

Impact of Quality of Work Life on Psychosocial Risks: Case of LAFARGE Cement Oggaz

LEKKAM Hanane *

University of Mascara, Algeria 

Lekkam.hanan@univ-mascara.dz

Received: 09/08/2023

Published: 01/01/2024

Abstract:

The objective of this article is to determine the impact of quality of work life on factors that may generate psychosocial risks within the Lafarge Oggaz cement plant located in the Mascara province.

To carry out this study, a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of 230 employees; the results have highlighted the positive impact of several dimensions of quality of work life on psychosocial factors within the factory. Firstly, job and career satisfaction were associated with a notable improvement in psychosocial conditions. Furthermore, overall well-being as well as the balance between work and personal life showed positive correlations with these same factors. It is important to note that these influences appear to mitigate the negative impact of psychosocial risks, thereby providing avenues to enhance employee well-being.

However, the study has also revealed a concerning outcome: a negative correlation between work-related stress and psychosocial elements. This finding suggests that work-related stress could potentially amplify psychosocial risks among employees.

Keywords: Quality of work life; psychosocial risk; LAFARGE Oggaz Company

JEL Classification Codes : M12; J28; J53.

* Corresponding author.

Introduction:

In the current socio-economic context, the quality of work-life is becoming a major concern. Opinion surveys highlight the rise of psychosocial risks (stress, workload, verbal/physical violence, harassment), the consequences of workplace distress, and the negative effects of work within an economic system where human aspects are neglected.

These findings reveal a consistent increase in workplace stress, exposing individuals to various professional risks and amplifying dissatisfaction with organizations and their management style. Despite the reduction in physical constraints, new problems emerge, whether psychological (continuous evaluation, leadership, total quality) or organizational (irregular hours, telecommuting, precarious work)

Indeed, the quality of work-life should not be viewed merely as the absence of suffering at work but as a genuine factor for personal development.

This observation was made after the publication of the (Lachmann, Larose, & Pénicaud, 2010), which posits that the issues surrounding working conditions extend far beyond the scope of risk prevention. Thus, it is essential to move beyond the notion of work solely as a risk or a source of suffering and embrace the positive dimensions of its challenges.

In this context, evaluating work-life quality becomes essential to understand the factors that give rise to psychosocial risks, in order to mitigate their spread and manage them effectively.

a) Study issue:

The study aims to answer the following questions.

What is the impact of quality of working life on psychosocial risks at work?

b) Study hypothesis:

1. Job and career satisfaction affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.
2. General well-being affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.
3. Homework interface affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.
4. Stress at work affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.
5. Control at work affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.
6. Working condition affect psychosocial risks at LAFARGE Company.

c) Study Objectives:

The purpose of this study is to:

- Identify organizational levers to improve the quality of life for its employees.
- evaluate psychosocial factors at work that may lead to the emergence of psychosocial risks
- Detect the nature of the relationship between dimensions of quality of working life and psychosocial risks.

1- Theoretical framework

In the first part of the article, we analyze the literature on the two key concepts of this research; quality of life at work, psychosocial risks in order to clarify their definitions and determine the link between them.

1-1 Quality of working life (QWL):

The notion of quality of life at work appeared in the early 1970s in Anglo-Saxon countries, its definition has continued to evolve depending on the authors (SOJKA, 2014). (QWL) is a complex, multidimensional and generic concept (Hsu & Kernohan, 2006, p. 122), it refers to multiple elements relating to employees (work satisfaction, health at work, motivation, happiness and life satisfaction) and to the organization (productivity) (Larouche & Trudell, 1983)

QWL remains a concept without a consensual definition, often associated with psychological health at work or well-being at work (Martel & Dupuis, 2006)

Table 1, presents an overview of some definitions that have marked the development of reflection on QWL and its measurement

Table number (1): some definitions of QWL

Authors	Definitions
(Carlson, 1980)	(QWL) is “both a goal and an ongoing process for achieving that goal. As a goal, QWL is the commitment of any organization to work improvement: the creation of more involving, satisfying, and effective jobs and work environments for people at all levels of the organization. As a process, QWL calls for efforts to realize this goal through the active involvement of people throughout the organization.”
(Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel, & Lee, 2001)	Employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace.
(Martel & Dupuis, 2006)	“the level reached by the individual in the dynamic pursuit of his or her hierarchical goals within the areas of his or her work where the reduction of the gap separating the individual from his or her objectives results in a positive impact on the individual’s overall quality of life, on organizational performance and, therefore, on the overall functioning of the company.”
(ANACT, Améliorer la qualité de vie au travail. Des pistes pour agir, 2007)	“a social process that makes it possible to act on the work (organization, context) for the development of people and enterprises”
(BNET, 2008)	The degree of persona! Satisfaction experienced at work. Quality of working life is dependent on the extent to which an employee feels valued, rewarded, motivated, consulted, and empowered. It is also influenced by factors such as job security, opportunities for career development, work patterns, and work-life balance.

Source: Organized by the author

Two theoretical and methodological perspectives have addressed the quality of life in the work environment and psychological well-being (Davis & Cherns, 1975) (González & Hernández, 2006) .

The first one is oriented towards improving productivity and professional efficiency as a first step towards satisfying the needs and demands of each worker.

The second one aims for worker satisfaction, health, and well-being, prioritizing individual interests over those of the organization (Segurado & Agulló, 2002)

1-2 What is a psychosocial risk?

The intensification of work, the rise of relationship work in contact with the general public, and the decline of labor collectives have led to the so-called 'emerging' risks qualified as “psychosocial risks”. “Stress”, “violence”, “moral harassment”, “suffering at work” ... has been very much in public debate recently to characterize the mental (and physical) health problems of workers related to the changing world (INRS, 2006)

The concept of psychosocial risks (PSR) refers to “mental, physical and social health risks, Employment conditions and organizational and relational factors that may interact with mental functioning” (INSEE, 2011)

The International Labor Organization defines them as “interactions between the working environment, the content of work, organizational conditions and capacities, needs, culture, personal out-of work attitudes that can affect health, work performance through perception and experience and job satisfaction (ILO, 1986)

1-3 psychosocial risk factors:

The College of Expertise led by Gollac (Gollac & Bodie, 2011) selected the psychosocial factors of risk at work”. The DARES (Direction de l'Animation de la Recherche, des études et des Statistiques) presented these various factors in advance-first (DARES, 2010) grouped into 6 factors:

1. Work intensity and working time extends the now traditional concepts of “psychological demand” (Karasek, 1979) and “effort-rewards” (Siegrist, 1996) .
2. Emotional demand refers to the need to control one's own emotions in order to control the emotions of those with whom one works.
3. Autonomy at work refers to the extent of decision-making freedom (Karasek, 1979), encompassing the employee's flexibility, involvement in decisions pertaining to their role, as well as the utilization and enhancement of skills.
4. Social relationships at work are measured by perceived social support from peers, superiors, and/or external partners (Theorell & Karasek, 1990)
5. Ethical distress is part of social relationships at work, but is essentially a value conflict, a situation in which a person is forced to act inconsistent with their professional, social, or personal values.
6. Work situation insecurity includes socio-economic insecurity and the risk of uncontrolled changes in jobs and working conditions. This classification, which now appears to be a consensus, has been repeated in many studies and intervention work.

(Machado, 2015) introduces three additional factors associated with psychosocial risk:

- Management, which pertains to how teams are managed.
- Communication, which represents a serenity-related aspect of work and can be measured at both organizational and individual levels (Brun & Martel, 2003).
- Individual characteristics, recognizing that the same organizational configuration can have very different consequences for different individuals.

1-4 The prevention of psychosocial risks:

The prevention of psychosocial risks is divided into three levels.

-Primary prevention aims to avoid risk situations by reducing risk factors from their onset. It involves early intervention to prevent any deterioration of the situation. In the context of psychosocial risks, primary prevention involves addressing work organization, management and leadership styles, company functioning, and working conditions (Brillet, Sauviat, & Soufflet, 2017, p. 65).

Secondary prevention aims to reduce health impacts by teaching individuals better stress management techniques. It comes into play after stress has appeared and focuses on assisting employees in better coping with stressful situations. This approach includes providing information on mental health at work and developing individual adaptation strategies. Its goal is to raise awareness, inform, and train employees and managers, without altering the organizational structure, in order to mitigate damages related to psychosocial risks.

Tertiary prevention involves actions taken after an accident or a serious event to prevent the situation from worsening or recurring. Its goal is to treat the damages resulting from traumatic situations and to provide support to individuals suffering from work-related health problems (Oudry & Foulard, 2014, p. 25). This may include assisting an employee during their return to work after a traumatic event, such as a workplace aggression. While tertiary prevention is the least effective of preventive approaches, it remains essential in supporting employees in distress

1-5 Quality of Work Life, Psychosocial Risks: What Relationship?

The Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Psychosocial Risks (PSRs) are two interconnected concepts that influence employees well-being and overall organizational performance. Quality of Work Life (QWL) encompasses the conditions under which employees perform their work and their work environment. It relates to both positive and negative aspects of the work experience, such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, autonomy, personal development opportunities, recognition, interpersonal relationships, etc. A good QWL is often associated with employees who are more motivated, engaged, and productive (Montreuil, 2020, pp. 43-44).

Psychosocial Risks (PSRs): PSRs refer to psychological, social, and organizational factors that can have adverse effects on the mental, physical, and well-being of workers. They include work-related stress, emotional exhaustion (burnout), harassment, lack of social support, workplace violence, job insecurity, etc. PSRs can result from unfavorable

Impact of Quality of Work Life on Psychosocial Risks: Case of LAFARGE Cement Oggaz

LEKKAM Hanane

working conditions, imbalances between job demands and available resources, or poor interpersonal relationships.

Overall, a positive QWL can contribute to reducing PSRs, as employees in a supportive work environment are less likely to develop stress-related issues or burnout. Conversely, the presence of PSRs can negatively affect QWL, leading to lower job satisfaction, strained relationships, and decreased motivation among employees.

Understanding and addressing psychosocial risks is crucial for promoting a healthier and more productive work environment. By prioritizing the well-being of employees, organizations can improve their overall performance and foster a positive work culture.

Table number (2): articulate psychosocial risks prevention with quality of work life

Quality of work life	Prevent psychosocial risks
Objective: develop the conditions for commitment of all	Objective: reduce risks at work
voluntary research to take work into account in organizational decisions based on an inter-professional agreement	a risk prevention research based on the regulations
a research approach frequently implemented to support transformations	Research generally implemented to solve problems with the ambition to act upstream
the desire to broaden the actors involved: HR, prevention but also R&D, design, purchasing	a circle of actors limited to prevention specialists

Source: (ANACT, <https://www.anact.fr/comment-articuler-la-prevention-des-risques-psychosociaux-la-qualite-de-vie-au-travail>., 2019)

2- EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK:

The study presented in this paper is a quantitative study based on a questionnaire survey conducted on all employees of Lafarge Ciment Oggaz, Mascara. The methodological choice of the study will be presented as well as the main results obtained.

2-1 Research Methodology:

In this section, we first introduce our research field, then we describe our sample, next, we present the variables of our research model, and finally, we explain the processing and analysis of the collected data.

2-1-1 Presentation of Lafarge Ciment Oggaz:

Lafarge Holcim Algeria is a leading company in the construction materials market, It offers Aggregates, Cements, Mortars, Concretes, Plasters, Bags, Logistics, and Distribution.

Lafarge Holcim was established as a result of the merger between Lafarge, the French cement company, and, the Swiss company (Holcim). The company's market value

after the merger reached approximately 50 billion US dollars. Its headquarters are located in Rapperswil-Jona, Switzerland, with a major branch in Paris (Mecheri, 2015)

The company operates in 90 countries around the world, with emerging markets such as South America and Africa accounting for 60% of its sales. Lafarge Holcim employs approximately 100.956 employees.

In Algeria, The group owns three cement plants (M'Sila and Oggaz) and Cilas in Biskra, in partnership with the Souakri Group, with a total production capacity of 11.5 million tons per year (<https://www.lafarge.dz/chiffres-cles>, s.d.).

The Lafarge Ciment Oggaz plant is located in the municipality of Oggaz, Mascara province, with a production capacity of 3.8 million tons per year, including 3.2 million tons (Gray) and 0.6 million tons (White).

The Oggaz plant is one of the few cement plants in the world that produces extra-white cement, which is in demand for major projects worldwide, such as in Brazil, England, and the USA. It was used in the construction of the Freedom Tower, which replaced the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York.

Lafarge Ciment Oggaz is ISO 14001 certified version 2015 and has an industrial waste treatment facility.

2-1-2 Description of the sample :

The study used the descriptive survey research design, the population of the study includes all Oggaz Cement Company employees, with 399 workers, while the study sample consisted of 230 randomly selected employees comprised of (directors, laboratory workers, career workers).

The questionnaire was distributed between April 23, 2023, and May 10, 2023. We sent it via the internet, specifically using Google Forms, to 30 employees based on the list of personnel with a professional email. The remaining questionnaires were distributed in person to other employees, and the table below illustrates the characteristics of the surveyed sample.

The table below illustrates that 88% of the workers interviewed are male, 50% of the sample is between 41 and 50 years old, we also find that 36% of the workers of the Cement company have a certificate of vocational training, 31% of the sample members have 11 to 15 years of professional experience, From the table data we see that Cement executor is the largest percentage at 64% due to the nature of its activity.

Impact of Quality of Work Life on Psychosocial Risks: Case of LAFARGE Cement Oggaz

LEKKAM Hanane

Table number (3): Demographic and functional characteristics of the sample study

Sex	Male	88%		Baccalaureate and less	18%	seniority	From 11 to 15years	62%
	Female	12%		vocational training	36%		More than 16 years	26%
Age	Less than 30 y old	04%	Learning Level	Certificate of Applied Studies	26%	functional level	framework	12%
	30 to 40 years old	24%		Bachelor's Degree	14%		controller	24%
	41 to 50 years old	50%		Postgraduate Studies	06%		executor	64%
	More than 50 years	22%		From 05 to 10 years	12%			

Source: SPSS outputs.

2-1-3 Scales of measurement:

This point allows us to present the independent, and dependent, variables that we have used.

A) Measurement of Quality of Work Life:

To measure the quality of life at work, we used The Work-Related Quality of Life measure (WRQoL), one of the most succinct yet psychometrically valid and reliable Quality of Working Life scales in the literature.

(WRQoL) scale has six dimensions within 23 items, all of them were measured on a 05 point 1 = Strongly Agree through to Strongly Disagree = 5 Likert scale (Van Laar et al., 2007), The scale includes the following dimensions:

1. **Job and career satisfaction (JCS):** also contained (06 items).
2. **General well-being (GWB):** contain (06 items) related to happiness and life satisfaction.
3. **Homework interface (HWI):** contained (03 items) related to issues of accommodating family and work commitments.
4. **Stress at work (SAW):** was presented by (02 items) related to demands
5. **Control at work (CAW):** was presented by (03 items) related to being able to have control over decisions.

6. **working conditions (WCS):** reflect (03 items) related to the physical working environment.

B) Measurement of psychosocial risk factors:

In the present study, we used the short version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ), consisting of 46 items grouped into 24 scales, distributed across six dimensions. This version has been translated into French and validated by (Dupret, Bocéréan, Teherani, & Feltrin, 2012). The questionnaire is applicable to all types of industries and professions. It encompasses all the work-related psychosocial risk factors included in the Gollac Report. Response scales of four or five points are used depending on the items.

The following domains are explored in this questionnaire:

1. **Quantitative demands (QD):** contain (06 items) Workload, Work Pace, and Cognitive Demands.
2. **Autonomy (A) :** contain (04 items) Flexibility, opportunities for fulfillment.
3. **Horizontal relationships (HR):** (04 items) Trust among colleagues Social support from colleagues
4. **Organizational aspects and leadership (OAL):** (16 items) Predictability, Recognition, Equity, Clarity of Roles, Role Conflict, Quality of Leadership from the Immediate Supervisor, Hierarchical Support, Trust between Employees and Management.
5. **Health and well-being (HWB):** (11 items) Self-rated health, stress, burnout, emotional demands, work-family conflict, job insecurity.
6. **Work experience (WE):** (5 items) sense of work, organizational commitment, job satisfaction.

The validity of the French version was tested in 2010 on a sample of 3166 employees from a major French aerospace industry company (Dupret, Bocéréan, Teherani, & Feltrin, 2012)

2-2 Results and discussion:

In this point, we present the essentials of the relevant results obtained following the processing of the data collected and we will discuss the results.

2-2-1 Measuring Tool Stability:

The consistency of the questionnaire paragraphs was identified by calculating internal consistency (Cronbach-Alpha) for each variable individually, the results as shown in Table below.

Table 4 shows that the constant coefficients of all variables were high, with different ratios reaching more than the acceptable constant coefficient of 60%, indicating the stability and non-contradiction of the scale.

Impact of Quality of Work Life on Psychosocial Risks: Case of LAFARGE Cement Oggaz

LEKKAM Hanane

Table number (4):Reliability of variables

items	Study variables	Cronbach-Alpha Coefficient
1-23	Work life quality	0.843
1-46	Psychosocial factors	0.890
1-69	Questionnaire	0.96

Source: output of SPSS

2-2-2 Results of descriptive analysis:

A) Perception of QWL by LAFARGE employees:

Table 05 presents the descriptive statistics of QWL dimensions, we find that the six dimensions that present QWL, have an average greater than 2.5 and a standard deviation of less than 0.7. Since the Likert scale varies from 1 to 5, the central value is (2.5). Note that this average is greater than 2.5. All this seems to corroborate the existence of a perception of the quality of life at work among the staff of LAFARGE Company constituting the sample. whereas, the level of the standard deviation shows that our interlocutors do not exhibit a real dispersion in their perception of QWL.

Table number (5): the descriptive statistics of QWL dimensions

	JCS	GWB	HWI	SAW	COW	WCs
Mean	4,06	3,97	3,87	3,73	3,05	3,74
Standard deviation	0,32	0,36	0,64	0,58	0,76	0,43
N	230	230	230	230	230	230

Source: output of SPSS

B) Perception of psychosocial factors by LAFARGE employees:

On reading Table 06, we also see that the mean of the six psychosocial risk factors are higher than 2.5.

Table number (6): the descriptive statistics of psychosocial Risks factors.

	QD	A	HR	OAL	HWB	WE
Mean	4,54	4,35	4,41	4,07	3,75	4,01
Standard deviation	0,47	0,50	0,59	0,70	0,42	0,56
N	230	230	230	230	230	230

Source: output of SPSS

These statistics highlight the existence of a positive perception of psychosocial Risks factors among the staff of LAFARGE constituting the sample, including quantitative demands, autonomy, horizontal relationships, organizational aspects and leadership, health and well-being, and overall work experience.

It is observed that the dimension of quantitative demands obtained the highest mean score, which is consistent with the findings reported by several studies, especially for positions that require quick decision-making and maintaining high levels of mental alertness (Sayeed & Kumar, 2010) (Van de Merwe, Oprins, Eriksson, & van, 2012).

The relatively low standard deviations suggest that the responses are consistent and the evaluations are relatively homogeneous within the sample.

2-2-3 Hypotheses test of study:

Table 7 above shows the Pearson coefficient in order to study the possibility of a statistically significant correlation between independent variable (the quality of working life in its six dimensions) and dependent variable (the psychosocial risks factors at work)

Table number (7): Correlations coefficients between quality of work life and psychosocial factors.

Variables	psychosocial factors at work	
	Pearson coefficient	P
Quality of working life	0.676	0.000
1.Job and career satisfaction	0.568	0.000
2.General well-being	0.425	0.000
3.Home–work interface	0.531	0.000
4.Stress at work	0.627	0.000
5.Control at work	-0.259	0.070
6.working conditions	0.102	0.481

Note: We considered significant the relationship with a $p < 0.05$

Source: output of SPSS

The table shows that:

1. The Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.568 at the significant level of 0.000. It is smaller than the significant level of 0.05, which explains the existence of a positive correlation between **Job and career satisfaction** and psychosocial aspects of work at the Lafarge company.
2. There is a positive correlation between **General well-being** and the psychosocial aspects of work in the institution in question", because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.425 at the significant level of 0.000. it is smaller than the significant level of 0.05;
3. There is a correlation between **Home–work interface** and Psychosocial factors, because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.531 at the significant level of 0.000, which is smaller than the significant level of 0.05;
4. There is a positive and strong correlation between **Stress at work** and the psychological and social aspects of the work experience in the institution in question" because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.627 at the significant level of 0.000 and is smaller than the significant level of 0.05;

Impact of Quality of Work Life on Psychosocial Risks: Case of LAFARGE Cement Oggaz

LEKKAM Hanane

5. There is no correlation between **Control at work** and Psychosocial factors in the institution because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.256 at the significant level of 0.07, which is greater than the significant level of 0.05;

6. There is no correlation between **working conditions** and Psychosocial factors because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.102 at the significant level of 0.481 and is greater than the significant level of 0.05;

7. Based on the results obtained, we conclude that there is a positive correlation between **Quality of working life** and psychosocial factors because the Pearson coefficient is equal to 0.676 at the significant level of 0.000 and is smaller than the significant level of 0.05.

Table number (8): Regression Analysis of the Influence of quality working life on Psychosocial factors among employees of LAFARGE Company.

Source	SS	df	Ms	f	P<
Regression	4.662	4	0.666	6.610	0.0000
Residual	4.232	225	0.101		
Total	8.895	229			
Independent variables			Beta	T value	Sig.
Constant			--		0.0000
1.Job and career satisfaction			0.373	2.495	0.000
2.General well-being			0.015	0.102	0.000
3.Home–work interface			0.125	0.722	0.000
4.Stress at work			- 0.249	1.173	0.000

R square= 0.524

Source: output of SPSS

Results of regression analysis have indicated that the 04 dimensions of quality of work life taken together (Since the last two dimensions ‘control at work, working conditions’ are not significant as shown in the table 07) are statistically significant ($F = 6.610$, $df = 7.142$, $Sig. = <.000$) (Table08) predictors of psychosocial factors of risks among employees of LAFARGE company, The total variance of psychosocial risks factors explained by this regression model was 52.4 percent.

According to beta values, all the dimensions except dimension 04 (stress at work) are positively regressed on the psychosocial factors among LAFARGE company’s employees.

The variable "Job and career satisfaction" has a beta coefficient of 0.373, a t-value of 2.495, and a p-value of 0.000, suggesting a significant and positive influence on psychosocial aspects of work. (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patt, Job Satisfaction and Mental Well-Being: The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review., 2001).

"General well-being" exhibits a beta coefficient of 0.015, a t-value of 0.102, and a p-value of 0.000. These values indicate a positive yet weak influence on psychosocial aspects of work, which aligns with the findings of (Abaidi & Drillon, 2016). The study underscores the close interrelation between well-being at work and psychosocial risks (RPS). Well-being at work encompasses job characteristics, work environment, recognition, company benevolence, and fulfillment. In contrast, psychosocial risks encompass the psychological dimensions of social life within the workplace.

In this regard, (Vanhée, 2013), elected HR Director of the Year 2012 in Belgium, points out that studies have shown that happy employees are "31% more productive (According to Shawn Achor - IAPR-USA)" and "55% more creative (T. Amabile - Harvard Business School)"

The variable "Home-work interface" has a beta coefficient of 0.125, a t-value of 0.722, and a p-value of 0.000, demonstrating a positive influence on psychosocial aspects of work.

As highlighted by (Pailhé & Solaz, 2009), a proper balance between family and work life contributes to overall job satisfaction and, consequently, a sense of well-being.

The variable "Stress at work" has a beta coefficient of -0.249, a t-value of 1.173, and a p-value of 0.000, suggesting a negative influence on psychosocial factors.

These results are consistent with the studies (Van Hooff & Van Hooft, 2014); (Chouanière, 2006) that indicates that stress can lead to various psychological disorders such as depression, anxiety, substance dependency, and suicide.

The rank order of the variables indicates that the dimension 1 (Job and career satisfaction) is the most important attitudinal dimension which is highly significant ($p < .0000$) in the psychosocial factors.

The results obtained can be interpreted to indicate that, an improvement in the four dimension of quality of working life (Job and career satisfaction, General well-being, Home-work interface, stress management) could lead to enhanced psychosocial factors, which in turn might help mitigate psychosocial risks in the workplace. This indicates a potential beneficial cycle where better working conditions contribute to better psychosocial well-being and potentially reduce the negative impact of psychosocial risks.

Conclusion:

A good quality of work life (QWL) can contribute to reducing Psychosocial Risks (PSRs): When employees benefit from a positive work environment, good relationships with their colleagues and superiors, adequate support, autonomy in their work, etc., they are less likely to develop PSRs such as stress or burnout.

PSRs can negatively impact QWL: On the other hand, when employees are exposed to chronic stress factors, conflict situations, or lack of support, their QWL suffers. This can lead to a decrease in job satisfaction, deterioration of interpersonal relationships, and a decrease in motivation.

Preventing PSRs improves QWL: By implementing measures to prevent PSRs, companies can promote better QWL for their employees. This may include actions aimed at reducing stress factors, promoting social support, improving working conditions, and fostering a balance between work and personal life.

In conclusion, Quality of Work Life and Psychosocial Risks are closely related, and a comprehensive approach to improving QWL and preventing PSRs is essential to promote employee well-being and optimize organizational performance."

References:

- (n.d.). Retrieved juillet 29, 2023, from <https://www.lafarge.dz/chiffres-cles>.
- Abaidi, J., & Drillon, D. (2016). Les dimensions du bien-être au travail : axes de prévention des risques psychosociaux ? *Revue internationale de psychosociologie et de gestion des comportements organisationnels*, 145-172.
- ANACT. (2007). Améliorer la qualité de vie au travail. Des pistes pour agir . *Travail et changements, numéro spécial mai/juin*, 01-32.
- ANACT. (2019, 12 04). <https://www.anact.fr/comment-articuler-la-prevention-des-risques-psychosociaux-la-qualite-de-vie-au-travail>. Retrieved 07 12, 2023, from Comment articuler la prévention des risques psychosociaux à la qualité de vie au travail ?
- BNET. (2008). *BNET .2008. BNET Business Dictionary*. Retrieved 2019, from <http://dictionary.bnet.com/definition/guality+of+working+life.html>>.
- Brillet, F., Sauviat, I., & Soufflet, E. (2017). Les conséquences et la prévention des risques psychosociaux. *Risques psychosociaux et qualité de vie au travail*, 63-84.
- Brun, J.-P., & Martel, J. (2003). La santé psychologique au travail. De la définition du problème aux solutions (Fascicule 2 : les causes du problème : les sources de stress au travail). Québec: Chaire en gestion de la santé et de la sécurité du travail, Canada.
- Carlson, H. C. (1980). *A Model of Quality of Work Life as a Developmental Process*. In *Trends and Issues in OD : Current Theory and Practice*, W.W. San Diego: W.W Bruke et L.D. Goodstein, University Associates.
- Chouanière, D. (2006). Stress et risques psychosociaux : concepts et prévention. 2006;106:169—86. *Doc Med Trav*, 106:169-86.
- DARES. (2010). *les risques psychosociaux*. Retrieved aout 05, 2023, from <https://dares.travail-emploi.gouv.fr/donnees/les-risques-psychosociaux>.
- Davis, L., & Cherna, A. (1975). *The Quality of Working Life*. New York, NY, USA: The Free Press, McMillan Publishers.
- Dupret, E., Bocéréan, C., Teherani, M., & Feltrin, E. (2012). Le COPSOQ : un nouveau questionnaire français d'évaluation des risques psychosociaux. . *Santé Publique*, 24, 189-207.

- Gollac, M., & Bodie, M. (2011). *Mesurer les facteurs de risques psychosociaux au travail pour les maîtriser* : . France-*/: rapport du collège d'expertise sur le suivi des risques psychosociaux au travail.
- González, M., & Hernández, R. (2006). Síntomas psicossomáticos y teoría transaccional del estrés. *Ansiedad y Estrés*, 45-61.
- Hsu, M. Y., & Kernohan, G. (2006). Dimensions of hospital nurses' quality of working life. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 54, (1), 120-131.
- ILO. (1986). *Psychosocial factors at work: Recognition and control*, No.56. Report of the Joint ILO/WHO Committee on Occupational Health, Ninth Session, Geneva. Retrieved 03 27, 2023, from https://ilo.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/fulldisplay/alma992480113402676/41ILO_INST:41ILO_V2.
- INRS. (2006). Stress et risques psychosociaux : concepts et prévention », , no 106. *Documents pour le médecin du travail*, 169-186.
- INSEE. (2011). *Quality of life and well-being often go hand in hand*. Retrieved 05, 2023, from <https://www.insee.fr/en/statistiques/1281415>.
- Judge, T., Thoresen, C., Bono, J. E., & Patt, C. (2001). Job Satisfaction and Mental Well-Being: The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407, 376-407.
- Judge, T., Thoresen, C., Bono, J. E., & Patt, C. (2001). Job Satisfaction and Mental Well-Being: The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
- Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308.
- Kumar, S., & Sayeed, O. (2010). Role, Work Perception & Stress in a High Reliability Work Environment. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46, 287-299.
- Lachmann, H., Larose, C., & Pénicaut, M. (2010). (2010), *Bien-être et efficacité au travail, Dix propositions pour améliorer la santé psychologique au travail*, France: Rapport au premier ministre, La Documentation française.
- Larouche, V., & Trudel, J. (1983). La qualité de vie au travail et l'horaire variable, 38, (3), p. 568-59. *Relations industrielles*, 568-597.
- Machado, T. (2015). *La prévention des risques psychosociaux : concepts et méthodologies d'intervention*. . Renne: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Martel, J.-P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). quality of work life : theoritical and methodological problems and presentation of a new model and measuring instrument, 77(2). *social indicators research*, 333-368.
- Mecheri, N. (2015, Novembre 28). *Lafarge Cement Oggaz l'un des fleurons de l'industrie algérienne, le jeune indépendant*. Retrieved juillet 28, 2023, from <https://www.jeune-independant.net/lafarge-ciment-oggaz-lun-des-fleurons-de>

- lindustrie-algerienne/, v: <https://www.jeune-independant.net/lafarge-ciment-oggaz-lun-des-fleurs-de-lindustrie-algerienne/>, v
- Montreuil, E. (2020). *Prévenir les risques psychosociaux et améliorer la qualité de vie au travail: Des outils pour agir efficacement*. France: Dunod.
- Oudry, A., & Foulard, A. (2014). La place du psychologue dans la prévention des risques psychosociaux. *Le Journal des psychologues* 1 (n° 314), 24-25.
- Pailhé, A., & Solaz, A. (2009). *Entre famille et travail, des arrangements de couple aux pratiques des employeurs*. Paris: la découverte.
- Sayeed, O., & Kumar, S. (2010). Role, Work Perception & Stress in a High Reliability Work Environment. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46, 287-299.
- Segurado, A., & Agulló, E. (2002). Calidad de vida laboral: Hacia un enfoque integrador desde la psicología social *Psicothema*, 14, . *Psicothema* , 828–836.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 1, 27-41.
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research_Springer*, vol. 55 no 3, En ligne. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>, 241-302.
- SOJKA, L. (2014). Specification of the Quality of Work Life Characteristics in the Slovak Economic Environment, 26, (3). *Sociologica*, 283-299.
- Theorell, T., & Karasek, R. (1990). *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Van de Merwe, K., Oprins, E., Eriksson, F., & van, F. (2012). The Influence of Automation Support on Performance, Workload, and Situation Awareness of Air Traffic Controllers. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 22, 120-143.
- Van Hooff, M., & Van Hooft, E. (2014). Boredom at work: proximal and dis-tal consequences of affective work-related boredom, 19(3):348—59. *Job Occupational Health Psychology*, 48-59.
- Vanhée, L. (2013). *hanppy HR: Le bonheur au travail, rentable et durable*. collection knoway.