influencing employees' willingness to remain at work and its impact on their physical, mental, and psychological well-being.

2.4 Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction

Walton (1973) stated that dissatisfaction with work life is a problem that affects almost all workers, sooner or later, regardless of the positions they occupy. The frustration, boredom, and widespread anger among employees can be costly for both the organization and the worker. Consequently, quality of work life stimulates job satisfaction (Tabassum, 2012, p. 80).

In academic institutions, QWL and job satisfaction are closely interrelated, with each dimension of QWL directly influencing job satisfaction. Consequently, organizations—whether economic, social, or educational—strive to create a supportive work environment that meets employees' needs and professional aspirations, yielding positive outcomes for both individuals and the institution (Khalfi & Boukdroun, 2021, p. 22).

Finally, Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction are essential factors for achieving the objectives of all parties within any university. The relationship between them is integrative and complementary, with each dimension of Quality of Work Life directly affecting the level of job satisfaction experienced by faculty members. Similarly, any institution—whether its activities are economic, social, or educational—works diligently to create a supportive work environment that fulfills employees' needs and professional goals. This, in turn, generates positive outcomes that benefit both the employees and the organization overall.

3. Applied Study

3.1 Methodology and Tools

This study employed both descriptive and analytical approaches to examine the impact of Quality of Work Life (QWL) on job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent.

- **Population and Sample:** The study population comprised all 96 faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent. A simple random sampling method was used to select participants from the population. Accordingly, 72 questionnaires were randomly distributed among faculty members, and 70 valid responses were obtained and used for statistical analysis, yielding a response rate of 97.2% (70/72), which is considered excellent and substantially reduces the risk of non-response bias.
- **Research Instrument:** A structured questionnaire was used as the primary data collection tool. It was divided into two parts: Part One

covered demographic information (gender, age group, academic rank, years of experience); Part Two comprised two main axes — the first covering QWL dimensions (wages and rewards, job security and stability, job characteristics, work teams, work-life balance, empowerment, supervision style) across 35 items, and the second covering job satisfaction across 17 items. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree).

- **Validity of the Instrument:** The face and content validity of the questionnaire were verified through two complementary procedures. First, apparent (face) validity was established by submitting the initial version of the questionnaire to a panel of academic referees specialized in management sciences and quantitative methods, who assessed the clarity, relevance, and formulation of the items; the questionnaire was subsequently amended in light of their remarks. Second, internal-consistency (construct) validity was verified statistically by computing the correlation coefficient between each dimension's score and the overall score of its axis, as well as through the square root of Cronbach's Alpha for each axis, which yielded validity coefficients of 0.956 for the QWL axis and 0.962 for the job satisfaction axis — both indicating a high degree of validity and confirming that the instrument measures what it was designed to measure.

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 26, as shown in the following tables:

Table 2. Likert Five-Point Scale

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

Source: Prepared by the researchers

Table 3. Arithmetic Mean Range for Each Level According to the Likert Five-Point Scale

Category	Weighted Mean Range	Alternative	Weight	Level
Fifth Category	4.20 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	5	Very High
Fourth Category	3.40 – 4.19	Agree	4	High
Third Category	2.60 – 3.39	Neutral	3	Medium
Second Category	1.80 – 2.59	Disagree	2	Low
First Category	1.00 – 1.79	Strongly Disagree	1	Very Low

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on Fattah (2008, p. 538)

3.2 Reliability of the Study Instrument:

The reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient through SPSS v26. The results were as follows:

Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the Study Instrument

Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Value
First Axis: Quality of Work Life	35	0.921
Second Axis: Job Satisfaction	17	0.927
Entire Questionnaire	**52**	**0.953**

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the entire questionnaire reached 0.953, which is well above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70. This indicates very high internal consistency and reliability of the instrument. Combined with the validity coefficients reported above (0.956 and 0.962), these results confirm the suitability of the instrument for the study and lend strong credibility to the results obtained.

3.3 Presentation and Discussion of the Study Results

First: General and Functional Characteristics of the Study Sample

In this section, we present and analyze the general and functional characteristics of the study sample:

Table 5. General and Functional Characteristics of the Study Sample

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	27	38.3
	Female	43	61.7
	Total	70	100.0
Age Group	25–30 years	4	6.4
	31–40 years	34	48.9
	41–50 years	29	40.4
	Over 50 years	3	4.3
	Total	70	100.0
Academic Rank	Temporary Lecturer	4	6.4
	Assistant Lecturer	12	17.0
	Lecturer	39	55.3
	Full Professor	15	21.3
	Total	70	100.0
Years of Experience	Less than 5 years	21	29.8
	5 to 10 years	16	23.4
	11 to 20 years	21	29.8
	More than 20 years	12	17.0
	Total	70	100.0

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

- **Gender (61.7% female):** The predominance of females reflects a well-established trend in Algerian universities, particularly in economic, commercial, and management sciences, where women have significantly increased their participation since the early 2000s,

due to strong academic performance and growing integration into academic careers.

- **Age Groups (48.9% aged 31–40 + 40.4% aged 41–50):** The majority of respondents belong to the most productive and experienced professional stages, making their opinions highly representative of daily realities and of QWL issues such as salaries, stability, and work-life balance.
- **Academic Rank (55.3% Lecturer):** The 'Lecturer' rank dominates, with a good balance between young assistant lecturers (17.0%), mid-career lecturers, and senior full professors (21.3%), providing diverse perspectives across career stages.
- **Years of Experience (balanced distribution):** The even spread between early-career faculty (29.8% < 5 years) and more experienced faculty (29.8% 11–20 years) enriches the findings across different professional phases.

Second: Analysis of the Questionnaire Dimensions

Using SPSS software, the means and standard deviations of the first dimension were calculated, as shown in the table below:

Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations of Quality of Work Life Dimensions

Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
Wages and Rewards	2.493	0.691	Moderate
Job Security and Stability	2.923	0.731	Moderate
Job Characteristics	3.910	0.635	High
Work Teams and Groups	3.453	0.720	High
Work-Life Balance	3.212	0.922	Moderate
Empowerment	2.859	0.694	Moderate
Supervision Style	3.570	1.422	High
Overall Quality of Work Life	**3.209**	**0.585**	**Moderate**

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

The overall mean for Quality of Work Life is 3.209, which falls in the moderate category on the five-point Likert scale. This indicates that faculty members perceive QWL dimensions as moderately available in their work

environment, with no strong satisfaction nor strong dissatisfaction. Notable variations appear across dimensions: high perceptions are reported for Job Characteristics (3.910), Supervision Style (3.570), and Work Teams (3.453), while moderate perceptions dominate for Wages and Rewards (2.493), Job Security (2.923), Empowerment (2.859), and Work-Life Balance (3.212). The low overall standard deviation (0.585) shows high consistency in respondents' opinions.

Using SPSS, the means and standard deviation for the second dimension were also calculated, as shown below:

Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviation for Job Satisfaction

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Agreement Level
Job Satisfaction	3.525	0.686	High

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

The mean score for job satisfaction is 3.525, which falls in the high/agreement category. This indicates that faculty members generally hold positive attitudes toward their job satisfaction. Individual item means ranged from 3.60 to 4.20, confirming consistent positive evaluations across different aspects of job satisfaction, and the relatively low standard deviation (0.686) reflects high consistency in responses. Despite the moderate perception of Quality of Work Life, faculty members report a high level of job satisfaction, suggesting that other factors beyond the measured QWL dimensions may also contribute positively to their job contentment — a point that is further discussed below.

3.4 Hypotheses Testing:

- First Hypothesis:

H1: There is a strong positive correlation between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent.

H0: There is no statistically significant correlation between QWL and job satisfaction ($r = 0$).

Decision rule: If Sig. < 0.05, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted; the strength

and direction of the relationship are then judged from the value and sign of Pearson's r.

To verify this hypothesis, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the scores of the quality-of-work-life dimensions and job satisfaction for the study sample. The results are presented in the following table:

Table 8. Pearson Correlation Results between Quality of Work Life and Job Satisfaction

Dimension	Correlation with Job Satisfaction (r)	Sig.	N
Wages & Rewards	0.561**	0.000	70
Job Security & Stability	0.743**	0.000	70
Job Characteristics	0.630**	0.000	70
Work Teams & Groups	0.567**	0.000	70
Work-Life Balance	0.490**	0.000	70
Empowerment	0.270	0.066	70
Supervision Style	0.461**	0.001	70
Quality of Work Life (overall)	**0.737****	**0.000**	**70**

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

The results provide strong empirical support for the first hypothesis. Since Sig. = 0.000 (< 0.05) for the overall QWL–job satisfaction relationship, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted: there is a statistically significant and positive correlation between overall Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction among faculty members ($r = 0.737$, $p < 0.001$), indicating a strong relationship between the two variables.

At the dimensional level, Job Security and Stability exhibited the strongest correlation with job satisfaction ($r = 0.743$, $p < 0.001$), making this dimension the most influential factor within the QWL framework. Wages and Rewards, Job Characteristics, Work Teams and Groups, Work–Life Balance, and Supervision Style all showed statistically significant (Sig. < 0.05) moderate positive correlations, so H0 is rejected for each of these

dimensions as well. In contrast, Empowerment did not demonstrate a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction (r = 0.270, Sig. = 0.066 > 0.05); for this dimension alone, H0 cannot be rejected, implying that increased autonomy or participation in decision-making does not significantly affect job satisfaction in the studied context, possibly due to limited practical implementation.

Based on the correlation analysis, the first hypothesis is accepted. There is a strong and statistically significant positive correlation between Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction among faculty members (r = 0.737, p < 0.001), with job security and stability emerging as the most critical determinant.

- **Second Hypothesis:**

H2: There is a statistically significant effect of Quality of Work Life (overall and in all its dimensions) on Job Satisfaction among faculty members, at the 5% significance level (α = 0.05).
H0: β = 0 — there is no statistically significant effect of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction.
H1: β does not equal 0 — there is a statistically significant effect of Quality of Work Life on Job Satisfaction.
Decision rule: The model's overall significance is tested via the F-test (ANOVA) and each coefficient's significance via the t-test; if Sig. < 0.05 for both, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted.

First: Simple Linear Regression Analysis

A simple linear regression (Enter / least-squares method) was performed with overall Quality of Work Life as the independent variable and Job Satisfaction as the dependent variable, at a significance level of 0.05.

Table 9. Linear Relationship between the Independent and Dependent Variables (Simple Regression)

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.737	0.543	0.533	0.469

Predictors: (Constant), Quality of Work Life; Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

The correlation coefficient (R = 0.737) indicates a strong positive linear relationship between overall QWL and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.543) shows that approximately 54.3% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by overall QWL alone — a substantial effect size for a single-predictor model in studies of academic job attitudes. The adjusted R^2 (0.533) remains close to R^2, confirming the model is stable and not overfitted.

Table 10. Regression Coefficient Values (Simple Regression)

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	0.750	0.385	—	1.948	0.058
Quality of Work Life	**0.865**	**0.118**	**0.737**	**7.319**	**0.000**

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

Since Sig. = 0.000 (< 0.05) for the slope coefficient, and the model itself is significant, H0 ($\beta = 0$) is rejected and H1 is accepted: overall QWL has a statistically significant positive effect on job satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.865) indicates that for every 1-unit increase in overall QWL, job satisfaction increases by 0.865 units, and the standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.737) confirms a strong standardized effect, matching R as expected in simple regression.

The Final Simple Regression Equation:

$$Y = 0.750 + 0.865\ X$$

Where Y = Job Satisfaction and X = Quality of Work Life.

Second: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis (Enter method) examines how individual QWL dimensions affect faculty job satisfaction, in order to test the second hypothesis at the level of each dimension.

Table 11. Multiple Regression Model — Variables Entered

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Wages & Rewards, Job Security & Stability, Job Characteristics, Work Teams, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment, Supervisory Style	None	Enter

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction. All requested variables were entered.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

Table 12. Linear Correlation between Independent Variables and Dependent Variable (Multiple Regression)

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.826	0.682	0.625	0.420

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs

The multiple correlation coefficient (R = 0.826) indicates a very strong positive relationship between the combined set of QWL dimensions and job satisfaction — stronger than the simple regression's R = 0.737. The coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.682) shows that the seven dimensions together explain 68.2% of the variance in job satisfaction, a substantial improvement over the 54.3% explained by overall QWL alone, highlighting the value of examining dimensions separately. The adjusted R^2 (0.625) remains reasonably high, suggesting the model is robust and not overly inflated by the added variables.

Table 13. Regression Coefficients Using the Enter Method (Multiple Regression)

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.237	0.467	—	1.948	0.614	—	—
Wages & Rewards	0.299	0.108	0.301	2.764	0.009	0.688	1.454
Job Security & Stability	0.421	0.126	0.448	3.344	0.002	0.453	2.206
Job Characteristics	0.283	0.139	0.261	2.036	0.049	0.495	2.021
Work Teams & Groups	0.124	0.148	0.130	0.839	0.406	0.341	2.935
Work-Life Balance	0.032	0.092	0.042	0.343	0.734	0.530	1.885
Empowerment	0.151	0.111	0.153	1.370	0.178	0.653	1.531
Supervisory Style	0.028	0.056	0.058	0.505	0.616	0.611	1.637

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS v26 outputs.

No serious multicollinearity is present: all VIF values are below 3 (highest = 2.935 for Work Teams), and Tolerance values are all above 0.3, well within the conventional safety thresholds (VIF > 5–10 considered problematic), meaning the estimates are stable and reliable.

Applying the decision rule (Sig. < 0.05 ⇒ reject H0), the results indicate that H0 is rejected — and H1 accepted — for three dimensions:

- Job Security & Stability: Beta = 0.448 (highest standardized effect), t = 3.344, Sig. = 0.002 — highly significant ($p < 0.01$), the most influential dimension.
- Wages & Rewards: Beta = 0.301, t = 2.764, Sig. = 0.009 — significant ($p < 0.01$).
- Job Characteristics: Beta = 0.261, t = 2.036, Sig. = 0.049 — significant (just below 0.05).

For the remaining four dimensions, Sig. > 0.05, so H0 cannot be rejected at the individual level (though this does not mean these dimensions are irrelevant — see discussion below):

- Work Teams & Groups: Beta = 0.130, t = 0.839, Sig. = 0.406 — not significant.
- Work-Life Balance: Beta = 0.042, t = 0.343, Sig. = 0.734 — not significant.
- Empowerment: Beta = 0.153, t = 1.370, Sig. = 0.178 — not significant.
- Supervisory Style: Beta = 0.058, t = 0.505, Sig. = 0.616 — not significant.

Final Multiple Regression Equation:

$$\mathbf{Y = 0.237 + 0.299\ X1 + 0.421\ X2 + 0.283\ X3}$$

Where Y = Job Satisfaction; X1 = Wages & Rewards; X2 = Job Security & Stability; X3 = Job Characteristics.

The multiple regression strongly confirms a significant overall effect of QWL dimensions on job satisfaction (R^2 = 68.2%), with Job Security & Stability as the most influential factor, followed by Wages & Rewards and Job Characteristics. Accordingly, the second hypothesis is accepted for the overall model and for these three dimensions, while it is not supported at the individual level for Work Teams, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment, and Supervisory Style.

- **Discussion of Results and Practical Challenges:**

Taken together, these results reveal an important nuance: while faculty members perceive overall Quality of Work Life only moderately (mean = 3.209), their job satisfaction is nonetheless high (mean = 3.525). This apparent paradox suggests that job satisfaction among Algerian university faculty may be sustained by intrinsic and professional factors — such as the prestige of the academic profession, intellectual autonomy in teaching and research, and social recognition — that are not fully captured by the QWL dimensions measured here, and that partly compensate for the moderate levels of wages, job security, and empowerment reported. This constitutes one of the central practical challenges revealed by the study: institutions may be 'under-investing' in structural QWL conditions while still benefiting, for now, from a reservoir of intrinsic professional motivation that cannot be assumed to persist indefinitely.

A second challenge concerns the non-significant dimensions (Work Teams and Groups, Work-Life Balance, Empowerment, and Supervisory Style). Their lack of independent statistical significance does not necessarily mean they are unimportant; rather, it may reflect (i) shared variance with the three significant dimensions (as suggested by their moderate-to-high VIF values), (ii) a genuinely limited practical implementation of participatory and flexible-work practices within the Algerian public university system, or (iii) the highly individualized nature of academic work, where faculty often operate with considerable independence from teams and direct supervision, thereby reducing the salience of these dimensions relative to job security and compensation. A further challenge lies in the moderate mean scores recorded for Wages & Rewards (2.493) and Empowerment (2.859) specifically — precisely two of the areas identified by the regression analysis as either highly influential (wages) or requiring further institutional attention (empowerment) — indicating that current resource and governance constraints in Algerian public higher education may be limiting the extent to which universities can act on these levers in the short term.

4. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the impact of Quality of Work Life (QWL) on job satisfaction among faculty members at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences, University of Ain Temouchent. By addressing the primary research question and its sub-questions, the

study offered robust empirical evidence regarding the nature and strength of the relationship between these two constructs within the context of an Algerian university.

The results indicated a strong, statistically significant positive correlation between Quality of Work Life and job satisfaction ($r = 0.737$, $p < 0.001$), underscoring the pivotal role of QWL in shaping faculty members' attitudes toward their profession. Simple linear regression analysis further revealed that QWL accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = 54.3\%$), confirming that enhancements in work-related conditions can significantly boost faculty satisfaction levels.
Multiple linear regression analysis demonstrated that the dimensions of QWL do not influence job satisfaction equally. Job security and stability emerged as the most powerful predictor, followed by wages and rewards, and then job characteristics. These findings align with the distinctive nature of academic work, where employment stability, equitable compensation, and intrinsically meaningful job design serve as foundational elements for psychological well-being, professional commitment, and long-term performance.

In contrast, other dimensions—such as work teams and groups, work–life balance, empowerment, and supervisory style—showed no statistically significant independent effects on job satisfaction. This pattern may suggest that these aspects are either insufficiently institutionalized in the studied context or perceived as less critical relative to structural and material factors. These results highlight the necessity of contextualizing QWL dimensions rather than assuming their impact is uniform across different organizational and cultural settings.

In conclusion, the study affirms that Quality of Work Life constitutes a comprehensive, multidimensional framework that plays a vital role in enhancing job satisfaction among university faculty members. Nevertheless, the strength and priority of its influence depend heavily on the specific organizational context and the relative salience of its various dimensions. These insights enrich the existing literature on QWL in higher education—particularly within Algerian and broader Arab academic environments—and provide a solid empirical foundation to guide institutional policy-making and targeted interventions aimed at improving faculty well-being and performance.

Recommendations

Based on the empirical findings of the study, particularly the results of the correlation and regression analyses, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Strengthening job security and stability: Given that job security and stability showed the strongest and most significant effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.448$, $p < 0.01$), university authorities should prioritize policies that enhance employment stability, clarify career progression paths, and ensure transparency in promotion and tenure procedures.

2. Revising wages and reward systems: As wages and rewards demonstrated a statistically significant positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.301$, $p < 0.01$), it is recommended to reassess salary structures and incentive schemes to better reflect faculty members' professional responsibilities, academic productivity, and increasing social and economic demands.

3. Improving job characteristics and academic work design: Since job characteristics significantly influenced job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.261$, $p < 0.05$), efforts should be made to enrich academic roles by enhancing autonomy in teaching and research, providing constructive feedback, and ensuring a reasonable balance between teaching, research, and administrative duties.

4. Supporting Quality of Work Life through complementary dimensions: Although work teams, work–life balance, empowerment, and supervisory style did not exhibit statistically significant independent effects, they should not be neglected. Universities should work on gradually activating these dimensions, as they may indirectly contribute to job satisfaction or become more influential under different organizational conditions.

5. Adopting an integrated Quality of Work Life approach: University management should adopt a comprehensive and long-term strategy for Quality of Work Life that aligns human resource policies with faculty members' professional needs, thereby sustaining job satisfaction, improving performance, and enhancing institutional effectiveness.

6. Encouraging future research: Future studies are encouraged to examine additional variables—such as organizational culture, leadership styles, or psychological well-being—and to apply random sampling methods or comparative studies across universities to enhance the generalizability of findings.

The proposed recommendations are directly derived from the empirical findings of the study. They aim to address the identified weaknesses in the dimensions of Quality of Work Life and to strengthen the dimensions that demonstrated a significant impact on job satisfaction, particularly job security and stability, compensation and rewards, and job characteristics.

5. Bibliography List:

1. Books:

_ Fattah, E. A. (2008). *Introduction to descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS* (1st ed.). Jeddah, Saudi Arabia: Khwarizmi Scientific Library.

2. Journal article:

- Aguwa, E. N., Ekekezie, O. O., Fajola, A., & Shiweobi, O. J. (2025). Job satisfaction and quality of life among faculty members in public universities in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Annals of African Medicine*. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.4103/aam.aam_94_25
- Akar, H. (2018). Analytic study concerning the effect of educational stakeholders' perceptions of quality of work life on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(3), 101-115. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2018.03.007
- Brayer, A., & Marcinowicz, L. (2018). Job satisfaction of nurses with master of nursing degrees in Poland: quantitative and qualitative analysis. *BMC Health Services Research, 18*(1). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3053-6
- Chanana, M., & Gupta, K. (2016). Quality of work life and its impact on job performance: A study of S.B.I & HDFC banking professionals. *International Research Journal of Management, IT & Social Sciences, 3*(5), 16-24. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v3i5.12
- Greenhaus, J., & Collins, K. M. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 510-531. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8
- Hidayaturrohmah, E., Harahap, D. H., Rohyati, E., & Fatuhrahmah, U. (2025). The role of quality of work life in increasing employee job satisfaction: A study on retail company. *Journal Spirits, 15*(2), 20-32.
- Khalfi, K., & Boukdroun, Y. (2021). The role of QWL in enhancing job satisfaction among faculty of Economic, Commercial and

Management Sciences at Khemis Miliana University in Algeria. *Journal of Business Economics Leadership, 7*(3), 10-32.

- Kumar, R., & Kumar, V. (2023). Quality of work life and its impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Human Resource and Development Management, 14*(1), 1-10.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*(2), 99-113. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*(4), 775-802. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x
- Seghiri, H., & Loukia, H. (2024). Quality of work life as a philosophy to ensure the development of professional satisfaction. *Journal of Human Sciences, 35*(4), 259-269. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.34174/ccpfj767
- Sempane, M. E., Rieger, H. S., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 28*(2), 23-30.
- Tabassum, A. (2012). The interrelationship between dimensions of quality of work life and job satisfaction among faculty members in private universities in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and Management, 4*(2), 78-89.
- Walton, R. E. (1973). Quality of working life: What is it? *Sloan Management Review, 15*(1), 11-21.