Assiut Scientific Nursing Journal
http://asnj.journals.ekb.eg
http://www.arabimpactfactor.com
http://olddrji.lbp.world/indexedJournals.aspx
DOI: 10.21608/ASNJ.2022.159453.1426

Quality of Work Life (QWL) and its Influence on Work Engagement among Academic Staff at Nursing Faculties: A comparative Study

Nema Fathy Saad[1] & Nadia Mohamed El-Sayed Ghonem[2]
[1.] Assistant Professor of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Ain Shams University, Egypt.
[2.] Assistant Professor of Nursing Administration, Faculty of Nursing, Suez-Canal University, Egypt.

Abstract
Background: Quality of Work Life (QWL) directly influences job satisfaction, productivity, and work engagement. It is essential for successful educational institutions. **Aim of the study:** To compare the QWL and work engagement among academic staff at two nursing faculties in a regional (A) and a capital-city (B) university. **Subjects and Methods:** This comparative cross-sectional research design was used to compare academic staff's QWL and work engagement in nursing faculties. It included 82 academic staff from each one. A self-administered questionnaire with the Quality of Work Life Scale and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was used to collect data. Fieldwork lasted from January to March 2021. **Results:** Participants from regional universities had more experience years (p=0.004), more singles (p=0.03), and rural residents (p<0.001). Regional university staff had lower QWL (12.2%) than capital-city university (52.4%), p<0.001, but had higher UWES scores (p<0.001). In multivariate analysis, working in a capital-city university was a positive predictor of QWL, while it was a negative predictor of engagement score. **Conclusion and Recommendations:** There are significant differences in QWL and work engagement of academic staff between faculties of nursing in the capital city and regional universities. The work engagement is influenced by the QWL and staff income and training. Improving academic staff QWL with better work design would help them achieve their own and institutional goals with a better balance of their work/home life. The effectiveness of improving work design and context on academic staff work engagement, professional performance, and work happiness needs to be studied.

Keywords: Academic staff, Nursing Faculties, Quality of work life & Work Engagement

Introduction
Teaching staff members are in daily contact with their students, and this may need them to have high levels of self-confidence, sympathy, altruism, dedication, and motivation **(Salas-Vallina et al., 2017)**. Those possessing such characteristics have positive feelings toward their job and students, which means happiness **(Osam et al., 2020)**. Satisfaction is of particular importance for those working in educational institutions **(Ozkara, 2015)**, and it is greatly influenced by their quality of work life (QWL) **(Jun & Jo, 2016; Javadi Sharif, 2020)**.

According to **Quadri (2019), QWL is** "the quality of the relationship between the employees and the total working environment." It reflects employees' satisfaction with their own and their organisation's needs through engagement in their work environment **(Swamy et al., 2015)**. It also indicates a balance between personal and professional life through proper management of individual private and job duties **(Fazal, 2019)**. QWL aims to help create a positive work environment that fosters growing and learning in a joyful work environment with maximum utilisation of personal potential **(Abubakar et al., 2019)**. Additionally, it tends to ameliorate employees' physical and psychological health and consequently improve the institution's image **(Chowdhury, 2019)**. Thus, the enhancement of the QWL is recommended for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) **(OECD, 2017)**.

The QWL directly influences job satisfaction, employees' productivity, and work engagement **(Nowrouzi, 2016)**. In academic institutions, a low level of QWL can hurt staff members' engagement and commitment to their duties in teaching and research and, consequently the quality of education in these institutions **(Devi and Lalu, 2018; Zehra and Rukhsana, 2020)**. Work engagement reflects employees' commitment to achieving their own and institutional goals through using their maximum potential at work with more vigour, dedication, and absorption **(Bakker and Schaufeli, 2010; Christian et al., 2011)**.

According to **Falola et al. (2018)**, the institutional support provided by the management of academic institutions is critical in fostering staff members' work engagement and effectiveness. Thus, the administration of educational institutions needs to build strategies to promote the QWL of their staff members (**Amith et al., 2019; Soni & Bakhru,**

2019). A good QWL level among faculty members is achieved when they can fulfil their needs through their work in the educational system and their achieving of the institutional objectives (**Medicine, 2011)**. Meanwhile, the distinctive faculty members' professional competencies are determinants of their work engagement **(Billy & Yuan-Li, 2020)**. Additionally, studies demonstrated that the more academic staff are satisfied with their job, the higher their work engagement and organisational commitment **(Okechukwu, 2017; Ghenghesh and Abdelmageed, 2018; Harini et al., 2019)**.

Significance of the study:

Successful educational institutions realise that their staff's QWL and work engagement is crucial. Higher education in Egypt may be confronting significant challenges as efforts are exerted to enhance the factors contributing to a better QWL for teaching members to improve their work engagement. These may vary among various universities with different work environments and contexts. This study attempts to identify differences in QWL and work arrangement of academic staff or faculty members at two nursing faculties in two other universities in Egypt.

Aim of the study:

The objective is to compare the Quality of Work Life (QWL) and work engagement among academic staff at two nursing faculties in regional (A) and capital-city (B) universities.

Research questions:

1. Is the QWL significantly different among academic staff at nursing faculties (A) and (B)?
2. Is work engagement significantly different among academic staff at two nursing faculties (A) and (B)?
3. What factors influence the QWL and work engagement among academic staff at nursing faculties?

Subjects and Methods

Research design: A comparative cross-sectional research design was used to compare academic staff's QWL and work engagement in nursing faculties.

Setting: The faculty of nursing (A) has 45 faculty members and 53 assistant staff. It was established in 2006 and adopted Problem Based Learning (PBL) education approach. Nursing faculty (B) has 146 faculty members and 98 assistant staff. It was established in 2000. It obtained accreditation and quality from the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Authority for the second time in 2017.

Participants: The study populations included all academic staff members, faculty members and their assistants in the two faculties of nursing during the study. The only inclusion criterion had at least one year of experience in the current job. The sample size was estimated using the G-power software program to detect any difference in QWL of work engagement with a small/medium effect size (0.35), at a 95% level of confidence and 80% power. The required sample size turned out to be 65 staff members. This was increased to 82 per group to account for an expected non-response rate of 20%. Participants were recruited by non-probability quota sampling from the various departments in proportion to the total numbers in each department. The sample was as shown below:

Nursing departments	University	
	Regional (A)	Capital city (B)
Pediatrics	12	7
Community health	12	10
Nursing administration	13	9
Obstetrics/Gyne	13	13
Mental health	11	10
Medical-surgical	21	33
Total	**82**	**82**

Data collection tools: A self-administered questionnaire was used to collect study data. It consisted of the three sections as follows.

Section I: This was for the demographic and job characteristics of the respondents. It covered age, gender, qualification level, years of experience, job position, marital status, having children or elder relatives for caring, residence, income, and previous attendance of training courses in QWL or work engagement.

Section II: The **QWL Scale (QWLS),** established by **Brooks and Anderson (2004),** was used to assess academic staff members' perception of their QWL. It consists of 42 items with a response on a 6-point Likert type scale ranging from "Completely agree" to "Absolutely disagree." They are categorised into four domains: 1) Work/home life (16 items) such as "I can balance work with my family needs" and "I have energy left after work;" 2) Work design (11 items), e.g. "I am satisfied with my job," "My workload is too heavy; 3) Work context (10 items) such as "Friendships with my co-workers are important to me" "My work setting provides career advancement opportunities;" and Work world (5 items) such as "I would be able to find the same job in another organisation with about the same salary and benefits," "I feel my job is secure".

Scoring: The responses for the items from "Completely agree" to "Absolutely disagree" are scored respectively from 6 to 1. For more accessible analysis, the authors **(Brooks & Anderson, 2004)** recommended dichotomising the rating scale into

high (completely agree, agree, slight agree rated 6 to 4 respectively) and low (absolutely disagree, disagree, and slightly disagree rated from 1 to 3).

Section III: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) developed by **Schaufeli et al. (2006)** was used to determine the level of work engagement among participants. It consists of 17 items under three dimensions: 1) absorption (6 items) such as "Time flies when I am working," "When I am working, I forget everything else around me;" 2) dedication (5 items), such as "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose," "My job inspires me;" and 3) vigour (6 items) such as "At my work, I feel bursting with energy," "When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work." The response for each item is on a 7-point Likert type scale ranging from "Always" to "Never."

Scoring: The responses from "Always" to "Never" are scored respectively from 7 to 1. The scores of the statements of each dimension and the total scale were summed-up and the total was divided by the number of corresponding items giving a mean score for each. These were categorised according to tool manual instructions **(Schaufeli et al., 2006)** into high (75^{th} percentile or higher), average (25^{th} – 75^{th} percentiles), and low ($<25^{th}$ percentile) levels of work engagement.

Tools' validity: The two scales used were derived from standardised scales with documented fact **(Lee et al., 2014 & Salanova et al., 2001)**. They were translated into Arabic using the translate-back-translate technique **(Behling & Law, 2000)**. Five experts reviewed the Arabic version in nursing administration for further validation. These included three professors from Ain Shams University, one professor from Suez-Canal University, and one assistant professor from Zagazig University. Minor modifications were made based on their opinions.

Tools' reliability: Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the reliability of the two scales used by evaluating their internal consistency. They demonstrated excellent levels of reliability with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.937 for the QWL scale and 0.953 for the UWES Scale.

Pilot study: A pilot study was carried out on 17 academic staff (9 faculty members and eight assistant staff) at the two study settings, representing about 10% of the primary study sample. The purpose was to test the tools' clarity and applicability, and reliability. It has also helped in estimating the time needed for data collection. The devices were finalised accordingly. The pilot participants were included in the primary study sample since no modifications were required for the data collection form.

Fieldwork: After obtaining official permissions, the researchers met with the potential eligible participants and provided them with a brief orientation about the nature of the study. They were all invited to participate. Those who gave their oral consent were given the data collection form and needed filling instructions. This was done individually at the workplace. Data were collected three days per week, with about 5-7 completed forms per week. The data collection process lasted for three months, from January 2021 to the end of March 2021.

Administrative design: Approvals for data collection were obtained from the Deans of the Nursing faculties at the two Universities. This was based on a presented study protocol explaining the aim of the study and its procedures and a copy of the data collection form.

Ethical considerations: The study protocol was approved by the research ethics committee in the faculty of Nursing at Suez Canal University. Oral informed consent was obtained from each participant after being informed about the aim and procedures of the study. They were reassured about their rights to refuse or withdraw at any time and the confidentiality of any obtained information. The study procedures could not involve any harmful effect on participants.

Statistical analysis: Data were presented using descriptive statistics as means, standard deviations and medians for numeric variables and frequencies and percentages for categorical ones. Analytic statistics used were chi-square or Fisher exact tests for variables and Spearman's rank correlation for quantitative and ranked variables. multiple linear regression analysis was performed to identify the independent predictors of the scores of QWL and work engagement. statistical significance was set at a p-value <0.05. All analyses were performed on SPSS 20.0 statistical package.

Results

Table (1): Demographic characteristics of participants in the study of two samples (82) for both universities

	University				X^2 test	p-value
	(Regional) (n=82)		(Capital city) (n=82)			
	No.	%	No.	%		
Age:						
<30	23	28.0	29	35.4		
30	32	39.0	25	30.5	1.57	0.46
40+	27	32.9	28	34.1		
Range	23.0-55.0		24.0-57.0			
Mean±SD	36.2±8.5		35.0±8.6		F=0.92	0.34
Median	36.0		31.0			
Gender:						
Male	10	12.2	6	7.3		
Female	72	87.8	76	92.7	1.11	0.29
Qualification:						
Bachelor	20	24.4	24	29.3		
Master	16	19.5	17	20.7	0.68	0.71
Doctorate	46	56.1	41	50.0		
Experience years:						
<10	29	35.4	48	58.5		
10	39	47.6	21	25.6	10.13	0.006*
20+	14	17.1	13	15.9		
Range	1.0-31.0		1.0-32.0			
Mean±SD	12.6±7.7		9.4±7.4		F=8.30	0.004*
Median	13.0		7.5			
Job position:						
Assistant	36	43.9	41	50.0		
Faculty	46	56.1	41	50.0	0.61	0.43
Marital status:						
Single	28	34.1	16	19.5		
Married	54	65.9	66	80.5	4.47	0.03*
Have children	44	53.7	55	67.1	3.08	0.08
Caregiving an elder relative	45	54.9	23	28.0	12.16	<0.001*
Residence:						
Rural	27	32.9	5	6.1		
Urban	55	67.1	77	93.9	18.79	<0.001*
Income:						
Insufficient	72	87.8	63	76.8		
Sufficient	10	12.2	19	23.2	3.39	0.07
Had training courses in:						
Quality of work life	61	74.4	44	53.7	7.65	0.006*
Job engagement	36	43.9	36	43.9	0.00	1.00

(*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

Table (2): QWL of participants in the studied two samples at both universities (82)

QWL	University				X^2 test	p-value
	Regional		Capital city			
	No.	%	No.	%		
High (completely agree/agree/slight agree):						
Work life/home life	3	3.7	30	36.6	27.66	<0.001*
Work design	0	0.0	9	11.0	Fisher	0.003*
Work context	39	47.6	55	67.1	6.38	0.01*
Work world	40	48.8	57	69.5	7.29	0.007*
Total:						
High (completely agree/agree/slight agree)	10	12.2	43	52.4		
Low (absolutely disagree/disagree/slight disagree)	72	87.8	39	47.6	30.36	<0.001*

(*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

Table (3): Levels of Work engagement (UWES) of participants in the study two samples

Work engagement (UWES)	University				X^2 test	p-value
	Regional		Capital city			
	No.	%	No.	%		
Absorption:						
Low (<25th percentile)	1	1.2	24	29.3		
Average (25th - 75th percentile)	52	63.4	36	43.9	25.03	<0.001*
High (75th percentile +)	29	35.4	22	26.8		
Dedication:						
Low (<25th percentile)	2	2.4	17	20.7		
Average (25th - 75th percentile)	66	80.5	46	56.1	16.17	<0.001*
High (75th percentile +)	14	17.1	19	23.2		
Vigor:						
Low (<25th percentile)	0	0.0	15	18.3		
Average (25th - 75th percentile)	54	65.9	42	51.2	16.67	<0.001*
High (75th percentile +)	28	34.1	25	30.5		
Total UWES:						
Low (<25th percentile)	0	0.0	15	18.3		
Average (25th - 75th percentile)	68	82.9	49	59.8	18.59	<0.001*
High (75th percentile +)	14	17.1	18	22.0		

(*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

Table (4): Correlation matrix of QWL and work engagement (UWES) scales dimensions' scores

UWES	Spearman's rank correlation coefficient			
	QWL: Work			
	Work/home life	Design	Context	World
Absorption	-.253**	-.230**	.020	-.107
Dedication	-.089	.082	.178*	.004
Vigor	-.154*	.012	.076	-.090

(*) Statistically significant at p<0.05 *(**) Statistically significant at p<0.01*

Table (5): Correlation between participants' QWL and work engagement (UWES) scores and their characteristics

	Spearman's rank correlation coefficient	
	QWL scores	UWES scores
UWES	-.027	1.000
Age	-.060	-.027
Qualification	-.029	-.061
Job position	.030	-.066
Experience years	-.135	.027
Income	.054	.175*

(*) Statistically significant at p<0.05

Table (6): Best fitting multiple linear regression model for the QWL score

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-test	p-value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower	Upper
Constant	94.46	6.31		14.966	<0.001	82.00	106.93
Capital city University	20.61	3.64	0.42	5.657	<0.001	13.42	27.80

R-square=0.17 Model ANOVA: F=16.08, p<0.001

Variables entered and excluded: age, gender, qualification, experience, department, job position, marital status, having children, residence, income, caregiving, training courses

Table (7): Best fitting multiple linear regression model for the UWES score

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-test	p-value	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower	Upper
UWES score (excluding QWL score)							
Constant	5.34	0.27		19.962	<0.001	4.81	5.87
Capital city University	-0.49	0.15	-0.24	-3.322	0.001	-0.79	-0.20
Training in work engagement	-0.35	0.15	-0.17	-2.391	0.018	-0.63	-0.06
Income	0.54	0.19	0.20	2.799	0.006	0.16	0.92
r-square=0.20 Model ANOVA: F=10.13, p<0.001 Variables entered and excluded: age, gender, qualification, experience, job position, marital status, having children, residence, caregiving, training courses							
UWES score (after adding QWL scores)							
Constant	6.24	0.43		14.443	<0.001	5.39	7.10
Capital city University	-0.75	0.20	-0.37	-3.802	<0.001	-1.14	-0.36
Training in work engagement	-0.29	0.14	-0.14	-2.011	0.046	-0.57	-0.01
Income	0.60	0.19	0.23	3.170	0.002	0.23	0.98
Work design score	0.03	0.01	0.21	2.013	0.046	0.00	0.06
Work world score	-0.08	0.03	-0.26	-3.120	0.002	-0.13	-0.03
r-square=0.25 Model ANOVA: F=8.75, p<0.001 Variables entered and excluded: age, gender, qualification, experience, job position, marital status, having children, residence, caregiving, training courses, work life, work context							

Table (1): As presented in, the participants from the regional and capital-city universities had almost equal mean age, with a majority of females, 87.8% and 92.7%, respectively, and an almost similar distribution of job positions. Those in the regional university had significantly more experience years (p=0.004), with higher percentages of single (p=0.03), caregiving for an elder relative (p<0.001), rural residence (p<0.001), and had training courses in QWL (p=0.006).

Table (2): demonstrates statistically significant differences in the QWL of participants from the two universities. In all its four dimensions, the percentages of high QWL were higher among those in the capital-city university. In both, the lowest QWL dimension was work design, whereas the highest was the work world. In total, 12.2% of those in the regional university had high QWL compared with 52.4% of the capital-city university (p<0.001).

Table (3): As regards work engagement, points to statistically significant differences in all its three dimensions, as well as the total UWES (p<0.001). As evident from the table, the highest percentage of participants in both groups had an average level of UWES. Meanwhile, the participants from the regional university had higher rates of moderate-high scores in all UWES dimensions as well as in the total score.

Table (4): shows statistically significant weak negative correlations between the absorption score of UWES and the QWL dimensions of work/home life (r=-0.253) and work design (r=-0.230). Similarly, the vigour dimension score had a statistically significant weak negative correlation with the score of the dimension of work/home life (r=-0.154). Conversely, the UWES dedication score had a statistically significant weak positive correlation with the score of the QWL dimension of work context (r=0.178).

Table (5): As displayed in, no statistically significant correlation was found between the total scores of

UWES and QWL. Meanwhile, a statistically substantial weak positive correlation was revealed between the total score of UWES and the income (r=0.175).

Table (6): The multivariate analysis indicates that the university type was the only statistically significant independent positive predictor of the QWL score. Working in the capital-city university would increase the QWL score by 20.61 points compared to working in a regional university. This variable explains 17% of the variation in the QWL score.

Table (7): Concerning the multivariate analysis for the UWES score, shows that work in the regional Capital university and having previously attended training courses in work engagement were statistically significant independent negative predictors of the UWES score. Conversely, a higher income was a positive predictor. The model explains 20% of the variation in the UWES score. Adding the scores of QWL to the multivariate analysis kept these same predictors. It added to the model the score of the dimension of work design as a positive predictor and that of the work world as a negative predictor. These two variables increased the model r-square from 0.20 to 0.25, thus providing 5% more explanation of the score of UWES.

Discussion

This study was conducted to answer questions regarding the differences in QWL and work engagement among nursing faculty academic staff in two universities. The results demonstrated significant differences both in their QWL and work engagement. The former was higher among those from the capital-city university, and conversely, the latter was higher among those from the regional university.

The academic staff in the current study's two universities had similar age and gender distribution, job positions, and income. However, they had significant differences in their demographic characteristics. Thus, those in the regional university tended to have more experience years and more attendance in related training courses. Although a higher percentage were unmarried, a more significant proportion was caregiving for an elder relative, which would add a home-life burden to them. Additionally, approximately one-third of them were living in rural residences compared with less than one-fifth of those in the capital-city university. These significant differences in their demographic characteristics could be confounding factors affecting their QWL and work engagement. However, the multivariate analysis could not identify any of them as a predictor of the QWL score. In line with this, a study of the demographic characteristics influencing QWL in Algeria could not reveal any statistically significant effects of participants' age, gender, years of experience, or job position on the QWL **(Mebarki et al., 2019)**.

According to the present study results, the QWL tended to be low in both universities. This was particularly evident in work design and work/home life dimensions. This could be explained by the high workload, shortage of time, lack of autonomy, and many interruptions in daily work, which point to poor work design. Additionally, being unable to balance work-family needs and being depleted after work would negatively impact the QWL. In agreement with this, **Jiang et al. (2021)** clarified that the adverse effects of job stressors and fatigue could be moderated by employees' QWL, improving their work engagement. A similarly low level of QWL was reported in a recent systematic review and meta-analysis of the QWL in Iran **(Sanago et al., 2020)**.

In total, only slightly more than one-tenth of the academic staff from the regional university had a high level of QWL compared with around one-half of their peers from the capital-city university. The difference was statistically significant and confirmed in multivariate analysis. Both job factors and personal factors might explain this. The job factors might be related to more facilities and resources in the capital city university, which would positively influence its academic staff QWL, especially regarding the work design dimension. As for the personal factors, many of those in the regional university could live far from their workplace and have to commute daily, which would deplete their energy and time, with a consequent negative impact on their QWL, particularly regarding the work/home life dimension. In agreement with this, **Nguyen et al. (2018),** in a study in Vietnam, concluded that the QWL not only influences staff satisfaction but also affects their lives outside their work and is considered an essential component of the quality of life.

The current study also compared the two universities' work engagement among nursing faculty academic staff. The results demonstrated that none of the academic staff in the regional university had low vigour, and only one or two had low absorption and dedication, compared to around one-fifth to one-third of those in the capital-city university. Thus, overall, all academic staff from the regional university had moderate to high work engagement compared to eighty percent of their counterparts from the capital-city university. In agreement with this, a study of work engagement and workaholism among university employees in Pakistan generally revealed moderate to high levels of engagement among them **(Sarfaraz et al., 2022)**.

The negative impact of being affiliated with a capital-city university compared to a regional university on

academic staff work engagement was put into evidence in the present study through the multivariate analysis, which identified it as an independent negative predictor of the UWES score. This difference could be attributed to the fact that regional universities tend to be newer in founding with relatively lower numbers of senior staff, which would give more opportunities for a young team to advance in their career and in the promotion to higher positions provided they are committed and engaged to their work. Additionally, these regional universities being more recently established adopt innovative approaches in education, which would be a good stimulant and motivating factor for more work engagement and achievement. Similar motivating factors related to goal achievement were demonstrated as drivers of work engagement among employees in a study in Germany and the Netherlands **(Bipp et al., 2021)** and in a more recent study in Japan **(Zeng et al., 2022)**.

Additional factors affecting the present study academic staff work engagement were their income and attendance in training courses. The positive impact of income on work engagement is entirely plausible since a person having insufficient income would not be motivated to deploy more effort at a work that is not compensating them and would save their time and effort to family life or even to a secondary job to improve their income. A similar positive association was found between income and work engagement, reported in a South Ethiopia study **(Kelbiso et al., 2017)**. The negative impact of attending training courses could be attributed to the questionable quality of the systems or to the attendant's willingness and eagerness to learn.

Lastly, regarding the relationship between work engagement and QWL, the present study results could not identify any significant correlation between their total scores. However, their dimensions had mostly weak negative correlations or no significant correlations. Only the extent of dedication was positively correlated with the score of the size of work context. However, adding the QWL score to the work engagement regression analysis added five per cent to the explanation of its variance. This was through the dimensions of work design and work world, which respectively had a positive and a negative impact on the work engagement score. The positive effects of the work design dimension on work engagement are reasonably expected, as previously discussed, and is in congruence with **(Gokhale & Machine., 2018),** who highlighted that the QWL has a positive impact on staff work engagement and consequently on their work performance. A similar association between QWL and work engagement was reported in a study of nurses in Spain **(Orgambídez et al., 2020)**.

Meanwhile, the negative impact of the work world on work engagement, as revealed in the current study might be attributed to the feeling of job security in governmental organisations regardless of the work engagement level. In line with this, **Waghmare & Dhole (2017),** in a study of the factors influencing QWL, demonstrated that the work environment had the most significant impact. Therefore, critical strategies set in a study in France to enhance employees' QWL involve integrating the societal responsibility to improve the work world dimension **(Penaud et al., 2021)**.

Conclusion

The study points to significant differences in QWL and works engagement among academic staff from faculties of nursing in the capital city and regional universities. The work engagement is influenced by the QWL and staff income and training.

Recommendations

Improving academic staff QWL is needed to foster their work engagement and, consequently, their performance. This would require a better work design that helps them achieve their own and institutional goals with a better balance of their work/home life. Further research is proposed to investigate the effectiveness of improving work design and context on academic staff engagement, professional performance, and work happiness.

References

- **Abubakar A.M., Anasori F., & Lasisi T.T. (2019):** Physical attractiveness and managerial favouritism in the hotel industry: The light and dark side of erotic capital. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management; 38:16-26.
- **Amith D., Vinay K.B., & Gowramma Y.P. (2019):** Effective strategies for stress management in work-life balance among women teaching profession (with particular reference to technical teachers). International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, Bophal; v. 8(1S): 177-182.
- **Bakker A., & Schaufeli W. (2010):** Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In Work engagement: a handbook of essential theory and research (Bakker, A. B. and Leiter, M. P. eds.) Psychology Press, Hove, pp. 10-24.
- **Behling O, & Law K. (2000):** Translating questionnaires and other research instruments: Problems and Solutions. Lewis-Beck MS, editor. Thousand Oaks: Sage; 2000. pp. 1–70.

- **Billy W. & Yuan-Li T. C. (2020):** University lecturers' construction of the 'ideal' undergraduate student. Journal of Further and Higher Education; 44(1): 54- 68. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1504010 [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar]
- **Bipp T., Kleingeld A., & Schelp L. (2021):** Achievement Goals and Goal Progress as Drivers of Work Engagement. Psychol Rep.;124(5):2180-2202. doiDOI: 10.1177/0033294120959778. Epub 2020 Sep 23. PMID: 32967531.
- **Brooks B., & Anderson M. (2004):** Defining quality of nursing work life. Nursing economic; 23(27): 319-26.
- **Chowdhury R. (2019):** A holistic approach to employee engagement. Systems thinking for management consultants. Singapore: Springer, pp.269-304
- **Christian M., Garza A., & Slaughter J. (2011)**: Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and Contextual performance. Personnel Psychology; 64:89-136.
- **Devi M.P. & Lalu A.N.G.F. (2018):** Stress and work-life balance of school teachers: a social work intervention. Journal of Social Work Education and Practice; 3(2): 57-61.
- **Falola H.O., Oludayo O.A., Akinnusi D.M., Osib anjo A.O., & Salau O.P. (2018):** Faculty commitment, the effectiveness of job responsibilities and the moderating role of institutional support: A survey data set. Data in Brief; 19: 1120–1123.
- **Fazal S. (2019):** Barriers and enablers of women's academic careers in Pakistan. Asian Journal of Women's Studies; 25(2): 217-238. https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2019.1607467
- **Ghenghesh P., & Abdelmageed S. (2018):** A study on the effects of staff development on teachers' satisfaction and perceptions of change in teaching performance. Journal of Education and Practice; 19(16): 43–49.
- **Gokhale A., & Machine K., (2018):** International Journal on E-Learning Volume 17, Number 2, April 2018 ISSN 1537-2456 Publisher: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), Waynesville, NC USA).
- **Harini S., Luddin M.R., & Hamid A.H. (2019):** Work-life balance, job satisfaction, work engagement and organisational commitment among Lecturers.
- **Javadi Sharif T., Hosseinzadeh M., Mahdavi N., Namdar Areshtanab H., & Dickens L.G. (2020):** Happiness and its relationship with job burnout in nurses of educational hospitals in Tabriz, Iran. Int J Commun Based Nurs Midwife; 8(4):1–10.
- **Jiang F., Liu D., Wu Y., Wang M., Liu Y. & Tang Y. (2021):** Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction and Work-Life Balance Among Chinese Physicians in Tertiary Public Hospitals, May 2021 | https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.635260,Original Research article, China.
- **Jun W.H. & Jo M.J. (2016):** Factor affecting happiness among nursing students in South Korea. J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs.; 23(6–7):419–26.
- **Kelbiso L., Belay A., & Woldie M. (2017):** Determinants of Quality of Work Life among Nurses Working in Hawassa Town Public Health Facilities, South Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Study, Published online 2017 Dec 12. DOI: 10.1155/2017/5181676
- **Lee Y., Dai Y., McCreary L., Yao G., & Brooks B. (2014):** Psychometric properties of the Chinese-version Quality of Nursing Work Life Scale. Nurs Health Sci.; 16(3):298-306
- **Mebarki B., Ahmed Fouatih M.E.A., & Mokdad M. (2019):** Quality of Work Life and differences in demographic characteristics among managerial staff in Algerian tertiary sector. Work.;62(3):435-442. DOI: 10.3233/WOR-192879. PMID: 30909260.
- **Medicine I. (2011):** Committee on the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Initiative on the Future of Nursing IM. The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- **Nguyen P., Tran K., Dang T., & Ton T. (2018):** The impact of high-quality workplace Relationships on job performance: A perspective on staff nurses in Vietnam Behave. Sci. 2018, 8(12), 109; https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8120109
- **Nowrouzi B., Giddens E., Gohar B., Schoenenberger S., Bautista M.C., & Casole J. (2016):** The quality of work life of registered nurses in Canada and the United States: a comprehensive literature review. Int J Occup Environ Health; 22(4):341–58.
- **OECD. (2017):** OECD Guidelines on Measuring the Quality of the Working Environment. OECD Publishing; Paris, France:
- **Okechukwu W. (2017):** Influence of training and development, employee performance on job satisfaction among the staff of school of technology management and logistics, University Utara Malaysia (STML, UUM). Journal of Technology Management and Business; 4(1): 1–16. [Google Scholar]
- **Orgambídez A., Borrego Y., & Vázquez-Aguado O. (2020):** Linking Self-efficacy to Quality of Working Life: The Role of Work Engagement.

West J Nurs Res.; 42(10):821-828. doi: 10.1177/0193945919897637. Epub 2020 Jan 16. PMID: 31941420.

- **Osam K., Shuck B., & Immekus J. (2020):** Happiness and healthiness: a replication study. Hum Resour Dev Q; 31(1):75–89.
- **Ozkara S.E. (2015)**: Concept analysis of nurses' happiness. Nurse Forum.; 50(1):55–62.
- **Penaud O., Abad M., Bousrez-Plaud F., & Denisse L. (2021):** Des clés pour améliorer la qualité de vie au travail [Keys to improving the quality of life at work]. Soins.;66(860):34-38. French. doi: 10.1016/j.soin.2021.10.008. Epub 2021 Oct 13. PMID: 34838210.
- **Quadri A.A. (2019):** Employees perception on effective reward system and motivating incentives to enhance performance in Irish owned restaurants: A case study of reward management system in comet restaurant Dublin (Doctoral Dissertation Dublin Business School)
- **Salanova M., Schaufeli W.B., Llorens S., Pieró J.M., & Grau R. (2001):** Desde el 'burnout' al 'engamement': una nueva perspectiva [From burnout to engagement: A new persepctive]. Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones; 16: 117-134.
- **Salas-Vallina A., López-Cabrales Á., Alegre J., & Fernández R. (2017)**: On the road to happiness at work (HAW): transformational leadership and organisational learning capability as drivers of HAW in a healthcare context. Pers Rev;46(2):314–38.
- **Sanagoo A., Sarokhani D., Hasanpour Dehkordi A., Sayehmiri K., & Jouybari L. (2020):** Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Quality of Work Life in Iran (2011-2017). Int J Prev Med.; 11:77. DOI: 10.4103/ijpvm.IJPVM_451_18. PMID: 33033586; PMCID: PMC7513780.
- **Sarfaraz M., Sarfaraz S., Maqsood A., Ahmed N., Vohra F., Abduljabbar T., & Abduljabbar A.S. (2022)**: Assessing the impact of workaholism and work engagement on medical university employee stress and satisfaction levels. PeerJ.;10: e12565. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.12565. PMID: 35186447; PMCID: PMC8820209.
- **Schaufeli W.B., Bakker A.B., & Salanova M. (2006)**: The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire: A Cross-National Study. Educational and Psychological Measurement; 66(4): 701-716
- **Soni P. & Bakhru K.M. (2019)**: Understanding triangulated collaboration of work-life balance, personality traits and eudemonic well-being. Problems and Perspectives in Management, Cham; 17(2): 63-82. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(2).
- **Swamy D.R., Nanjundeswaraswamy T.S., &Rashmi S. (2015):** Quality of work life: scale development and validation. International Journal of Caring Sciences; 8(2):281
- **Waghmare S. & Dhole V. (2017):** Quality of Work Life and Influencing Factors. Int. J. Adv. Res.; 5:1328–1332. DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/4252.
- **Zehra F. & Rukhsana N. (2020):** Faculty job satisfaction in a private medical university: a cross-sectional study from Karachi, Pakistan. Rawal Medical Journal; 45(1): 211-217.
- **Zeng D., Takada N., Hara Y., Sugiyama S., Ito Y., Nihei Y., & Asakura K. (2022):** Impact of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Work Engagement: A Cross-Sectional Study of Nurses Working in Long-Term Care Facilities. Int J Environ Res Public Health.;19(3):1284. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph19031284. PMID: 35162307; PMCID: PMC8834725.