

# A Study on Quality of Work Life and Turnover Intention Among Employees in the Manufacturing Sector

<sup>1</sup>Akshaya J, <sup>2</sup>Ms.Vimala M

<sup>1</sup>Student, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor

Department of Psychology

<sup>1</sup>Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous),  
Bengaluru, India

**Abstract:** This study aimed to investigate the relationship between the overall quality of work life and turnover intention among employees in the manufacturing sector, as well as to examine the impact of determinants of quality of work life on turnover intention. Additionally, the study aimed to determine if there is any statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different age groups and years of experience. The sample size was 120 employees aged 22–40 years, and data were collected using the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) scale and the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6). The findings revealed a moderately strong negative relationship between overall quality of work life and turnover intention, as well as a significant difference in the quality of work life based on years of experience. It also revealed that Job and career Satisfaction and Working conditions are more significant predictors of turnover intention than other determinants. However, there is no statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different age groups. The study highlights the importance of improving the quality of work life to reduce turnover intention among employees in the heavy machinery manufacturing sector.

**Index terms:** Quality of work life, Turnover intention, Job career satisfaction, Working conditions, Manufacturing sector, age, experience.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### *Quality of Work Life*

According to Harrison (1985), “QWL is the degree to which the working organization contributes to the material and psychological well-being of its members”. Louis Davis formulated the concept of Quality of Work-Life. “Theories that suggested a link between employee morale and productivity emerged in the 1950s and 1960s. One such theory was Fredrick Herzberg's Motivation Hygiene Theory, which showed that employee satisfaction is more influenced by how the employee feels at work than by other factors like pay and working conditions (Herzberg et al., 1959; Tella et al., 2007). With additional development, theories of motivation and leadership lead to the formation of the concept of QWL.

According to studies, an employee who is happy and satisfied at work and with the organization will approach QWL more positively. He or she has a favourable opinion of their workplace, which has an effect on their physical and mental health (Chan & Wyatt, 2007). A positive working environment and fulfilling the needs of the workforce will lead to the retention of the present workforce and an improvement in the organization's performance (Hashempour et al., 2018). Employees must have a positive view of their job and life in order to be valuable assets to the organization. They must also find a good balance between their professional and personal requirements and goals. Therefore, those with high levels of Organisational commitment and Quality of work-life are considered to have a healthy work-life balance. (Kalliath & Kalliath, 2013). In this context, HRD in an organization is striving to develop techniques such as interventions, workshops, and employee training. This will benefit their workforce, improving the quality of their work life and increasing their commitment to the organization (Gayathiri & Ramakrishnan, 2013).

The three most influential works in the field of QWL are done by Walton (1975), Taylor (1978), and Levine et al (1984). Walton has found eight elements that contribute to QWL. These include: (i) adequate and fair compensation; (ii) safe and healthy working conditions; (iii) opportunities for growth; (iv) opportunities to cultivate human capacities; and (v) social opportunities (vi) constitutionalism (vii) social relevance (viii) work and complete life space. Taylor (1978) used the factor analysis method for the first time to empirically investigate the dimensions underlying QWL. The variables were similar to Walton's model, with the exception of two additional dimensions, employer and society, which were suggested by Seashore (1975) and identified separately in the model. Levine et al (1984) researched QWL from the perspective of white-collar workers. He identified seven significant predictors, which are as follows: (a) the degree to which superiors treat employees with respect and have confidence in their abilities, (b) variety in daily work routine, (c) challenge of work, (d) current work leads to future possibilities, (e) self-esteem, (f) the extent to which life beyond work affects life at work, and (g) the extent to which work contributes to society.

Organizations are only effective when many individual efforts are combined into team efforts. Material and monetary resources are effectively employed for the achievement of common goals through the combined efforts of people (Nurlaelawati & Suwanto, 2020). Human resources are regarded as the most significant production component. Any organization considers human capital to be an advantage. As a result, it can never be substituted with figures or logarithms. Good quality of work life fosters positive interpersonal relationships and they together strive for achieving the goals of the organisation.

### *Turnover Intention*

Turnover intention can be defined as the employee's behaviour to quit from their current job. According to Mobley et al. (1978), an employee's intention to leave their job is a comprehensive expression of their unhappiness with their job, preparing to change jobs, and seeking other employment opportunities.

There are several theories that offer and explain different explanations for why an employee leaves an organization voluntarily. Some theories are described in more detail below:

The first formal theory on turnover intention is thought to be the Barnard-Simon Theory of Organizational Equilibrium, which offers a complete knowledge of the importance of employee retention. This hypothesis states that an employee will remain in a role as long as their perceived value to an organization and the value of the organization to their lives are equal. According to this theory, the following variables affect job satisfaction: Compatibility with one's varying responsibilities at the workplace and relationships at work that are predictable, and self-images that are in line with one's work. Therefore, employee retention rates will be good as long as an individual's personal aspirations and work-related goals do not conflict.

The unfolding turnover model (Lee & Mitchel, 1994; Lee et al. 1999; Lee et al. 1996) They suggested that a shock is what causes turnover. According to them, a shock is an incident that occurs to employees in response to purposeful judgments about their jobs. One forms some beliefs as a result of this shock. An employee plans to leave the company when this shock occurs because they no longer have any attachment to it. On the other hand, if shock does not occur, the same can prompt the person to assess their level of job satisfaction and look for different employment opportunities.

A highly dedicated and engaged workforce is necessary for a company to maintain a competitive advantage in the labor market and in the production of its products. Recently, several businesses have made an effort to become employers of choice, which is defined as an organization that outperforms its rivals in recruiting, training, and retaining talent-rich individuals (Joo & McLean, 2006). Employee turnover intentions have recently attracted the attention of managers and scholars across a variety of disciplines. The problem of employee turnover has long been a serious organizational problem. According to Lambert et al. (2001), turnover intention has been stressed as a crucial component for the financial success of companies. It's also influenced by a variety of organizational factors.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Almalki et al. (2012) conducted research on "The relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention of primary health care nurses in Saudi Arabia". The study included 508 PHC nurses from the Jazan region of Saudi Arabia. The PHC nurses in this study demonstrated low satisfaction and a high intention to leave the profession. There is a strong correlation between QWL and PHC nurses' intention to leave their jobs. The initiatives that are created in response to these findings may enhance QWL and lower PHC nurse turnover.

A conceptual model was created by Korunka et al. (2008) and evaluated on two national samples (the American and Austrian samples). 624 individuals from five IT organizations in the United States and 677 employees from a global IT production/manufacturing company in Austria were chosen as samples for the study. The questionnaire for both populations had the same four factors: QWL, organizational characteristics, turnover intentions, and job characteristics. Findings revealed that the link between "job/organizational characteristics and turnover intention" is confirmed by the study to be mediated by QWL.

Mosadeghrad (2013) conducted research titled "Quality of Working Life: An Antecedent to Employee Turnover Intention" on 608 hospital staff workers in Tehran, Iran to see whether there is a relationship between QWL and employees' turnover intentions. The findings revealed that hospital staff members possess a low degree of QWL. Employee satisfaction with pay, perks, career advancement, and managerial support at the hospital was low. Finally, it was found that there is a strong and inverse link between QWL and intentions to quit. Another study conducted by Mosadeghrad et al. (2011) found that Job stress and QWL are negatively correlated among hospital staff. Finally, job stress was positively correlated with employees' intention to leave and QWL was negatively correlated with Turnover intentions. Applying the proper human resources policies will improve employees' QWL and reduce turnover because job stress strongly correlates with both employee QWL and turnover intention.

Yadav et al. (2020) presented the findings of the research titled "Impact of Quality of Work Life on Turnover Intention of Ground Staff of Airlines in India". The population of this study was Ground staff of airlines operating through Indian Airports. Out of the total of 280 respondents, the surveyed sample included men and women. There were 163 (52.8 percent) Men and 117 (41.8 percent) Women. The research identified key influencers of Quality of Work Life and the moderating effect of different demographic factors on turnover intention; more focused and dedicated interventions can be formulated by Airlines to attract and retain manpower.

Bhatia (2021) conducted research titled "Quality of work life and turnover intentions - a study of the IT Sector". The study has covered only four IT companies and the sample is taken from Delhi NCR Area only. From the study, it is revealed that QWL and its components have a significant and negative relationship with Turnover Intentions. Employees' intention to leave the company will undoubtedly decrease as their opinions of its various QWL elements and overall QWL improve, resulting in longer retention and more commitment. For this study, QWL and its various components are used and recommendations have been given for the organizations on how to improve and enhance QWL.

Els et al.(2021) conducted a study titled " Quality of work life: Effects on turnover intention and organisational commitment amongst selected South African manufacturing organisations" and found that there is a relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention and the results further indicated that organisational commitment partially mediates the relationship between the quality of work life and turnover intention. The study was conducted on 400 employees working in the manufacturing sector in South Africa. The findings provide insight into both the benefits for the organisation and the impact that high levels QWL have on individuals. Another research conducted on Health care employees in Odisha by Nayak and Tanaya (2016) also revealed that organisational commitment partially mediated the relationship between QWL and turnover intention.

In 2014, Surlenty et al. performed research on 121 accounting specialists in auditing and taxation who were employed by four significant Malaysian accounting firms. To look at the relationship between the factors "Quality of Work-Life and Turnover

Intention". Four components were chosen under "Quality of Work Life," including "Supervisory Behaviour, Compensation & Benefits, Job Characteristics, and Work-Life Balance". Turnover Intentions were found to be strongly and negatively correlated with supervisory behavior, compensation & benefits, and job characteristics. Additionally, it was discovered that the QWL's component on work-life balance was the strongest predictor of turnover intentions.

The study titled "Quality of work life of Emirati Women and its Influence on job satisfaction and turnover intention: evidence from the UAE" was conducted by Jabeen et al.(2018) and examined the quality of work life of Emirati women employed in various public sector organizations in the United Arab Emirates and their influence on job satisfaction and turnover intention. Findings revealed that (a) job satisfaction is positively correlated with quality of work life; (b) job satisfaction reduces turnover intention; and (c) quality of work life directly correlates with decreased turnover intention. In addition, QoWL has a direct impact on the turnover intention. Another study conducted by Izzati and Mulyana (2019) on teachers also shows there is a relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention. The relationship between variables is negative, meaning the higher the quality of work life, the lower the turnover intention of the teachers.

A study conducted by Sim and Choi (2017) intends to show the causal connections between affective organizational commitment, turnover intention, and quality of work life (QWL) among South Korean Y-Generation chefs. The findings showed that personal quality and social quality were the two components that made up the quality of work life. Both aspects of QWL had a very positive effect on affective organizational commitment. However, only personal quality had a substantial negative impact on turnover intention when it came to the relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention, while the impact of social quality on turnover intention was insignificant. The affective organizational commitment was found to be a major mediator between the quality of work life and turnover intention, and it also had a negative impact on turnover intention.

Although many studies have examined the concepts of QWL and turnover individually and with many other variables, there is no study that has linked determinants of QWL with turnover intention in the Manufacturing sector studies done in India. Thus, this research strives to fill the void in the existing body of knowledge by assessing the relationship between determinants of quality of work life and its impact on turnover intention among employees in the Manufacturing Sector.

### III. METHODOLOGY

The major objectives of the study were to find the relationship between the overall quality of work life and turnover intention, to understand the impact of determinants of Quality of work life on turnover intention, and to examine if age groups and years of experience have any significant difference on the overall quality of work life among employees in the manufacturing sector. The universe of the study is Heavy manufacturing Sector Employees( especially employees from Earth moving manufacturing and Mining Equipments manufacturing) across Bangalore. A convenience sampling technique was used for the study. Only people who are between the age of 22-40 are taken in the study. Participants should have an experience of a minimum 1 year in the manufacturing sector. White-collar employees in the manufacturing sector are only considered.

Consent was taken from the participants before they started filling the Google form. Confidentiality of the participants was maintained. The participants had their own decision of withdrawing from the study whenever they wanted.

The research variables are:

1. Quality of Work Life
2. Turnover Intention

#### *Tools Used*

1. The Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) scale given by Simon A Easton and Darren L Van Laar is a 23-item- 5 points likert psychometric scale used to gauge the perceived quality of life of employees as measured through six psychosocial sub-factors. The WRQoL scale has been used in many types of organization across the world and has been translated into several languages. The WRQoL scale is used by individuals, organizations and consultants as well as researchers as an aid to assessing and understanding the quality of working life of working people. Overall Cronbach's alpha for all 23 items was found to be an excellent 0.94.

2. Turnover intentions were measured with a six-item Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6) (Bothma & Roodt 2013). The response scale was scored on a five-item Likert scale, varying between poles of intensity with 1 (never) to 5 (always) (Du Plooy & Roodt 2010). A Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of 0.80 has been reported for the TIS-6 (Bothma & Roodt 2013).

#### *Procedure*

A Google form with many sections was made to gather information for the study. The first part of the form included the fundamental information including the objective of the research, confidentiality, informed consent, and the researcher's contact information. Finally, the participant has the choice of accepting or rejecting to participate. The Quality of work-life questionnaire had 23 items and the Turnover intention scale had 6 items.

A span of one month was provided for the data collection. Google forms are circulated in the manufacturing companies of Bangalore. The Google forms were circulated on various social media platforms and the researcher gave the forms in person as well. After data collection, coding and scoring of sample data will be done with the help of MS Excel and later will be exported to IBM SPSS version 20 software for data analysis and interpretation.

### IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1:** The mean and standard deviation of Quality of work life, its determinants, and Turnover Intention respectively

Variable	M	SD
Quality of work life	72.240	12.7646
General Well-being (GWB)	17.909	3.9833
Home-Work Interface (HWI)	8.339	2.4582
Job-Career Satisfaction (JCS)	18.884	4.2626
Control at Work (CAW)	8.950	2.4456
Working Conditions (WCS)	9.818	2.4427
Stress at Work (SAW)	5.331	2.0058
Turnover Intention	18.190	3.3747

The above-given table represents descriptive statistics including mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for each variable along with its determinants. The mean score of quality of work life is 72.240 with a standard deviation of 12.7646. The mean score of determinants of Quality of work life, i.e., General Well-being (GWB) is 17.909, Home-Work Interface (HWI) is 8.339, Job-Career Satisfaction (JCS) is 18.884, Control at Work (CAW) is 8.950, Working Conditions (WCS), Stress at Work (SAW) is 5.331 is 9.818 with a standard deviation of 3.9833, 2.4582, 4.2626, 2.4456, 2.4427 and 2.0058 respectively. The mean score for turnover intention is 18.190 with a standard deviation of 3.3747. These descriptive statistics provide an overview of the distribution of each variable, including the central tendency (mean) and variability (standard deviation). They can be used to compare different variables and assess their relative importance in the context of work life. A normality test (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) was done to check if the data were normally distributed. Based on the test it was revealed that the data was normally distributed.

**Table 2:** Indicates Pearson correlations showing the correlation coefficients for respective variables

Variables	p	r
Quality of work life	.000	-.528**
Turnover Intention		

\*\* Indicates correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), N=121

The Pearson correlation coefficient indicates a significant negative correlation between the quality of work life and turnover intention for the collected data. The correlation coefficient value of -0.528 suggests a moderately strong negative relationship between the two variables, indicating that as the quality of work life improves, the likelihood of employees intending to leave their job decreases. The p-value of .000 indicates that the correlation between the quality of work life and turnover intention is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, providing evidence that this correlation is not due to chance alone. Thus  $H_0$  stating that there is no significant relationship between overall quality of work life and turnover intention among employees in the manufacturing sector is rejected in the study.

Table 3: Multiple Linear regression to measure the impact of determinants of Quality of work life on the Turnover intention

Variable	$\beta$	F	R <sup>2</sup>	t	p
JCS	-.478	35.100	.222	-5.929	.000
JCS WCS	-.359 -.202	20.190	.242	-3.669 -2.065	.000 .041
Excluded Variables CAW				-1.131	.260
HWI				-1.078	.283
GWB				-1.482	.141
SAW				-1.465	.146

1. Dependent Variable: Turnover intention

2. Independent Variable: General Well-being (GWB), Home-Work Interface (HWI), Job-Career Satisfaction (JCS), Control at Work (CAW), Working Conditions (WCS) & Stress at Work (SAW).

The above table shows the results of the regression analysis. The first model has only one predictor, JCS, and it shows the adjusted R-square value of 0.222, which means that 22.2 % of the variation in turnover intention can be explained by JCS with a significance level of 0.000, indicating that JCS is statistically significant in explaining Turnover intention. The standardized coefficient for JCS is -.478, indicating that a one standard deviation increase in JCS is associated with a .478 standard deviation decrease in turnover intention. The t-value for JCS is -5.929, indicating that the coefficient is significant at  $p < .001$ .

The second model has two predictors, JCS and WCS, and the adjusted R-square value increased to 0.242 which means that 24.2% of the variation in Turnover intention can be explained by JCS and WCS. This suggests that adding WCS to the model has increased the amount of variation in the Turnover intention that can be explained by the predictors. The change in R-square between the first and second models is 0.027 with a significance level of 0.041, indicating that the addition of WCS is statistically significant in explaining Turnover intention. The standardized coefficient for JCS is -.359, indicating that a one standard deviation increase in JCS is associated with a .359 standard deviation decrease in turnover intention. The standardized coefficient for WCS is -.202, indicating that a one standard deviation increase in WCS is associated with a .202 standard deviation decrease in turnover intention. The t-values for JCS and WCS are -3.669 and -2.065, respectively, indicating that both coefficients are significant at  $p < .05$ .

The beta coefficients for all predictor variables are negative, suggesting that as the values of the predictor variables decrease, turnover intention increases. However, only the beta coefficients for JCS and WCS are statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), indicating that JCS and WCS are significant predictors of turnover intention in this model. Thus,  $H_{02}$  stating that Overall Quality of Work Life (QWL) has no impact on Turnover Intention is rejected. This also reveals that sub hypothesis  $H_{02a}$  stating General Well-being (GWB) has no impact on Turnover Intention is accepted; sub hypothesis  $H_{02b}$  stating Home-Work Interface (HWI) has no impact on Turnover Intention is accepted; sub hypothesis  $H_{02c}$  stating Job-Career Satisfaction (JCS) has no impact on Turnover Intention is rejected; sub hypothesis stating  $H_{02d}$  Control at Work (CAW) has no impact on Turnover Intention is accepted; sub hypothesis  $H_{02e}$  stating Working Conditions (WCS) has no impact on Turnover Intention is rejected; sub hypothesis  $H_{02f}$  stating Stress at Work (SAW) has no impact on Turnover Intention is accepted.

Table 4: One-way ANOVA to measure the effect of age on the Quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Between Groups</b>	1101.107	4	275.277	1.731	.148
<b>Within Groups</b>	18450.942	116	159.060		
<b>Total</b>	19552.050	120			

The ANOVA table above shows the results of an analysis investigating the relationship between age and quality of work life. The



dependent variable is quality of work life, and age is the independent variable with 5 levels (groups). The results show that the total sum of squares is 19552.050, with 120 degrees of freedom (df). The sum of squares between groups is 1101.107, with 4 degrees of freedom, and the sum of squares within groups is 18450.942, with 116 degrees of freedom. The mean square for between groups is 275.277, and the mean square within groups is 159.060. The F-value for the between-groups source is 1.731, with a corresponding p-value of .148. This suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different age groups, as the p-value is greater than the conventional alpha level of .05. In summary, the ANOVA analysis suggests that age does not have a statistically significant effect on quality of work life. Thus, the  $H_{03}$  stating there is no significant difference in the quality of work life based on age is accepted in the study.

Table 5: One-way ANOVA to measure the effect of years of experience on the Quality of work life

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Between Groups</b>	1239.42	2	619.713	3.993	.021
<b>Within Groups</b>	18312.624	118	155.192		
<b>Total</b>	19552.050	120			

The ANOVA table above shows the results of an analysis examining the relationship between experience and quality of work life. The dependent variable is quality of work life, and experience is the independent variable with 3 levels (groups). The results show that the total sum of squares is 19552.050, with 120 degrees of freedom (df). The sum of squares between groups is 1239.425, with 2 degrees of freedom, and the sum of squares within groups is 18312.624, with 118 degrees of freedom. The mean square for between groups is 619.713, and the mean square within groups is 155.192. The F-value for the between-groups source is 3.993, with a corresponding p-value of .021. This suggests that there is a statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different experience groups, as the p-value is less than the conventional alpha level of .05. Thus, the  $H_{04}$  states there is no significant difference in the quality of work life based on years of experience is rejected in the study. Additionally the study also found that employees with 1-4 years of experience possess a good quality of work life.

## CONCLUSION

The findings showed that there is a significant relationship between the overall quality of work life and turnover intention, certain determinants of Quality of work life have impact on turnover intention, there no statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different age groups and there is a statistically significant difference in quality of work life between the different experience group.

## IMPLICATIONS

The above findings have important implications for organizations seeking to reduce turnover and improve quality of work life among their employees. The negative relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention highlights the importance of creating a work environment that promotes employee satisfaction, engagement, and well-being. This can be achieved through initiatives such as flexible work arrangements, opportunities for professional development, and a supportive and inclusive workplace culture.

The finding that overall quality of work life has an impact on turnover intention suggests that organizations should focus on improving multiple aspects of the work environment, rather than addressing individual factors in isolation. This may involve conducting employee surveys to identify areas for improvement and implementing targeted interventions to address employee concerns.

The lack of significant difference in quality of work life based on different age groups suggests that interventions to improve quality of work life should be designed to meet the needs and preferences of all employees, regardless of age. However, the significant difference in quality of work life based on years of experience highlights the importance of providing opportunities for career development and advancement to long-term employees, who may have different needs and expectations compared to newer employees.

In the manufacturing sector, organizations can apply these findings by implementing initiatives such as job rotation programs, skills training and development, and opportunities for employee participation in decision-making. This can help to create a work environment that promotes employee engagement and reduces turnover, while also improving productivity and overall organizational performance.

## LIMITATIONS

The study only focuses on employees working in the manufacturing sector in Bangalore between the ages of 22-41. As such, the findings cannot be generalized to other sectors or age groups. The study may have a small sample size which limits the generalizability of the findings. The study relies on self-reported data, which may be subject to bias and may not accurately reflect the actual quality of work life or turnover intention. Participants may be influenced by social desirability bias, leading to inflated or

deflated responses. The results and inference may not be applicable to other industries since the responses were gathered from the heavy machinery and automotive manufacturing sectors. The data was collected for a stipulated time duration due to time and resource constraints and thus the findings may vary for different time frames.

### SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As mentioned in the introduction, only a few studies have been conducted in the manufacturing sector with quality of work life and turnover intention as variables. Thus, more studies can be conducted to gain a deeper understanding of how, to what extent and which determinants of quality of work life affect turnover intentions with a larger sample. The current study only looked at age and years of experience as demographic factors that may influence quality of work life. However, there may be other factors, such as gender, education, or marital status, that could also play a role. Further research could explore these factors and their relationships with quality of work life and turnover intention. Researchers can conduct a longitudinal study to examine how quality of work life and turnover intention change over time. This would help to provide insights into the long-term effects of quality of work life on employees and organization.

### REFERENCES:

1. Almalki, M. J., FitzGerald, G., & Clark, M. (2012). The relationship between quality of work life and turnover intention of primary health care nurses in Saudi Arabia. *BMC Health Services Research*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-12-314>
2. Chan, K. W., & Wyatt, T. A. (2007). Quality of Work Life: A Study of Employees in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13(4), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602380701250681>
3. Els, V., Brouwers, M., & Lodewyk, R. B. (2021). Quality of work life: Effects on turnover intention and organisational commitment amongst selected South African manufacturing organisations. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v19i0.1407>
4. Gayathiri, R., & Ramakrishnan, L. (2013). Quality of work life: Linkage with job satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(1), 1–8.
5. Hashempour, R., Hosseinpour Ghahremanlou, H., Etemadi, S., & Poursadeghiyan, M. (2018). The Relationship Between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment of Iranian Emergency Nurses. *Health in Emergencies & Disasters Quarterly*, 49–54. <https://doi.org/10.32598/hdq.4.1.49>
6. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley
7. Izzati, U. A., & Mulyana, O. P. (2019). The Relationship Between Quality of Teacher Work Life and Turnover Intention. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Education Innovation (ICEI 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icei-19.2019.82>
8. Jabeen, F., Friesen, H. L., & Ghoudi, K. (2018). Quality of work life of Emirati women and its influence on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(2), 352–370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-01-2017-0016>
9. Joo, B.-K. (Brian), & Mclean, G. N. (2006). Best Employer Studies: A Conceptual Model from a Literature Review and a Case Study. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(2), 228–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484306287515>
10. Kalliath, T., & Kalliath, P. (2013). Work–life balance: The case of Indian professionals. *Journal of Human Values*, 19(2), 117–130. doi: 10.1177/0971685813477415
11. Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P., & Carayon, P. (2008). Quality of working life and turnover intention in information technology work. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, 18(4), 409–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hfm.20099>
12. Lambert, E. G., Lynne Hogan, N., & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal*, 38(2), 233–250. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0362-3319\(01\)00110-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0362-3319(01)00110-0)
13. Mosadeghrad, A. M., Ferlie, E., & Rosenberg, D. (2011). A study of the relationship between job stress, quality of working life and turnover intention among hospital employees. *Health Services Management Research*, 24(4), 170–181. <https://doi.org/10.1258/hsmr.2011.011009>
14. Mosadeghrad, A. M. (2013). Quality of working life: An antecedent to employee turnover intention. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 1(1), 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2013.07>
15. Nurlaelawati, E., & Suwanto, D. (2020). The impact of organizational resources and teamwork on job performance in manufacturing companies. *Journal of Talent Development and Excellence*, 12(2s), 2302–2311. doi: 10.18517/jtde.v12i2s.1146
16. Shodhganga@INFLIBNET: Quality of work life and turnover intentions a study of it sector. (n.d.). Shodhganga : a reservoir of Indian theses @ INFLIBNET. <https://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/40>
17. Sim, S., & Choi, H. (2017). A Research about Quality of Work-Life, Affective Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention of Y Generational Chef. *Culinary Science & Hospitality Research*, 23(2), pp.169–180. doi:10.20878/cshr.2017.23.2.017017017.
18. Surienty, L., Ramayah, T., Lo, M.-C., & Tarmizi, A. N. (2013). Quality of Work Life and Turnover Intention: A Partial Least Square (PLS) Approach. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(1), 405–420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0486-5>
19. Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 9(1), 1–10.
20. Walton, R. (1980). Quality of work life activities: A research agenda. *Professional Psychology*, 11(3), 484–493. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.11.3.484>
21. Yadav., V. (2020). Impact of quality of work life QWL on turnover intention of ground staff of airlines in India. Shodhganga. <https://hdl.handle.net/10603/401245>