

Tijana Savic Tot¹
Marija Runic Ristic
Vilmos Tot

Article info:

Received 01.01.2021.

Accepted 11.09.2021.

UDC – 005.96

DOI – 10.24874/IJQR16.02-02



EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION AS AN ELEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

Abstract: *In this paper, the authors aimed to examine the relationship between the process of employee job satisfaction and the quality of work life. The main hypothesis, which is confirmed in the paper, is that there is a statistically significant correlation between the elements of job satisfaction and the quality of work life. Based on the suggested hypothesis, the main objective of the paper was to identify the concerns within the job satisfaction processes in the organizations where the research was conducted. The research involved 127 respondents who are employed at all three management levels in the organization (top management, middle management and the first-line management) in 86 business entities in the Rasina District. For the purpose of implementing this research, a questionnaire was used and its results were subsequently processed by using several statistical methods. The results of the research indicate, among other things, the concerns in the job satisfaction process, which are the basis for measuring and improving the quality of work life.*

Keywords: *Quality of work life; Employee satisfaction; Human resource management; Rasina district*

1. Introduction

The quality of work life is a field that for many years has been a subject matter of the study of sociology, work psychology and organizational behavior, but primarily of the human resource management (Pandala & Suryanarayana, 2010). As there has been an interest in human labor since ancient times, the evolution of the construct of the quality of work life coincides with the evolution of the scientific field of human resource management that has been developing in the broader context of social, industrial and economic development and which emerged in response to the key changes that the industrialization created in the society and work (Noe et al., 2020). In the process of evolution of the human resource management

there are two developmental stages that can be distinguished: personnel management which is characterized by the development of certain activities related to employees, and human resource management which is characterized by the development and formalization of processes related to employee management in organizations (Abdel – Qader & Al – Mahayreh, 2015). Personnel management emerged under the influence of the industrial revolution and its role was of administrative and advisory nature with the primary objective of reducing labor costs and increasing productivity (Ahammad, 2017). Defining of the work hours, compulsory health care, improving safety at work and providing employee training were the first activities of the personnel function (Ivancevich, 2007).

¹ Corresponding author: Tijana Savić Tot
Email: tijanastot@gmail.com

Further development of the activity of the personnel function was most influenced by the emergence of scientific management, behavioral theories in management, strengthening the role of trade unions, the emergence of labor legislation and industrial psychology (Torrington et al., 2020) From a historical point of view, and relative to the changes in the environment, the focus and importance of certain activities of personnel management has shifted, as well as the employers' understanding of the importance of these activities Looking after health insurance, employee file management, work logs and sick leaves, as well as job design, testing and training and union negotiations and workforce planning (Torrington et al., 2020) personnel function, had an exclusively administrative role in the organization. Although the term itself was first defined in the late 1960s at which point it referred exclusively to the identification of factors for improving working conditions in order to improve workers' productivity (Martel & Dupuis, 2006), it was only years later and due to the development of behavioral theories in management (Noe et al., 2020) and by revealing the connection between the employees' attitudes and behavior at work and the productivity of the organization, that the concept of the quality of work life started to play a significant role in the field of human resource management.

The change in the values of employees that occurred during the 1980s required the adapting of the activities of personnel management in organizations to a new generation of employees whose attitudes on authority and work changed. Higher levels of education, growing importance of the service sector, restructuring in organizations primarily by reducing middle management, increased women's employment participation, slower market growth, more intense international competition and new legislation initiated a shift in focus from reducing labor costs to viewing employees as resources and led to a qualitatively new phase in the development of the discipline - the

development of the human resource management approach. Personnel management changed its name to human resource management and assumed a consultancy role with the aim of developing processes and practices to guide the individual skills, abilities and interests of employees towards achieving organizational goals and strategies. (Ivancevich, 2007). In this period, many authors were primarily concerned with developing and formalization of the human resource management processes (job analysis, human resource planning, human resource recruitment, selection, onboarding and orientation, human resource development, performance appraisals and rewards, labor relations, etc..) in organizations (Hollenbeck et al., 2015; Torrington, 2014) as well as examining the impact of these processes on organizational performance (Nankervis et al., 2011). The development of human resource management processes and activities, as well as the research of their impact on the organization productivity initiated and influenced the growing importance of the concept of the employee quality of work life as a tool and program that harmonizes the interests of employees and organizations, by reviewing the degree of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the quality of work life as basic indicators for improving the process in the organization. (Pandala & Suryanarayana, 2010). The concept of the quality of work life, as an integral part of human resource management, at that time, was characterized by the development of appropriate models, dimension and techniques in the form of programs, strategies and instruments to determine and improve the quality of work life of employees. (Koonmee et al., 2010).

Over the recent years, human resource management, as an area of the organization science that deals with the study of all aspects of employment, due to its impact on organizational performance (Torrington et al., 2020), has become focused on creating models, tools and methods for gaining a competitive advantage in the market (Tayson,

2015; Ahamad, 2017). An increasing number of studies (Noe, et al., 2020) shows a direct link between human resource management activities in organizations and competitive advantage (Albrecht et al., 2015) In order to be able to create a new or improve the existing process of human resource management in organizations that is in the function of gaining the competitive advantage, it is necessary to examine the employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with all job aspects in order to define its shortcomings (Aseidu, 2015; Vorina et al., 2017). Both theorists and practitioners regard as the main issue the fact there is no universal model of human resource management nor a universal program for improving the quality of work life (Mahapatra, 2011). The model of human resource management affects the program of quality of work life of employees, i.e. the quality of work life of employees indicates the quality of the process of human resource management (Mahapatra, 2011). Since the quality of work life is being observed and studied as a special program within the process of human resource management, and considering that job satisfaction as its basic element is particularly significant (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). The main objective of management in organizations is to create programs which will contribute to the improving of the dimensions of the quality. Majority of research on the quality of employee work life was focused on single countries (Bernhard & O'Driscoll, 2011), and it was found that the reward system had the greatest impact on job satisfaction or on comparative analyses for the purpose of determining similarities and differences (Westorer & Taylor, 2010), through which it was found that the significance of the factors mostly depends on the culture of the country. Having in mind the above, the authors in this paper intended to examine specific factors of employee job satisfaction as an element of the human resource management process and to identify the shortcomings which are related to the quality of work life. Also, the authors wanted to examine whether there are

differences among organizations in regards to the activity they perform, in terms of legal form, size as well as differences in terms of gender, level of education, level of management and length of service.

The chapters that follow elaborately describe the human resource management process with particular emphasis on job satisfaction and its role in determining and improving the quality of work life. The quality of work life is a field that for many years has been a subject matter of the study of sociology, work psychology and organizational behavior, but primarily of the human resource management (Pandala & Suryanarayana, 2010). As there has been an interest in human labor since ancient times, the evolution of the construct of the quality of work life coincides with the evolution of the scientific field of human resource management that has been developing in the broader context of social, industrial and economic development and which emerged in response to the key changes that the industrialization created in the society and work (Noe et al., 2020). In the process of evolution of the human resource management there are two developmental stages that can be distinguished: personnel management which is characterized by the development of certain activities related to employees, and human resource management which is characterized by the development and formalization of processes related to employee management in organizations (Abdel – Qader & Al-Mahayreh, 2015). Personnel management emerged under the influence of the industrial revolution and its role was of administrative and advisory nature with the primary objective of reducing labor costs and increasing productivity (Ahammad, 2017). Defining of the work hours, compulsory health care, improving safety at work and providing employee training were the first activities of the personnel function (Ivancevich, 2007). Further development of the activity of the personnel function was most influenced by the emergence of scientific management, behavioral theories in management

strengthening the role of trade unions, the emergence of labor legislation and industrial psychology (Torrington, et al., 2020). From a historical point of view, and relative to the changes in the environment, the focus and importance of certain activities of personnel management has shifted, as well as the employers' understanding of the importance of these activities. Looking after health insurance, employee file management, work logs and sick leaves, as well as job design, testing and training and union negotiations and workforce planning (Torrington et al., 2020) personnel function, had an exclusively administrative role in the organization. Although the term itself was first defined in the late 1960s at which point it referred exclusively to the identification of factors for improving working conditions in order to improve workers' productivity (Martel & Dupuis, 2006), it was only years later and due to the development of behavioral theories in management (Noe et al., 2020) and by revealing the connection between the employees' attitudes and behavior at work and the productivity of the organization, that the concept of the quality of work life started to play a significant role in the field of human resource management.

The change in the values of employees that occurred during the 1980s required the adapting of the activities of personnel management in organizations to a new generation of employees whose attitudes on authority and work changed. Higher levels of education, growing importance of the service sector, restructuring in organizations primarily by reducing middle management, increased women's employment participation, slower market growth, more intense international competition and new legislation initiated a shift in focus from reducing labor costs to viewing employees as resources and led to a qualitatively new phase in the development of the discipline - the development of the human resource management approach. Personnel management changed its name to human resource management and assumed a

consultancy role with the aim of developing processes and practices to guide the individual skills, abilities and interests of employees towards achieving organizational goals and strategies. (Ivancevich, 2007). In this period, many authors were primarily concerned with developing and formalization of the human resource management processes (job analysis, human resource planning, human resource recruitment, selection, onboarding and orientation, human resource development, performance appraisals and rewards, labor relations, etc.) in organizations (Hollenbeck et al., 2015; Torrington, 2014) as well as examining the impact of these processes on organizational performance (Nankervis et al., 2011). The development of human resource management processes and activities, as well as the research of their impact on the organization productivity initiated and influenced the growing importance of the concept of the employee quality of work life as a tool and program that harmonizes the interests of employees and organizations, by reviewing the degree of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the quality of work life as basic indicators for improving the process in the organization. (Pandala & Suryanarayana, 2010). The concept of the quality of work life, as an integral part of human resource management, at that time, was characterized by the development of appropriate models, dimension and techniques in the form of programs, strategies and instruments to determine and improve the quality of work life of employees. (Koonmee et al., 2010).

Over the recent years, human resource management, as an area of the organization science that deals with the study of all aspects of employment (Torrington, 2014), due to its impact on organizational performance (Torrington et al., 2020), has become focused on creating models, tools and methods for gaining a competitive advantage in the market (Tayson, 2015; Ahamad, 2017). An increasing number of studies (Noe et al., 2020) shows a direct link between human resource management activities in

organizations and competitive advantage (Albrecht et al., 2015) In order to be able to create a new or improve the existing process of human resource management in organizations that is in the function of gaining the competitive advantage, it is necessary to examine the employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction with all job aspects in order to define its shortcomings (Aseidu, 2015; Vorina et al., 2017). Both theorists and practitioners regard as the main issue the fact there is no universal model of human resource management nor a universal program for improving the quality of work life (Mahapatra, 2011). The model of human resource management affects the program of quality of work life of employees, i.e. the quality of work life of employees indicates the quality of the process of human resource management (Mahapatra, 2011). Since the quality of work life is being observed and studied as a special program within the process of human resource management, and considering that job satisfaction as its basic element is particularly significant (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). The main objective of management in organizations is to create programs which will contribute to the improving of the dimensions of the quality. Majority of research on the quality of employee work life was focused on single countries (Bernhard & O'Driscoll, 2011), and it was found that the reward system had the greatest impact on job satisfaction or on comparative analyses for the purpose of determining similarities and differences (Westorer & Taylor, 2010), through which it was found that the significance of the factors mostly depends on the culture of the country. Having in mind the above, the authors in this paper intended to examine specific factors of employee job satisfaction as an element of the human resource management process and to identify the shortcomings which are related to the quality of work life. Also, the authors wanted to examine whether there are differences among organizations in regards to the activity they perform, in terms of legal form, size as well as differences in terms of

gender, level of education, level of management and length of service.

The chapters that follow elaborately describe the human resource management process with particular emphasis on job satisfaction and its role in determining and improving the quality of work life.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Defining the concept and process of human resource management

Human resource management is an area of the organization science that deals with the study of all aspects of employment by implementing various activities aimed at aligning the interests of employees with the organization's goals (Torrington, 2014). Numerous authors define the field of human resource management in different ways (Tayson, 2015; Torrington et al., 2020;) but the essence of all definitions is that human resource management is a new concept of managing employee relations and the way to manage their work and development, that has evolved over time in response to the changes in economy (the concept of market economy), organization (new organizational forms, globalization etc.) and management (changes in the structure, content and methods of work).

The first step in building an effective system of human resource management in organizations, with the purpose of increasing the level of performance and gaining a competitive advantage of organizations involves the formalization of processes and activities related to employee management (Tayson, 2015).

According to the group of authors Noe, et al., (2020) the process of human resource management can be managed through the following elements:

1. Job analysis,
2. Human resource planning,
3. Recruitment of human resources,
4. Selection of human resources,

5. Human resource development,
6. Human resource training ,
7. Human resource reward policy,
8. Employee performance evaluation,
9. Labor relations.

The very process of human resource management in the organization implies certain elements or sub-processes which in turn imply various activities (Torrington, 2020). The selection of appropriate sub-processes and related activities depends on a large number of factors, primarily internal, which include: the role of activities related to the sub-system of human resource management in the organization, organization and status of human resource management, number and structure of engaged human resource experts, level of development of other sub-systems in the organization, human resource strategy goals, corporate goals, principles and policies of human resources, activity of the organization, its size, impact of the environment on the process of human resource management, attitudes of the management and governing bodies towards human resource activities, management expertise and its attitude to change, the content of the concept of organizational development, etc. In other words, the process of human resource management is different in each organization, its structure (by which we mean sub-processes and activities) depends on the previously mentioned factors that we use as a guideline in defining and adapting the process itself.

Since the main role of human resource management is to develop processes and related activities in order to harmonize them with the strategy of the organization, the majority of time has been devoted to the research of their impact on the performance of the organization. Therefore, the author West, with associates (1997), in the period of five years, examined the types and impact of management activities on the performance of the company, in the course of which he came to the conclusion that changes in profits are due to the application of different methods of

selection, employee onboarding, training, reward and job design, rather than strategic position, investment in technology or quality. Watson Wyatt, the creator of the Human Capital Index, in 1999. in a study conducted in 400 organizations in the US and Canada identified 30 key activities in human resource management that are associated with a 30% increase in the market value of the organization. Eleven years later, the same research resulted in the identification of 43. activities which W. Wyatt categorized into the 5. dimensions, given the fact that the impact is in increasing the company's market value (rewarding performance, collegial and flexible workplace, recruiting, communicating, training, career management). Ten years later, a similar research was conducted in 16. European countries, which identified 19. basic activities that are associated with a 26% increase in the market value of the company. Also, differences between European and American companies in human resource management were identified, which initiated further research in the direction of comparative analyses between countries in which it was determined that differences are primarily due to different cultures, norms, values, attitudes, characteristics of the workforce.

A research conducted in USA (Gerhart, 2005) confirmed the link between employee productivity and/or organizational performance with the activities within the scope of recruitment and selection sub-process, employee education, performance assessments, compensation and benefits and activities that support innovation. The research has also shown that organizations that implement these sub-processes accomplish better results than organizations that do not have formalized sub-processes within the same industry (Bartel, 2004)

Based on all of the above, it is unquestionable that all defined processes within human resource management in organizations affect the performance of the organization to a greater or lesser extent. Satisfaction or

dissatisfaction of employees with these processes in the organization has a direct impact on the achievement of organizational goals and performance (Eliyana et al., 2019). That is, the higher the employee satisfaction with defined processes and their implementation, the greater the impact on increasing the performance and profit of the organization and vice versa, the lower the employee satisfaction with defined processes and their implementation, the lower the performance and profit.

2.2 Defining the concept of job satisfaction

According to the author Bloisi, W. (2003) job satisfaction refers to the attitude and level of satisfaction in all aspects of work. Similarly, according to the group of authors job satisfaction is an individual's attitude based on his subjective assessment and feelings towards the level of satisfaction with job-related factors which means that individuals will evaluate their jobs against all of those factors that are important to them (Sempane, et al., 2002).

According to the author Tayson, (2015) job satisfaction is primarily influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors, the quality of supervision/control of work, social factors and the degree to which individuals succeed or fail in their work. Authors Purcell, et al., (2003) in their research of job satisfaction factors pointed out carrier opportunities, job influence, teamwork and job challenge as factors of significant influence.

Job satisfaction according to the author Mullins (2007) is influenced by a number of factors, as follows:

- Individual factors – personality, education, abilities,
- Social factors – relationships with co-workers, group norms,
- Cultural factors – underlying attitudes, beliefs and values,
- Organizational factors– structure, policy, nature of work, leadership,

- Environmental factors – economic, social, governmental influences

Each of the above factors can affect the individuals and their level of job satisfaction, i.e. the individual may be satisfied with one and dissatisfied with another factor. In order to determine which aspects of the job an individual is satisfied or dissatisfied with, structured questionnaires, interviews, a combination of questionnaires and interviews and a focus group are used.

The research of job satisfaction involved a large and complex survey of a large number of employees across the United States (Grubic Nestic, 2005). According to the structured sample, 15,000 employees of all levels of management structures were surveyed, out of which 91% were employed full-time, with an average age of about 33, and both sexes were proportionally represented. According to the results of the research, six factors have been identified that have a decisive influence on job satisfaction, as follows:

- Opportunities provided by the job,
- Stress,
- Leadership,
- Work standard
- Honest and fair relations and
- Use of adequate authority

By analyzing all the above listed factors of job satisfaction that have been developed so far, we can conclude that they are connected to all human resource management processes and thus they represent the basis for determining their quality in the organization with the aim of adapting and improving them to increase organizational performance and thus achieve market competitiveness (Anvar & Abdullah, 2021; Stahl et al., 2020).

2.3 Defining the term and concept of quality of work life

Since, today, people spend a significant part of their lives at work, the quality of that time is an indispensable factor that affects the overall quality of the life of individuals. The

concept that deals with the study and improvement of the quality of life of employees in organizations is called the quality of work life. Although the concept of the quality of life has been researched in great detail (Radosevic et al., 2018), the concept of the quality of work life still remains relatively undefined (Martel & Dupuis, 2006) and displays certain disagreements among different authors in regards to its elements, factors and measures. There are numerous definitions of the quality of work life, which in fact represent the views of various authors on the concept itself, but also show the development of the importance of certain factors over time. According to Harrison, (2000): "The quality of work life refers to the degree to which work in an organization contributes to material and psychological well-being of its employees." The author Sirgy, (2001) defines the quality of work life as a process of joint decision-making, mutual cooperation and building respect between management and employees. According to Sahni, (2019) the quality of work life refers to the degree to which employees in a particular organization are able to meet important personal needs through experience in the organization. Similarly, author Sirgy, (2001) define the quality of work life as the perception of employees about satisfaction or dissatisfaction with organizational factors and the environment. According to the American Society of Training and Development, the quality of work life is a process of work in an organization which enables its employees at all hierarchical levels to actively and effectively participate in shaping the organization's environment, work methods and organizational outcomes. It is a value-based process that aims to increase the performance of the organization and improve the performance of employees.

An overview of the definitions of various authors shows that the quality of work life is viewed as a philosophy (Nadler & Lawer, 1983), as a concept (Sirgy, 2001) and as a process (American Society of Training and Development). Common factors in all

definitions, which have stood out over time, are divided into three groups and relate to individual factors, job-related factors and organizational factors (Walton, 2005). In regards to the defined factors the most meaningful definition of the quality of work life was offered by Singhapakdi et al. (2015) who pointed out that the quality of work life referred to the level of satisfaction, motivation, involvement, experiences and talents of employees in the work process. In this way, the author equated the importance of meeting the organization needs with meeting the needs of employees for improvement of the job and working conditions. As already mentioned, numerous research that have been conducted in the field of human resource management confirmed that people play a crucial role in gaining a competitive advantage. Therefore, models, processes, methods, tools and techniques for managing of this highly significant resource have been developed within the field for years. The main goal of the field itself is to align the interests and the needs of the employees with organization for the purpose of gaining a competitive advantage. As the goal of the concept of quality of work life has completely coincided with the goal of the field of human resources management over the years, it has become and developed as an integral strategy or program that aims to determine satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the job and organization.

There are numerous models of the quality of work life concept. In defining the model of the quality of work life concept, the authors Hackman and Oldham, (1980) focused their attention to the importance of employee's psychological growth needs in the work process. These needs were related to the variety of the employee's skills, defining jobs and tasks, autonomy and feedback in the work process. Their model pointed out the importance of meeting these needs in order to increase the quality of work life. On the other hand, Taylor, (1911) took a more pragmatic approach in defining the basic elements of the quality of work life by emphasizing the

importance of wages, working hours, working conditions, and the nature of the job itself that an individual performs. He also suggested additional aspects that can affect the quality of work life such as individual power, employee participation in the decision-making, fairness and equity, social support, use of present skills and abilities of the employees, a meaningful future at work, social relevance of the organization's products, employees' self-development, effect on extra work activities, etc. The importance of his study of the quality of work life is reflected in the knowledge that the concept of the quality of work life depends on the organization and structure of employees and thus we cannot develop a universal model but attention must be focused on adapting of the elements of the concept of the quality of work life to a certain organization. While some authors in the research of the concept focused on various factors related to the workplace, others emphasized the importance of personality factors, psychological factors of well-being and broader concepts of life satisfaction. Defining the factors that undoubtedly affect the quality of work life has been the main focus of researchers for many years.

One of the most influential authors of the quality of work life concept Walton (1975) defined eight key factors which influence on the quality of life of individuals:

1. Adequate and Fair Compensation: There are different opinions about adequate compensation. The committee on Fair Wages defined fair wage as "the wage which is above the minimum wage, but below the living wage."
2. Safe and Healthy Working Conditions: Most of the organizations provide safe and healthy working conditions due to humanitarian requirements and/or legal requirements. In fact, these conditions are a matter of enlightened self interest.
3. Opportunity to Use and Develop Human Capacities: Contrary to the traditional assumptions, Quality of Work Life is improved... "to the extent that the worker can exercise more control over his or her work, and the degree to which the job embraces an entire meaningful task" ... but not a part of it. Further, Quality of Work Life provides for opportunities like autonomy in work and participation in planning in order to use human capabilities.
4. Opportunity for Career Growth: Opportunities for promotions are limited in case of all categories of employees either due to educational barriers or due to limited openings at the higher level. Quality of Work Life provides future opportunity for continued growth and security by expanding one's capabilities, knowledge and qualifications.
5. Social Integration in the Work Force: Social integration in the work force can be established by creating freedom from prejudice, supporting primary work groups, a sense of community and inter-personnel openness, egalitarianism and upward mobility.
6. Constitutionalism in the Work Organization: Quality of Work Life provides constitutional protection to the employees only to the level of desirability as it hampers workers. It happens because the management's action is challenged in every action and bureaucratic procedures need to be followed at that level. Constitutional protection is provided to employees on such matters as privacy, free speech, equity and due process.
7. Work and Quality of Life: Quality of Work Life provides for the balanced relationship among work, non-work and family aspects of life. In other words family life and social life should not be strained by working hours

including overtime work, work during inconvenient hours, business travel, transfers, vacations etc.

8. **Social Relevance of Work:** Quality of Work Life is concerned about the establishment of social relevance to work in a socially beneficial manner. The workers' self-esteem would be high if his work is useful to the society and the vice versa is also true. Moreover, they emphasized the influence of job content on the quality of work life.

The authors Mirvis and Lawler, (1984) listed safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities, and opportunities for advancement of employees as basic elements of the quality of work life. Unlike their predecessors, Baba and Jamal (1991) defined typical indicators of the quality of work life, which include job satisfaction, job involvement, work role ambiguity, work role conflict, work role overload, job stress, organizational commitment, and turn-over intentions. Nevertheless, a comprehensive model was proposed by Sirgy (2001) and associates who considered meeting the needs related to work, work environment, behavior of superiors, satisfaction with the availability of employee support programs and organizational commitment as key elements of the quality of work life. The authors defined the quality of work life as the level of satisfaction of employees' needs with the use and availability of resources, processes and activities in organizations and the outcomes that are generated as a result of employee participation in decision making. By the proposed model, the authors initiated the observation of the concept of the quality of work life of employees as satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees with the mentioned dimensions of the work process. The instruments for measuring the quality of work life were created in relation to the models, factors and criteria that have developed over the years within the concept itself. One of the better-known instruments is

The Work-Related Quality of Life scale which uses six key factors to explain differences in the quality of work lives of individuals. The factors that this instrument addresses are job and career satisfaction, working conditions, general well-being, work-life balance, stress at work and control at work mechanisms. The assessment of these factors in organizations provides insight into the concerns and is used as a basis for achieving higher quality of work life of employees (Bagtasos, 2011) That is, by determining and measuring the quality of work life of employees in the organization, managers can define the advantages and disadvantages of the human resources management process with the aim of improving them. By reviewing the above listed models, factors and criteria, it can be concluded that the concept of the quality of work life is directly related to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees with the processes and activities of human resource management in organizations.

3. Research

As shown in the theoretical part of the paper, employee job satisfaction is a basic dimension of the quality of work life. The subject matter of the empirical part of the paper is focused on examining the relationship between job satisfaction as an element of human resource management and the quality of work life. So, based on that, the basic hypothesis of the paper was formulated, which is:

HO: There is a statistically significant correlation between the elements of job satisfaction and the quality of work life.

Based on the suggested hypothesis, the main goal of the paper was to determine the concerns of the job satisfaction process in the organizations where the research is conducted.

The research instrument is a questionnaire designed for a larger-scope, research (Tot Savic, T., doctoral dissertation, 2016) in

which batteries of questions related to the activities of the human resources management process were created, including the batteries of questions that examine employee job satisfaction. Independent variables within the questionnaire were categorized into two groups:

- Those related to the characteristics of the organization (activity and legal form of the organization, the number of employees in the organization) and
- Those related to the characteristics of the respondents (gender and age of the respondents, level of education, level of management at which the respondents are employed, years of service).

The standardized short form of Minnesota Satisfaction questionnaire was used to define the dependent variables which referred to the key elements of employee satisfaction in the organizations in which the research was conducted, as follows:

- Pay satisfaction,
- Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement,
- Satisfaction with the level of competence of the superior manager,
- Satisfaction with the personal example of the superior in performing the job,
- Satisfaction with the possibilities of salary increase,
- Satisfaction with the reward system,
- Satisfaction with the scope of work,
- Satisfaction with interpersonal relationships and
- Impact of interpersonal relationships on the performance of work.

The research involved 127 respondents employed at all three management levels in the organization (top management, middle management and the first level of management) in 86 business entities of Rasina District. The sampling technique that we used is cluster sampling.

The sample size is small since the research has been conducted in only Rasina region in Serbia which consists of 6 municipalities and approximately 14 organizations were analysed in one municipality. The selection of organizations was made on the basis of business performance and geographical affiliation to the Rasina District in which the research was conducted. The structure of the sample in relation to the characteristics of the organization in which the respondents are employed is defined by the activity (table no.1) and legal form of the organization (table no.2), number of employees (table no.3) and existence of human resources department (table no.4) and is shown in the following tables.

Table 1. Sample structure in relation to the activities of the organization

The activities of the organization	The number of respondents	%
Production	58	46.03%
Service	68	53.97%
Total	126	100%

Table 2. Sample structure in relation to the legal form of the organization

The legal form of the organization	The number of respondents	%
Public	49	38.6%
Private	78	61.4%
Total	127	100%

In order to provide a better insight into the structures of organizations according to the number of employees, we divided them into the following four groups: up to 10 employees, from 10 to 50 employees, from 50 to 250 employees and over 250 employees.

The structure of the sample in relation to the characteristics of the respondents is defined by gender (table no. 5), level of education (table no.7), years of service (table no. 8) , age structure (table no. 6), and, level of management they perform (table no. 9).

Table 3. Sample structure in relation to the number of employees in the organization

The number of employees in the organization	The number of respondents	%
Up to 10 employees	9	7.1%
From 10 to 50 employees	61	48.4%
From 50. to 250. Employees	22	17.5%
Over 250 employees	34	27%
Total	126	100%

Table 4. Sample structure in relation to the existence of a human resource department in the organization

Human resource department	The number of respondents	%
Exist	58	45.7%
Doesn't exist	66	52%
I don't know	3	2.4%
Total	127	100%

Table 5. Sample structure in relation to the gender of the respondents

The gender of the respondents	The number of respondents	%
Male	78	64.5%
Female	43	35.5%
Total	121	100%

Table 6. Sample structure in relation to the age of the respondents

The age of the respondents	The number of respondents	%
From 25 to 30. Years	5	3.9%
From 30 to 35 years	5	3.9%
From 35 to 40 years	13	10.2%
From 40 to 45 years	27	21.3%
From 45 to 50 years	24	18.9%
From 50 to 55 years	23	18.1%
Over 55 years	30	23.6%
Total	127	100%

Table 7. Sample structure in relation to the level of education of the respondents

The level of education	The number of respondents	%
High School	12	9.8%
Higher School	22	17.9%
Undergraduate studies	83	67.5%
Graduate studies	6	4.9%
Total	123	100%

In the research sample, as expected, there were no managers with lower than secondary education.

Table 8. Sample structure in relation to the years of service of the respondents

The years of service	The number of respondents	%
Up to 5 years	18	14.4%
From 6 to 10 years	34	27.2%
From 11 to 20 years	43	34.4%
From 21 to 30 years	18	14.4%
Over 31 years	12	9.6%
Total	125	100%

As expected, managers with a length of service of 21 and 30 years are the most represented in the top management of organizations.

Table 9. Sample structure in relation to the level of management of the respondents

The level of management	The number of respondents	%
Top management	53	42.1%
The middle level managers (functional managers)	42	33.3%
The first level managers (supervisors)	31	24.6%
Total	126	100%

The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale in which respondents, by circling one of the offered alternatives, state the degree of agreement or disagreement with the content of the question. Also, there are closed-ended questions in which the respondents were able

to complete one or more offered answers or, alternatively, to write down the answer that was not provided by the questionnaire.

The Alpha coefficient was applied for the reliability of the Questionnaire. Considering that the reliability range of the Alpha coefficient ranges from 0 to 1, based on the obtained result, we can conclude that the reliability of the Questionnaire is high.

In the implementation of the research, the following statistical methods were applied:

- a) The Mann-Whitney test – the Mann-Whitney U test is equivalent to the parametric t-test, because it compares two groups of data, via a median.
- b) The Spearman's rank-order correlation – the Spearman's correlation coefficient (product of rank-order correlation) is used to measure the relationship between variables in cases where it is not possible to apply Pearson's correlation coefficient. It is based on measuring the consistency of association between variables, and the form of association (e.g. the linear form which is a prerequisite for using the Pearson coefficient) is not important.
- c) The Pearson's chi-squared test - The most common non-parametric estimate used is the χ^2 test. χ^2 distribution is used in scientific research in order to determine whether

a distribution of the obtained measurement results significantly deviates from another distribution or coincides.

4. Results of research and discussion

The analysis of the representation of the activities of the job satisfaction -process in relation to the characteristics of the organization - activity, legal form, number of employees in the organization and the number of employees in the human resource department generated the following results:

- a) **In regards to the activities of the organization**, the Mann-Whitney test, presented in the table no. 10., and table no. 11., found that the respondents employed in service organizations rated the following activities with a higher score and degree of agreement than the respondents employed in production:
 - You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better (U = 1586.500, z = -2.327, p <0.05)
 - You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job (U = 1366.000, z = -2.978, p <0.01)

Table 10. Testing the differences between the respondents employed in production and service organizations in relation to the represented activities of the process of employee job satisfaction using the Mann-Whitney test

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	P
You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job	1366.000	-2.978	.003**
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	1586.500	-2.327	.020*
Grouping Variable: the activities of the organization			
*The significant at the level lower than 0.05			
** The significant at the level lower than 0.01			

Table 11. Average range for production and service organizations on variables for which a significant difference was observed in the represented activities of the employee satisfaction process

	The activities of the organization	N	Average range	Sum range
	You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job	Production	58	53.05
Service		67	71.61	4798.00
Total		125		
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	Production	58	56.85	3297.50
	Service	69	70.01	4830.50
	Total	127		

Within the job satisfaction process as an element of quality of work life in relation to the activity of the organization in service organizations, statistically significant differences showed that employees in service organizations would have higher job performance if interpersonal relations were better and that their work was made more complicated due to excessive paperwork. Poor interpersonal relationships negatively affect all aspects of business operations especially in service organizations. Too much paperwork in service organizations primarily affects the flexibility and speed of providing service to customers. The possibility of creating databases and computerization of business operations greatly facilitates the handling of administrative tasks, which is necessary in the business operations of an organization. Although, over the years, the research has not identified differences between production and service organizations in regards to the impact of job satisfaction on the quality of work life of employees (Rudez & Mihalic, 2007), the importance and influence of certain factors varies (Sattar et al., 2018), which was confirmed by this research also. Factors that affect job satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and thus the quality of work life, that are present in service organizations are different from job satisfaction factors in production organizations (Sattar et al., 2018). Namely, sources of employee dissatisfaction can be numerous, and the basic task of the human

resource department is to determine what the sources of dissatisfaction are and define ways to overcome them.

- b) **In relation to the legal form of the organization**, the Mann-Whitney test presented in table no 12., and table no. 13., established that the respondents employed in public organizations rated the following activities with a higher score and degree of agreement than the respondents employed in private organizations:
- You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job (U = 1345.000, z = -2.590, p <0.01)
 - You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better (U = 1570.000, z = -1.956, p <0.05)

While the respondents in private organizations rated the following activities with a higher score and degree of agreement:

- You think that your superior shows by personal example how to work (U = 1488.000, z = -1.999, p <0.05)
- You are satisfied with the reward system (U = 1431.000, z = -2.458, p <0.05)
- You are satisfied with the relationship between employees in the organization (U = 1526.000, z = -2.005, p <0.05)

Table 12. Testing the differences between respondents employed in public and private organizations in the representation of activities in the process of employee job satisfaction using the Mann-Whitney test

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	P
You think that your superior shows by personal example how to work	1488.000	-1.999	.046*
You are satisfied with the reward system	1431.000	-2.458	.014*
You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job	1345.500	-2.590	.010**
You are satisfied with the interpersonal relationships in the organization	1526.000	-2.005	.045*
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	1570.500	-1.956	.050*
Grouping Variable: legal form of organization			

Table 13. Average range for public and private organizations on variables for which a significant difference was observed in the representation of activities in the process of employee job satisfaction

	The legal form of the organization	N	Average range	Sum range
You think that your superior shows by personal example how to work	Public	47	55.66	2616.00
	Private	78	67.42	5259.00
	Total	125		
You are satisfied with the reward system	Public	49	54.20	2656.00
	Private	78	70.15	5472.00
	Total	127		
You think that excessive paperwork complicates your job	Public	47	73.37	3448.50
	Private	78	56.75	4426.50
	Total	125		
You are satisfied with the interpersonal relationships in the organization	Public	49	56.14	2751.00
	Private	78	68.94	5377.00
	Total	127		
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	Public	49	70.95	3476.50
	Private	78	59.63	4651.50
	Total	127		
You are satisfied with your job	Public	49	64.17	3144.50
	Private	78	63.89	4983.50
	Total	127		

The results of the job satisfaction research as a dimension of the quality of work life showed that there is a difference between public and private organizations. Namely, in the public organizations, the factors of dissatisfaction that stood out refer to too much paperwork and poor interpersonal relationships, which can be explained by a greater degree of bureaucratization and focus on form and not on the essence.

In private organizations, the personal example of superiors in performing work,

adequate reward system and satisfaction with interpersonal relationships stood out as significant factors of job satisfaction, which can be explained by greater market orientation as well as greater business insecurity.

The results of the research confirmed the results of previous studies (Singh & Rapheileng, 2014; Ashan, 2017) which defined the differences in the factors contributing to job satisfaction between private and public organizations. Namely, in

private organizations, job security, relationship with superiors and recognition for work stood out as the most influential factors (Singh & Rapheileng, 2014; Ashan, 2017), while in state organizations job satisfaction is most influenced by the promotion system and work environment. (Singh & Rapheileng, 2014; Ashan, 2017)

c) **In relation to the number of employees in the organization**, Spearman's rank correlation presented in table no. 14., determined that the respondents in organizations with a higher number of employees less agreed and rated the following activities lower:

- You feel that you are adequately paid for the job you do ($\rho_s = -.274^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)
- You are satisfied with career advancement opportunities ($\rho_s = -.237^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)
- You are satisfied with the possibilities of salary increase ($\rho_s = -.293^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)
- You are satisfied with the reward system ($\rho_s = -.336^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)
- Extensive paperwork complicates your job ($\rho_s = -.200^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)
- You are satisfied with the relationship between employees in the organization ($\rho_s = -.257^{**}$, $p < 0.01$)

Table 14. The relationship between the activities of the employee job satisfaction process with the number of employees in the organization

	The number of employees in the organization	
You feel that you are adequately paid for the job you do	ρ_s	-.274**
	P	0.002
	N	124
You are satisfied with career advancement opportunities	ρ_s	-.237**
	P	0.008
	N	124
You think that your superior is competent to perform the job	ρ_s	-0.035
	P	0.702
	N	124
You are satisfied with the possibilities of salary increase	ρ_s	-.293**
	P	0.001
	N	124
You are satisfied with the reward system	ρ_s	-.336**
	P	0
	N	126
Extensive paperwork complicates your job	ρ_s	-.200*
	P	0.026
	N	124

Table 14. The relationship between the activities of the employee job satisfaction process with the number of employees in the organization (continued)

		The number of employees in the organization
You are satisfied with the relationship between employees in the organization	ρ_s	-.257**
	P	0.004
	N	126
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	ρ_s	0.016
	P	0.859
	N	126
	P	0.605
	N	126
* The significant at the level lower than 0,05		
** The significant at the level lower than 0,01		

Differences in job satisfaction between organizations of different sizes were confirmed by previous research (Cummins & Worley, 2015) which found that employee satisfaction in small and medium-size organizations is mostly influenced by salary, interpersonal relationships and promotion system, as well as the level of system development (Dharmanegara et al., 2016), while in larger organizations, satisfaction is mostly influenced by a clear reward system.

The results of the job satisfaction research as a dimension of the quality of work life in Rasina discrit showed that in organizations with a larger number of employees there is dissatisfaction which indicates inadequately defined processes of rewarding and advancement as well as dissatisfaction with salary, interpersonal relations and unnecessary administration.

The analysis of the representation of job satisfaction sub-processes as an element of quality of work life in relation to the characteristics of respondents - gender,

level of education, years of service, age structure, and level of management they perform:

- **In regards to the gender of the respondents,** the Mann-Whitney test presented in table no. 15., and table no. 16., determined that the female respondents rated the following activity with a higher score and degree of agreement than the male respondents:
 - You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better ($U = 1322.00, z = -2.225, p < 0.05$)

The influence of gender differences on job satisfaction was confirmed by some research (Andrade, et al., 2019) while some research shows that significant differences do not exist (Suki & Suki, 2011). Differences in job satisfaction in relation to the gender of the respondents largely depend on the factors of the environment, culture and economy of the country (Kristensen & Johansson, 2008).

Table 15. Testing gender differences between respondents in regards to the representation of activities in the process of employee job satisfaction using the Mann-Whitney test

	Mann-Whitney U	Z	P
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	1322.000	-2.225	.026*

Table 16. Average ranks for the gender of respondents on variables for which a significant difference was observed in the representation of activities in the process of employee job satisfaction

	Gender	N	Average range	Suma range
You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better	Male	78	56.45	4403.00
	Female	43	69.26	2978.00
	Total	121		

b) In regards to the age of the respondents, no significant differences were found by Spearman's rank correlation

c) In regards to the level of education of the respondents, Spearman's rank correlation did not reveal significant differences. The relation between the level of education and job satisfaction was not confirmed by previous research (AlAhmadi, 2009). It should be noted that employees with higher education have a greater impact on organizational performance and and that the satisfaction of employees of all educational levels and structures is equally important for the quality of work life (AlAhmadi, 2009)

d) In regards to years of service, Spearman's rank correlation determined that respondents with higher years of service rated the following activities with a lower score and degree of agreement:

- You think that your superior is competent to perform the job ($\rho_s = -.192^*$, $p < 0.05$)
- You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better ($\rho_s = -.196^*$, $p < 0.05$)

The influence of the number of years of service on employee satisfaction and quality of work was confirmed by previous research (Kavanaugh et al., 2006) Differences in the satisfaction of employees with higher number of years of service, with experience based on what that they see and give themselves the right to analyze the competence of superiors on the one hand, while on the other hand they see the negative aspects of poor interpersonal relationships.

e) In regards to the level of management to which they belong to, Spearman's rank correlation determined that the respondents at a higher level of management rated the following activities with a lower grade and degree of agreement:

- You are satisfied with the possibilities of salary increase ($\rho_s = -.189^*$, $p < 0.05$)
- You are satisfied with the reward system ($\rho_s = -.202^*$, $p < 0.05$)

while they rated the following activities with a higher score and degree of agreement:

- You think that your job performance would be higher if interpersonal relationships were better ($\rho_s = .180^*$, $p < 0.05$).

The relation between the level of management to which employees belong and the level of job satisfaction was confirmed by numerous studies (Vorina, et al., 2017). The higher the level of management to which employees belong, the greater the job satisfaction that influences the increase in the quality of work life of employees. According to the results of the research, dissatisfaction of respondents at higher levels of management may be due to limited opportunities for advancement or reward system that exists in organizations, i.e. they believe that they are insufficiently rewarded for their work and do not see room for their own development. A part of the responsibility for the results of work they also see in poor interpersonal relationships, although they are the most responsible for the creation of these relationships.

Based on the suggested and confirmed hypothesis: **“There is a statistically significant correlation between the elements of job satisfaction and the quality of work life**, it can be seen that the respondents recognized the following activities:

- Satisfaction with adequate compensation,
- Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement,
- Satisfaction with the competence of the superior,
- Satisfaction with the possibilities of salary increase,
- Satisfaction with the reward system,
- Satisfaction with the relations between employees in the organization,
- Satisfaction with the work they do,
- Satisfaction with performing work based on personal example of a superior,
- Possibility of increased job performance if interpersonal relationships were better

Satisfaction or dissatisfaction with these factors is a direct consequence of the activity of the human resource department and its status in the organizations under study. Considering that in 52% of organizations there is no human resource department, it can be assumed that the activities related to job satisfaction directly depend on the manager and that they are not formalized. A human resource department in an organization is a basic prerequisite for the development and formalization of activities and processes for employee management, which leads us to the conclusion that in the organizations under study there is still no developed awareness of its importance. These results completely coincide with the results of the CRANET survey (2016) which found that in most organizations in the Republic of Serbia there is no department for human resources, and even when there is one, that its role is still in the first phase of development, i.e. personnel and focused on administrative and advisory work without special influence on the business of the organization (Slavic &

Berber, 2016). Strengthening the awareness of employers and management of organizations about the importance, significance and role of the function of human resource management itself in organizations is the first step towards defining and creating adequate processes and activities for employee management. Creating a program of the quality of work life in relation to satisfaction/dissatisfaction with defined activities is directly related to defining adequate human resource management processes.

5. Concluding remarks

The quality of work life of employees in organizations, as explained in the theoretical part of the paper, is an integral part of the strategy of the human resource management process, which is primarily related to the process of job satisfaction (Johnsrud, 2002). Job satisfaction implies the degree of employee satisfaction with the job itself, reward systems, promotion, career development, salary and benefits, working conditions, environment, etc. (Stahl et al., 2020). As there is no universal model of human resource management that can be implemented in organizations, the concept of the quality of work life is adapted to each organization individually in relation to many factors that affect the organization and individuals: environment, industry in which they operate, internal factors, strategies, phases of the life cycle, characteristics of the available workforce, etc (Lee, et al., 2007).

The analysis of the results of the job satisfaction research as an element of the quality of work life showed that there are statistically significant differences in relation to the activity of the organization, form of organization, number of employees and the level of management.

The defined specifics completely coincide with the results of previous research (Vorina et al., 2017; Kavanaugh et al., 2006;

AlAhmadi, 2009; Andrade et al., 2019; Kristensen & Johansson, 2008; Cummings & Worley, 2015; Ashan, 2017; Sattar et al., 2018), which speaks in favor of the fact that there is no universal model of human resource management and thus of universal factors of quality of work life (Torrington, 2020; Alzalabani, 2017; Nair & Subash, 2019). As a part of the research conducted in Rasina district, job satisfaction factors were determined and defined as an element of the quality of work life, according to which an adequate strategy should be defined within the human resource management process. The contribution of the realized research is reflected in the possibility of applying the results, primarily for the purpose of improving the activities of the human resource management process with the aim of increasing employee job satisfaction and thus for creating and improving programs to

increase the quality of work life. Also, these results can serve as a basis for further research in defining similarities and differences in organizations of different activities, industries, sizes, etc. Limitations of the research are related to the sample of research which was focused on the respondents from three management levels in organizations and it would be interesting to compare the results with the attitudes of other employees in order to define similarities and differences, if there are any, among the job satisfaction factors and thus in terms of the quality of work life. Also, the instrument of the research, a short form of Minnesota Satisfaction questionnaire which was applied in the research, involved examining selected job satisfaction factors and for the purpose of future research, all factors should be examined in order to identify those that have the greatest impact on employees.

References:

- Abdel-Qader, M. A., & Al-Mahayreh, M. (2015). The impact of human resources management on the learning and growth of employees in the Jordanian insurance companies. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(7), 291-302.
- Ahammad, T. (2017). Personnel Management to Human Resource Management. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*, 13(9), 412-420. doi: 10.17265/1548-6583/2017.09.004
- Ashan, M. K. (2017). A comparison of job satisfaction of private and public banks employees. *Journal of Studies in Management and Planning*, 3(6), 76-92.
- Al-Ahmadi, H. (2009). Factors affecting performance of hospital nurses in Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Healthcare Quality Assessment*, 22(1), 40-54.
- Albrecht, S. L., Bakker, A. B., Gruman, J. A., & Macey, W. H. (2015). Employee Engagement, *Human Resource Management Practices and Competitive Advantage: An Integrated Approach*. *J. Organ. Eff. People Perform.*, 2(1), 7-35.
- Alzalabani, A. H. (2017). A study on perception of quality of work life and job satisfaction: evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 7(2), 1-9.
- Andrade, M. S., Westover, J. H., & Peterson, J., (2019). Job Satisfaction and Gender. *Journal of Business Diversity*, 9(3), 22-40.
- Anvar, G., & Abdullah, N. N. (2021). The Impact of Human Resource Management Practice on Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 4(1).
- Aseidu, E. (2015). Supportive Organizational Culture and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Critical Source of Competitive Advantage. A Case Study in a Selected Banking Company in Oxford City-UK. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 2.

- Baba, V. V., & Jamal, M. (1991). Routinization of Job Context and Job Content as Related to Employees' Quality of Working Life: A Study of Psychiatric Nurses. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 379-386.
- Bagtasos R. M. (2011). Quality Of Work Life: A review of literature. *Business and Economics Review*, 1-8.
- Bartel, A. P. (2004). Human resource management and organizational performance: Evidence from retail banking. *ILR Review*, 57(2), 181-203.
- Bloisi, W. (2003). *Management and organizational behavior*. Mc Graw-Hill companies
- Cranet <https://businessapps.cranfield.ac.uk/cranet/> (accessed Feb 20, 2021).
- Cummings, T.G., & Worley, C.G. (2015). *Organizational Development and Change 10th ed.*, Cengage Learning.
- Dharmanegara, I., Sitiari, N.W., & Wirayudha, N. (2016). Job Competency and Work Environment: the effect on Job Satisfaction and Job Performance among SMEs Worker. *Journal of Business Management*, 18(1), 19-26.
- Eliyana, A., Ma'arif, S., & Muzakki (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment effect in transformational leadership towards employee performance. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 25(3), 144-150.
- Gerhart, B. (2005). Human resources and business performance: Findings, unanswered questions, and an alternative approach. *Management Review*, 174-185.
- Grubic – Nestic, L. (2005). *Razvoj ljudskih resursa*. Novi Sad: AB print
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign, Redesignes*. M.A. Addison-Wesley
- Harrison, G. (2000). The measurement of quality of work life in SA companies. *People Dynamics*, 18, 23-25.
- Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., Noe, R. A., & Wright, P. M. (2015). *Loose-Leaf for Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Ivancevich, J. M. (2007). *Human Resource Management*. McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Johnsrud, L. K. (2002). Measuring the Quality of Faculty and Administrative Worklife: Implications for College and University Campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 379-395.
- Kavanaugh, J., Duffy, A., & Lilly, J. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction and demographic variables for healthcare professionals. *Management Research News*, 29(6).
- Koonmee, K., Singhapakdi, A., Virakul, B., & Lee, D-J. (2010). Ethics institutionalization, quality of work life, and employee job-related outcomes: A survey of human resource managers in Thailand. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(1), 20-26.
- Kristensen, N., & Johansson, E. (2008). New Evidence on cross country differences in job satisfaction using anchoring vignettes. *Labour Economics*, 15(1), 96-117.
- Mahapatra, U. C. (2011). Human resource management and Quality of Work Life. *Social Science International, New Delhi*, 27(2), 327-338.
- Martel, J. P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of Work Life-Theoretical and Methodological Problems and Presentation of a new model and Measuring Instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77, 333-368.
- Mullins, J. L. (2007). *Management and organizational behavior* (70th Ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

- Nadler, D. A., & Lawler, E. E. (1983). Quality of work life: Perceptions and direction. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11(3), 20-30.
- Nair, P. R., & Subash, T. (2019). Quality of work life and job satisfaction: A comparative study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(2), 15-21.
- Nankervis, A., Compton, R., Baird, M., & Coffee, J., (2011). *Human Resource Management: Strategy and Practice 7th ed.* Cengage Learning.
- Noe, R., Hollenbeck, J., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. (2020). *Human Resource Management 12th ed.* McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pandala, S. R., Suryanarayana, N. V. S. (2010). *Industrial safety and quality of work life.* Retrieved from <http://www.article.base.com/envt-articles/industrial-safety-andQWL-3108813.html>
- Purcell, J., Kinne, N., & Hutchinson, S., (2003). *Understanding the people and performance link: unlocking the black box.* London: CIPD.
- Radosevic, T., Bulatovic, G., & Bulatovic, LJ. (2018). Quality of life shown in correlations between significant socio-personal values of students and employees and their attitudes towards change. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 12(3), 723-740.
- Rudez, H. N., & Mihalic, T. (2007). *Intellectual capital in the hotel industry: a case study from Slovenia.* *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(1), 188-199.
- Sahni, J. (2019). *Role of Quality of Work Life in Determining Employee Engagement and Organizational Commitment in Telecom Industry.* *International Journal for Quality Research*, 13(2).
- Sattar, S., Laila, K., Zakir, M., & Khan, H. (2018). Relation of Job Related Factors with Different Dimensions of Quality of Work Life. *World J. Public Heal.*, 3, 16-22.
- Sempane, M., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G., (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23-30.
- Singhapakdi, A., Sirgy M., Lee, D. J., Senasu, K. Yu., & G. B. (2015). Gender Disparity in Job Satisfaction of Western versus Asian managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1257-1266.
- 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*, 55(3), 241-302.
- Slavic, A. B., & Berber, N. (2016). The evolution of hrm practice in serbia: the analysis based on two successive cranet researches. In *An Enterprise Odyssey. International Conference Proceedings*; University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics and Business, 281.
- Stahl, G. K., Brewster, C. J., Collings, D. G., & Hajro, A. (2020). Enhancing the role of human resource management in corporate sustainability and social responsibility: A multistakeholder, multidimensional approach to HRM. *Human Resource Management Review*, 30(3).
- Suki, M. N., & Suki, M. N. (2011). Job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: The Effect of Gender. *International Journal of Psychology Research*, 6(5), 1-15.
- Torrington, D. (2014). *Human Resource Management*, 9th edition. Trans-Atlantic Publications: Harlow.
- Torrington, D., Hall, L., Taylor, S., & Atkinson, C., (2020). *Human Resource Management, 11th Edition.* Pearson: Harlow, England, New York.

- Tot Savic, T. (2016). *Razvoj modela Strategijskog menadzmenta ljudskih resursa u funkciji sticanja konkurentske prednosti* (Doctoral thesis. Novi Sad: Faculty of Technical Sciences).
- Tyson, S. (2015). *Essentials of Human Resource Management*, 6th edition. Routledge: New York.
- Vorina, A., Simonič, M., & Vlasova, M. (2017). An Analysis of Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement. *Economics Themes*, 55(2), 243-262.
- Walton, R. E. (1975). Criteria for Quality of Working Life, in Davis, L., Cherns, A. (eds). *The Quality of Working Life*. New York: Free Press, 91-110.
- Walton, R. E. (2005). *Quality of Work Life (QWL) Measurement*. Retrieved from: <http://www.Syn.Com/QWL.htm>
- Westover, H. J., & Taylor, J. (2010). International differences in job satisfaction: The effects of public service motivation, rewards and work relations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
- West, M. A., Patterson, M. G., Lawthom, R., & Nickell, S. (1997). *Impact of People Management Practices on Business Performance*. Intitute of Personnel and Development, London.
- Wyatt, W. (2001). *Human Capital Index*.

Tijana Savic Tot

Faculty of Management,
Sremski Karlovci, 21205,
University Union Nikola Tesla,
Beograd, Serbia
tijanastot@gmail.com
ORCID 0000-0001-5597-8004

Marija Runic Ristic

College of Business
Administration, American
University in the Emirates,
Dubai, UAE
marija.ristic@aue.ae
ORCID 0000-0002-5711-7010

Vilmos Tot

Faculty of Business
Economics, University
Educons, 21208 Sremska
Kamenica, Serbia
tot.vilmos@gmail.com
ORCID 0000-0001-6286-7839
