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ABSTRACT

The study examined the organizational culture, perceived organizational politics and quality of work life in selected public sector organizations in Ghana. It further examined the effect of perceived organizational support on the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. One hundred and thirty-one (131) respondents were conveniently sampled from two public sector organizations in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. Using a quantitative design, all selected participants completed questionnaires on Organizational Culture, Perceived Organizational Politics, Perceived Organizational Support and Quality of Work Life. The Simple Linear Regression, Standard Regression and Hierarchical Multiple Regression were conducted on the data. The results indicated that, organizational culture and perceived organizational politics significantly predicted quality of work life. The result further indicated that, Perceived organizational support did not moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work-life. Based on the research findings, theoretical and practical implications are discussed as well as limitations and suggestions for future research also highlighted.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of study

Every employee aspires to have a good quality of work life. Similarly, organizations that value their employees strategize to better the quality of work life of workers so as to have improvement in productivity. These objectives can be influenced by organizational politics or culture which can either be supportive or inhibiting. Employees are one of the most valuable assets of any organization. They independently and collectively contribute to the realization of the organization’s objectives (Armstrong, 2005). Employees therefore constitute the hinges on which the survival of the organization hangs. Thus, to a very large extent, their actions and inactions determine the success or the shortfall of the organization. Just as with life we all strive to attain Quality of Life (QoL), so it is with work. Workers try so much to attain Quality of Work Life (QWL) because it is a very important aspect of employees working life and life in general. Thus employees do not want to work just because of the monetary aspect of the work but want more than that. They want the work environment to be able to cater for the human factor and the technology factor and not neglecting the human factor totally while focusing mainly on the technology aspect. They want an environment where there is interpersonal relation and the employee’s views are important. In so doing, the perception of the quality of working life of employee becomes high (Anbarasan & Mehta, 2009).

Although psychological aspects of work eventually results in superior job performances, and contributes immensely to the development of self motivation and the wellbeing of the employees, they were hardly ever deemed essential (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, because psychological aspects of work have an effect on the wellbeing and
performance of employees, quality of work life which is also a psychological aspect of work is the focus of this study.

According to Sirgy, Joseph, David, Efraty, Phillip and Lee (2001) Quality of work life (QWL) is employee’s satisfaction with a variety of needs in the form of resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace.

Quality of work life has been a controversial issue among scholars, but industrial and organizational psychologists and management scholars agree in general that the construct entails the well-being of employees (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Research on Quality of Work Life (QWL) started in the early 1970s (Saklani, 2004) and studies on it are necessary to help organizations identify gaps that could improve employee’s QWL since high QWL could attract and retain employees (Sandrick, 2003). Quality of work life is an expression that covers a lot of workplace activities, because it refers to all the things an employer does that adds positively to the lives of employees. Those things are some combination of benefits that are seen and not seen, real and perceived that make somewhere good place to work and another a bad place to work. Quality of work life is of the view that to be a good employer or institution, one must recognize that employees have lives before and after work (Chan & Wyatt, 2007).

The significance of human factor decreased due to the shift from human labour to mechanization after the social and economic changes started in the late 18th century (Turnage, 1990). The antecedents of the mechanization were problems like boredom, job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, lack of commitment and so on. However, most management theorists still emphasized production and how to make use of the skills of employees to their advantage rather than the wellbeing of the worker. It was for these reasons Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in 1946 researched on problems workers were facing in the
industrial world and they came up with a study approach called socio-technical system in which they paid attention to job design to satisfy human needs and QWL of worker sufficiently in an organization.

There are lots of definitions of QWL because of the diverse views of QWL. Nevertheless, most researchers and experts in this area agree that QWL should be viewed as a holistic well-being of the employee by the organization rather than just focusing on the work-related aspects (Sirgy et al., 2001).

Even though QWL deals with the well-being of employees in totality (Sinha, 2012; Sirgy et al., 2001; Wan & Chan, 2012), it is crucial for organizations to understand that an employee needs to be satisfied with each of the different facets of his/her job to experience a good QWL. A high quality of work life is essential for organizations to continue to attract and retain employees (Havlovic, 1999). This is because a high quality of work life will ensure employees psychological, physical and social wellbeing which will in return affect their actions towards the organization. It has been noted that QWL is a comprehensive evaluation made by the employee, based on the various experiences and outcomes of his/her work life, on the professional and personal fronts (Daud, 2010; Ramya & Kannan, 2013; Tabassum, RAhMAN & Jahan, 2011). Despite this, most organizations pay more attention to just some aspects of work life such as the satisfaction of the physical needs of the employee, and very little attention given to QWL in totality. However, the enhancement of the psychological and social aspects of the job are the ones that enhance employee performance, satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors the most (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 2011), and these are especially important for an institution to thrive in this turbulent work environment.
Sirgy et al. (2001) identified six need dimensions of QWL and these are health and safety needs (relating to aspects of employee health and safety both at work and away from work), economic and family needs (relating to income, job security and needs of the employee’s family), social needs (which concern the employee’s relationship with colleagues and also his/her personal time needs), esteem needs (which relate to how much the employee is valued and credited for his/her efforts both within and outside his/her company), actualization needs (which concern realization of the employee’s potential as a professional within the organization), aesthetic needs (that is how much the employee is able to use his/her creativity within and outside of his/her job). These dimensions should be given equal attention if quality of work life is to be achieved.

According to Sirgy et al. (2001) quality of work life has not seen any significant improvement even in developed countries even though they have grown increasingly affluent in material wealth. Rather, workers have experienced greater work overload, more significant stress, greater control, less autonomy and less job security than ever before.

Considering the importance of employees’ quality of work life in organizations’ productivity, identification of the components of quality of work life is one of the main necessities to increase productivity in the organizations. Human resources managers and behavior sciences authorities consider the attention and right perception of quality of work life as a tool for improvement the management performance.

Quality of work life has also been viewed in a variety of ways including set of organizational interventions and type of work life of employees. As such quality of work life has been defined as the policies, procedures and environment that are put in place to promote and maintain employee satisfaction with the intention of improving working conditions and effectiveness for employers (Srivastava, 2007). Quality of work life also
entails how work systems are designed to enhance the quality of working life of workers, thereby improving commitment to organizational goals and also motivating them to strive to achieve organizational goals (Renduff & Mick, 2009). More specifically, QWL may function in terms of employees’ perceptions of their physical and psychological wellbeing at work. The design of work systems that enhances the better working life of workers falls under the organizational culture of the organization. Therefore, for workers to arrive at high quality of work life the culture of the organization must be taken into consideration.

Organizational culture is a set of shared assumptions that guide what happens in organizations by defining appropriate behavior for various situations. It is also the pattern of such collective behaviors and assumptions that are taught to new organizational members as a way of perceiving and, even, thinking and feeling (Schein, 2010).

From the Competing Values Framework (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983) four organizational culture types emerged: Clan culture, innovative culture, bureaucratic culture and competitive culture.

**Clan Culture**

A clan culture is a type of culture that focuses on an open and friendly work place where people value each other and have the best of each other; it is like an extended family. Employees see and consider their leaders to be mentors and not a rigid autocratic leader. The sense of group loyalty and sense of tradition are strong; where people stay together through thick and thin and stand for each other all times. There is also an emphasis on the long-term benefits of human resources development rather than the short term and importance is given to group cohesion. Here, people are valued. Teamwork, employee involvement and consensus are the pillars of clan culture.
Innovative Culture

It is a work culture that allows people to be dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative. Employees and leaders allow innovation and risk-taking. Because innovation is important to them, they are committed to experimentation and thinking differently. They strive always to be a step ahead of others. The long-term emphasis is on growth and acquiring new resources. To them success means gaining unique and new products or services. Individual initiative and freedom are also encouraged.

Bureaucratic Culture

It is a highly structured and formalized work culture. Rules and procedures govern the behavior of both workers and leader. Leaders strive to be good coordinators and organizers who try to organize their workers in order to be efficient. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is most critical to them. There are laid down procedures and formal policies that hold the group together. Consistency, high performance, and efficient operations are their long-term goals. Success means delivery always on the job and at a low cost.

Competitive Culture

It is an organization that is results-driven and focused on completion of job. Competition is valued therefore people are competitive and goal-oriented. Leaders on the other side are demanding, hard-driving, and productive. The emphasis on winning unifies the organization. The reputation and success of the organization are common goals for the management and workers. Their long-term focus is on competitive action and achievement of measurable goals and targets. Under a competitive culture, success means having greater market share and penetrating new grounds.
The culture of people determines how they live and do things and so is the culture of people in an organization. The culture of an organization will determine the importance they will place on the quality of working life of their employees.

During the process of organizational formation, an organizational culture is created which reflects the organization values and beliefs. Subsequently, the culture of the organization continues to shape the behavior of the employees and approach to things done in the organization. Thus, organizational culture affects the way people and groups interact with each other, with clients, and with stakeholders (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). In addition, organizational culture may affect how much employees identify with an organization. Organizational culture can be a factor in the survival or failure of an organization. Organizational culture is reflected in the way people perform tasks, set objectives, and administer the necessary resources to achieve objectives. Culture affects the way individuals make decisions, feel, and act in response to the opportunities and threats affecting the organization (Mosandeghrad & Rosenberg, 2011).

Organizational culture therefore needs to be given the needed attention in order to attain the desired quality of working life of employees.

Organizational culture has been found by many researchers to have psychological or mental health toll on employees. Organizational culture which is the way things are done in an organization has a link with organizational politics. Therefore an organization that values the quality of work life of its employees must manage and minimize perceived organizational politics.

One other variable that is vital when discussing quality of work life is organizational politics. Organizational politics is omnipresent and cannot be avoided in the life of an organization. This is because wherever humans are involved and there is a common target
of achievement, everyone strives to achieve which creates some form of pressure or what is called politics. Politics surfaces and significantly influences people’s perception, behavior, as well as their actions at work because everyone wants to attain the ultimate (Gandz & Murray, 1980).

Though there is no doubt that there is politics within the organization, what leads to these political acts and behavior and their consequences on both the organization and the employee remain untapped (Zhou & Ferris, 1995). When politics is generally mentioned, what comes to mind is people struggling for power and resources and the same comes to mind when perceived organizational politics is mentioned; where people in the organizations are using any means and all means possible to gain power and resources (Vigoda, 2011). Organizations are made up of many departments, people with different academic background and status which make them open to conflicts and competitions. Therefore, there will be conflicting desires and interests of different individuals, teams, divisions and departments and thus making politics in organizations an unavoidable reality (Newstrom, 2007). Organizational politics can be viewed from two perspectives; positively and negatively. Every entity has rules, regulations, policy, management, governing body and structures put in place to ensure the efficient and effective running of the place. These systems are called politics; when these systems work as they should it will impact the employees and the organization positively. However, aside these systems, people in the organization will like to do things their own way and will manipulate the system to favor them; this is when politics begins to have negative effect on the employees and the organization.

Perceived organizational politics is seen as actions and behaviors that employees engage not for the benefit of all and the organization but for their own gains not taking into account how those actions could affect others (Kacmar & Baron, 1999). Policies that favor
only some employees and not everybody, people tearing others down in an attempt to climb up and deliberate distortion of information requested by others for purposes of personal gain are some of such political actions people involve in.

According to Ferris and King (1991) perceived organizational politics is the way employees see their organization based on their actions, behaviors and policies. Whether they are fair and just and have the interest of all and not just to favor a few. They are also the individual view of the employee and not a collective view. Therefore the perception of one person may be different from the perception of another.

Employees’ perception of politics has been the focus of the few studies on organizational politics. However there are other aspects of organizational politics that are not fully explored. For example, there are employees that will not engage actively in political behaviors but will support others to do so. If these aspects are also looked at, it would create a broader view on organizational politics and how to handle it effectively. Actual political behavior is different from perception of politics; but actual politics is related to perceived politics in the sense that when people engage in real political activities, it will make others to perceive politics.

Perception of self-serving behaviors rather than the reality has been the focus of most organizational politics researchers because it is not easy for one to point at behaviors or actions of others as political; one can only assume it but cannot be sure it is. Ferris, Adams, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter and Ammeter (2002) stated that, the actions and behaviors of people in a political work environment are mostly due to what they perceive and not what they are sure of. Hence, uncertainty characterizes a highly politicized work place with everyone not sure of what is right or wrong, what can be rewarded or punished and not even sure that their sacrifices will attract some level of recognition. Ferris et al.
submitted that in a politicized work environment, there are some employees who will engage in the politic behavior. There are others who will also not engage in it but whatever decision they make go a long way to affect them positively or negatively. So in a politicized workplace, there are people who will stay and take advantage of the situation to push through their own interest (Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley & Harvey, 2007). However, there are other employees who will not take part in any political action or exhibit any political behavior but will choose to remain in the organization and give their best. To these employees, the negative effects of perceived organizational politics will be a source of stress to them and they may have to adapt strategies to cope well with this stressor. The stressor may also end up increasing their physical and psychological stress (Vigoda, 2002; Vigoda-Gadot & Kapun, 2005). There are other employees who will also choose to stay in a politicized work environment but will not engage themselves in any political behavior, however their negative attitude toward work may be detrimental to the organization (Ferris et al., 2002; Hochwarter, Perrewe, & Ferris, 2003; Shenge, 2007; Valle & Perrewe, 2000).

It is therefore not surprising that, perceived organizational politics have constantly been linked with negative outcomes on both the employee and the organization (Byrne, 2005; Ferris et al., 2002; Harris & Kacmar, 2005; Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999; Rosen, Levy, & Hall, 2006; Vigoda, 2000, 2002). Thus, it is important that the relationship between perceptions of politics and quality of work life is tested to further understand the effects of perceived organizational politics.

Perceived organizational support is one important variable that may alleviate the negative effects of perceived organizational politics on quality of work life (Jain, Giga & Cooper, 2013). Perceived organizational support (POS) is defined as the extent to which employees perceived that the organization valued their contribution and cared about their wellbeing.
(Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Perceived organizational support depicts a work environment where employees feel appreciated and see the organization as being concerned about their wellbeing (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Loi, Ngo & Foley, 2006). Employees usually ascribe the characteristics of a human to their organization. Therefore expecting it to behave as humans do; caring, loving, listening and providing for them when the need arises (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

There are factors that play roles in the commitment and the output of workers. Factors such as the culture of the organization and support from supervisors influence the behavior of employees which in return influence their input (Dirks & Ferrin, 2000). Therefore organizational support needs to be taken into consideration if quality of work life of employees is of importance to an organization. Employees will sacrifice and put in their best to perform their duties if they believe the organization cares about their wellbeing (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001). Researchers have associated supportive organizations with a lot of positive outcomes. Such researchers posit that when an organization values the wellbeing of its workers, they will attain a high level of QWL and are likely to reciprocate with positive feelings, job attitudes, and behavioral intentions toward the organization. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) stated that perceived organizational support is directly linked with three categories of favorable treatment received by employees, such as; fairness, supervisor support, organizational rewards and favorable job conditions, and, in return favorable outcomes are attained such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Research by Shanock and Eisenberger, (2006) on POS has also supported this idea, producing evidence of positive relationships between POS and desirable organizational consequences such as quality of work life, good job performance and employee satisfaction.
Statement of Problem

Quality of work life is one of the desirable things which all organizations must try to achieve. Inability to achieve this aim can be as a result of poor organizational policies (Balaji, 2013), such as organizational politics, organizational culture and organizational support which in the long run can affect organizational survival.

Globalization has caused changes all over the world and these changes have affected the economies of countries and other countries are coming together to be a strong force to stand the wind of change (Taqi, 1996). These changes have also affected organization and they have put in measures such as also, mergers and acquisitions, reorganizations and layoffs (Rantanen, 2001) all of which can affect the quality of work life of employees. Industrialization has come up as a result of globalization and a developing country like Ghana is not excluded. However, the globalization process has not succeeded in equalizing the condition of work, in fact, the opposite has occurred; the gaps are increasing. Thus globalization and its associated changing nature of work have made the attainment of QWL more challenging than ever. Organizations are keen on maximizing profits and reducing cost and so sacrifice their employees in order to attain their desired targets and achievements.

For an organization to survive in this turbulent environment, it must put in measures to aid its employees to attain high quality of work life. An organization that is characterized by low commitment, low level of employee morale, inefficiency, low profit, limited individual autonomy, high level of distrust, unclear goals, and lack of communication which are all effects of poor quality of work life, is one that tends to have low level of effectiveness (Mumford, 1988). However, organizational effectiveness which has been the main focus of most employees could be attained if attention is given to organizational culture, organizational politics and organizational support which results in quality of work
life. To ensure an increase in quality of work life, there is the need to ensure that the prevailing organizational culture, organizational politics and organizational support encourages high level of employee commitment, autonomy, responsibility and also ensure effective communication and high level of organizational trust.

Perceived organizational politics plays a major role in organizations. This is because, whenever there are a group of people, there is a form of politics. Simply, politics in an organization is inevitable; therefore attention must be given to it to know its implications on the organization, how to manage it effectively and make the possible best out of it to avoid its negative consequences on the employees and the organization.

Research conducted over the years suggest that the perception of organizational politics is a stressor that affects employees physically and psychologically, thereby influencing their quality of work life and affecting the efficiency of employees leading to low productivity (Rashid, Karim, Rashid & Usman, 2013).

On the other hand, organizational culture which is the collective beliefs, assumptions and actions of people in an organization plays a very important role in the attainment of high quality of work life though little attention has been given to it. Organizational cultures role in quality of work life has been on the blind side of many researchers and management although researchers have found supportive organizational culture to have a positive effect on employees’ quality of work life (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001). Employees appreciate the organization, management and their colleagues viewing the organization as family-like organization; where everyone is important and valued and considered a precious gem to the organization and not just an asset that can be used and dump at anytime (Bond, 2013). Studies have also indicated that the employees’ psychological needs in an organization can be met through application of quality of work life techniques (Pollock, 2003). Because of
the positive effects of quality of work life it has been considered as a holistic program that will increase employee's satisfaction, reinforce their learning environment and will help them in performing their tasks.

In Ghana, the highest number of workers is from the informal sector as compared to the public sector which generates most of the resources for national development (GSS, 2012). However the sector has been characterized with lack of concern toward their work. Some researchers have argued that perception of organizational politics (Vigoda- Gadot, Vinarski-Peretz & Ben-Zion, 2003); quality of work life (Dousti, Abbasi &Khalili, 2012); perceived organizational support (Jain & Sinha, 2005; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and organizational culture (Zakari, Poku & Owusu-Ansah, 2013) could lead to these behavioral outcomes due to the less attention being paid to them.

It is for these reasons that the present research wants to examine the relationship between organizational culture, perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and quality of work life in selected public sector organizations in Accra.

**Aims and Objectives of Study**

The major goal of this research is to ascertain the relationships that exist among organizational culture, perceived organizational politics, perceived organizational support and quality of work life. Specifically the following objectives are proposed:

- To ascertain the relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life.
- To determine the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life.
- To establish the moderating role of perceived organizational support plays in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life.
Relevance of the study

In the current competitive work environment, every organization is putting in measures to help it survive, thrive and make gains as much as possible. Organizations have put in structures and strategies to make this possible. But aside all the technical, marketing, monetary and economic arrangements, without the supportive workforce, these arrangements may not yield the expected result. Therefore, attention should be given to all aspects of employee’s life in order to get the best out of the employee. It is therefore very important that the employees are both psychologically and physically sound so as to utilize their abilities its maximum. This is where the quality of work life of employees is necessary.

According to Dolan, Garcia, Cabezas and Tzafrir (2008), quality of work life is a major concern for employees and how organizations deal with this issue is both of academic and practical importance. Therefore, job satisfaction and satisfaction in private life are both important for having a positive quality of work life experience. Mostly the quality of work life considers the work life and its changes the environment at work along with human-technological-organizational interface (Luthans, 1995). According to Davis and Cherns (1975), quality of work life is not only enhancing the company’s productivity but also important in helping the employee’s work place identity, a sense of belonging and pride in their work.

Quality of work life is an important aspect of work life of employees and also of great benefit to the organization because employees with low quality of work life will not be satisfied with their work. This will influence the attainment of the goals of the organization which will go a long way to affect the organization’s development. Perceived organizational politics, organizational culture and perceived organizational support may influence the members of an organization positively or negatively. However, little
attention has been focused on these variables in terms of empirical research. The few studies that have been conducted, however, requires confirmation from other different settings. Ghanaian-based empirical findings is particularly important because it would not only strengthen existing literature but also will contribute literature from a collectivist environment to the already numerous individualistic research findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction
The primary objective of this chapter is to provide a review of the theories on perceived organizational politics, organizational culture, perceived organizational support and quality of work life and empirical research essential to the current study. This chapter specifically provides an overview of theories, and a conceptual framework. The chapter also includes review of related studies, the rational for the study, the hypotheses and the definition of terms used in the research.

Theoretical Framework
There are several theories that have contributed to our understanding of perceived organizational politics, organizational culture and perceived organizational support and how they operate in organizational settings to enhance desired outcomes of quality of work life of employees in an organization. These theories are discussed in the context of the present study to help explain the relationship between organizational culture, organizational politics, perceived organizational support and quality of work life.

Perception theory
Lewin’s (1936) theory of perception states that people may react to events depending on what they assume rather than the event itself. Due to their perception, they may act or behave in ways that measure up to what they perceive to be there. According to Lewin (1936), because it is difficult to point out self serving behaviors, it will be appropriate to study politics within organizations in relations to how people perceive events rather than the event itself. It means that, when laid down procedures and processes are not followed
duly within the organizations, workers may perceive unfairness and so are likely to respond with certain behaviors and actions that may not be beneficial to the organization. Also because individual perceptions vary, people working in the same organization may react individually to what they assume to be happening in the organization. Thus, in the same organization, one person will see the processes and procedures to be fair whilst to another, it is unfair. Therefore, the study of organizational politics should be how individuals think and not the reality. For instance males and females may perceive their work environment differently. To females, the work environment may be perceived to be political and unsupportive while the males may see nothing wrong with the work environment. These differences in their perceptions may influence their attitude at work and behavior toward their colleagues which will have a detrimental effect on quality of work life.

Also, perception theory explains the relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life and perceived organizational support and quality of work life. Individual’s perception of their organizational culture will then have an effect on individual’s perceived quality of work life. The same applies to perceived organizational support moderating the effect of perceived organizational politics on quality of work life. As the theory puts it, individuals may act in response to what they imagine to exist rather than what is really happening and react as a result of what they perceive. Perception plays a major role in the current study.

**Fairness Theory**

The fairness theory by Folger and Cropanzano (2001) states that when people are faced with situations, they evaluate the situation cognitively; that is the situation against their perceived ideal situation. They then evaluate and react to the current situation base on
what should, could, and would (Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson & Pagon, 2006). When it matches the ideal, then the situation is fair but if it does not then they will perceive it to be unfair.

With the current study, when public sector workers assess the politics in the organization, and evaluate it against what should, could and would alternative situations, they will ask themselves counterfactual question such as, would their quality of work life be better if their perceived organizational politics decreased or would clan culture better their quality of work life? In short, workers will perceive the quality of work life to be unfair when they feel that they would have received better outcomes if the employer could have acted differently and should have done so. However, if the employees perceive fairness with regard to the three counterfactual questions and so will be their perceptions of quality of work life in their company.

**Conservation of Resources Theory (2001)**

The Conservation of Resources (COR) Model (Hobfoll, 1989) is a combined model of stress that includes various stress theories. According to the model, individuals seek to obtain and maintain resources, including objects such as homes and clothes, personal characteristics like self-esteem, conditions such as being married or living with someone who provides social support or financial security and energies that is time, money, and knowledge. Stress occurs when one losses resources, or there is a threat of loss. For example, the model proposes that work-family conflict leads to stress because resources such as time, energy are lost in the process of managing both work and family roles which in turn leads to job dissatisfaction, anxiety, and thoughts about quitting one's job.

With the current research, stress occurs when there is a loss of resources, or a threat of loss due to unfavorable organizational culture or perceived organizational politics. For
example, perceived organizational politics leads to stress because time and energy are lost in the process of cope with a politicized work environment, which in turn leads to job dissatisfaction, anxiety and affecting quality of work life.

**Perceived Organizational Support Theory**

Eisenberger’s (1986) perceived organizational support theory states that employees ascribe human characteristics to the organization and expect the organization to treat them as such. The theory also states that, the development of POS has come about as a result of the human characteristics been given to the organization making it responsible for its workers. Actions and behavior put up by leaders of the organization are seen as decisions of the organization and not a personal action or behavior of the leader (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employees subconsciously view the organization as an entity that can enact policies, define role behaviors, and exert power over the individual (Eisenberger, 1986). Employees get the conviction that the organization will always stand by them and make provisions when the need arises to enable them perform their job effectively and to properly handle stressful situations (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organizations have also taken advantage of perceived methods and programs to assist the employees to work and manage obstacles effectively.

The theory also states that POS should produce feelings of responsibility from the employee to work towards the organizations goals and interests. POS should fulfill socio-emotional needs thereby making workers to identify with the organization. Additionally, POS should strengthen employees beliefs that the organization rewards increased performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).
Review of Related Studies

Organizational culture and quality of work-life

Bond (2013) did a study on organizational culture and work-life conflict in the UK. Using data from employee surveys carried out in four financial sector companies in Scotland, it was found that no matter the level of the employees’ perception of programs to ensure work-life balance it did not have an impact on work-life balance. However, organizational culture was significantly associated with quality of work life. This indicates that without a supportive work-life organizational culture, the provision made to ensure work-life balance in themselves which included flexible working hours, provision of nursery places to take of babies for working mothers, will not necessarily lead to better work-life balance outcomes. The results also shows that other factors like the position of the person at work and longer working hours were significantly associated with work-life outcomes. Because a person with a higher job status may be able to use their position to lobby for time while the person with a lower status cannot and just have to adjust to the situation. Bond’s (2013) research explains that, no matter the arrangements made by employers and management to ensure their employees attain a better QWL, the arrangements alone will not ensure a quality of work life without a supportive organizational culture (clan culture). This shows that organizational culture contributes a lot to the QWL of employees. It is for this reason the current seeks to explore this area among Ghanaian workers.

A case study research in the UK indicates that the culture of an organization is important in determining the effectiveness of family-friendly policies (Lewis, 1997; Lewis, 2001) which contributes greatly to the attainment of overall quality of work life. Some US studies have also tried to study some aspects of organizational culture and family-friendly culture was their focus (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2001; Galinsky, Bond & Friedman, 1996; Saltzstein, Ting & Saltzstein, 2001; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Thompson, Beauvais and
Lyness (1999), for instance, defined work-family culture as the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the degree to which an organization takes into consideration the balance between employees work and family life. In UK, attention has been given to work-life balance and not family alone. Therefore, this definition is extended to include an organization’s support and valuing of the balance between work and life outside work.

Additionally, Abbaspour and Noghreh (2015) examined the relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction of tourism bank employees in Iran. In their study, quality of work life was viewed as job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had themes like general wellbeing, stress at work, control at work, career satisfaction which are some of the themes of quality of work life. This study has been carried out to take a critical look at organizational culture, job satisfaction, and examine the relationship between them. The workers of the Central Department of Tourism bank took part in the study. Their organizational culture questionnaire covered 10 components of including creativity, risk-taking, leadership, integrity, protection, management, control, identity, reward system, compromise with the phenomenon conflict, and communication model. The results indicated that there is a relationship between organizational culture and job satisfaction with organizational culture accounting for the variation in job satisfaction.

In another study, Valizadeh and Ghahremani (2012) examined the relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life of employees in Islamic Azad University of Tabriz. The Hofstede Organizational questionnaire was used for collecting information based on Queen and Gareth model and Walton work life quality questionnaire. Findings of the research show that there was direct and significant relation between organizational culture and quality of employees work life. There was also a direct and significant relation between every components of work life quality and organizational culture. They
recommended consensus and participatory culture (adhocracy and clan culture) to management as the culture to promote because of their role in achieving quality of work life.

Though organizational culture was found to have direct and significant relation on quality of work life, Valizadeh and Ghahremani (2012) recommended two dimensions (adhocracy and clan culture) to management to be given the needed attention in order to promote quality of work life.

Webber, Sarris and Bessell (2010) carried out a research on organizational culture, the use of work–life balance programs and how these programs influence work attitudes and work–life conflict. The study examined attitudes toward work–life balance (WLB). Organizational culture, as it relates to the way and manner in which employees can use WLB initiatives, was also investigated. Particularly, organizational culture was investigated in relation to how individuals perceive culture in the organization. They also looked at other factors like the support of WLB initiatives by management, working hours that may eat into non work activities, autonomy and leave systems. As predicted, perceptions of managerial support of WLB initiatives were related to initiative use. This means that when employees perceive that management is interested in contributing positively toward their work-life balance, the initiatives put in place are used. Results also showed that when employees perceive a supportive organizational culture they become more committed to the organization. The support from management is also negatively related to work–life conflict and employees’ intentions to leave. Further, the study results show that employees’ perception of supportive organizational culture was strongly related to positive organizational outcome.
Benjamin (2015) studied the impact of organizational culture and leadership style on quality of work life. Employees from both private and public sector organizations in Ekiti State, Nigeria took part in the study. The study revealed that organizational culture and leadership style significantly influenced quality of work life experience. Not only that, but also, organizational culture and leadership style together had a significant influence on quality of work life. The individualistic dimension of organizational culture and democratic dimension of leadership style combine to impact more positively on quality of work life.

Organizational culture was found to determine the type of leadership style to be used. It is therefore not surprising that in the study by Benjamin (2015), organizational culture and leadership style separately and jointly influenced quality of work life significantly.

An, Yom and Ruggiero (2011) studied Organizational Culture, Quality of Work Life, and Organizational Effectiveness in Korean University Hospitals. This study investigated organizational culture and quality of work life among nurses working in Korean University. Self-administered questionnaire were given to the nurses to respond to. The study indicated that there were significant relationships between organizational culture, quality of work life, and organizational effectiveness. The study also found that there will be an improvement in organizational effectiveness when the nurses perceive support from the organization and have an improved quality of work life. In particular, both clan culture and innovative culture were related to quality of work life. That is, nurses working in environments where there is unity, value for one another and where interpersonal relationships were of importance to the hospital had higher quality of work life than nurses working in environments where the value for nurses is poor. This finding also indicates that supervisors should work hand in hand with their assistants because from the study,
nurses expected their supervisors to see and treat them as one of them. This finding suggests that no matter the national culture, a supportive culture may be the best move toward enhancing quality of work life or organizational effectiveness. Also, employees working in competitive culture had lower quality of work life. Those workers who perceived their organizational culture as one which only values the services they render and will use their abilities to achieve their goals while paying no or little attention to them were reported to have lower quality of work life. They proposed that the findings of the research were important and need further studies into the area of organizational culture and quality of work life. It is for these reasons; this study seeks to find out whether the same conclusion could be drawn from Ghana with different sample from the public sector and from a country with a collectivist culture.

**Perceived organizational politics and quality of work life**

Rashid, Karim, Rashid and Usman (2013) conducted a study looking at employee’s perception of organizational politics and its relationship with stress in Pakistan. Using convenient sampling technique employees from various organizations of Peshawar, Abbottabad and Islamabad were selected for the study. A cross-sectional analysis was conducted to analyze the effect of perception of organizational politics on employee’s stress during work and its effect on their quality of work life. The cause to job stress was investigated in this study and the result was that job stress badly affects people’s physiological as well as mental health. The result supported the prediction that perception of organizational politics is significantly related to job stress and quality of work life.

Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey and Toth (1997) also researched into detail the relation of politics with individual stress related variables like exhaustion, physical and job pressure and found significantly positive relationship between politics and stress related aspects.
Ferris, Frink, Galang, Zhou, Kacmar and Howard (1996) also empirically examined this relationship among university employees and found significantly positive relationship between perceived politics and stress. Vigoda (2002) concluded based on these studies that stress is a one of the ways we individually react to a stressful work environment. Vigoda (2002) further explained that employees may experience stress and show nervous behavior when they are faced with high pressure due to perceived politics.

Many studies have found employee perceptions of organizational politics to have been associated with a range of negative outcomes in organizations including low levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, task performance, and OCB (Cropanzano et al., 1997). Yet, little attention has been given to it by researchers (Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson & Anthony, 1999). Perceived organizational politics that will lead to low levels of job satisfaction, psychological stress and other negative outcomes cannot lead to a high quality of work life since it functions as work stressor for employees that may lead to job stress which affects the quality of work life of the employee. Organizational politics is not a temporal event that will just happen for a moment and stop but a continuous activity in the organizational environment and therefore, its impact on employees build up over time (Gilmore, Ferris, Dulebohn and Harrell-Cook, 1996). Therefore, much attention needs to be paid to organizational politics by employers if they want to increase productivity. Employers, who value their employees and want them to attain the needed quality of working life, must try as much to reduce politics in the organization which is a form of stressor that affects them physically, psychologically and also reduces productivity.

Javed, Abrar, Haq and Shabir (2014) also explored how the perception of organizational politics and core-self evaluation (CSE) affect the job satisfaction of employees. The study also looked at whether the relationship between perceived organizational politics and
satisfaction derived from the job could be moderate by CSE. By using a self-administered questionnaire, POP and CSE were tested on job satisfaction. The results of the study show that, when people perceive politics at the workplace, their job satisfaction is affected negatively. In other words, they do not derive any satisfaction from their job. Furthermore, CSE did not guarantee job satisfaction. However, the negative effect of POP on job satisfaction was moderated by CSE such that when CSE was high, it weakened the negative relationship between perception of organizational politics and job satisfaction. If job satisfaction cannot be achieved because of POP, then it is obvious POP does not offer anything good to organizations and workers. If POP could affect job satisfaction, it is possible it can also affect the QWL of employees. Many researchers have linked perceived organizational politics to negative outcomes (Akanbi & Ofoegbu, 2013; Vigoda, 2006; Vigoda & Kapun, 2005) and that is why this study seeks to examine whether perceived organizational politics also affects their quality of work life.

Kodisinghe (2010) examined whether the perception of organizational political affairs could affect the pleasure workers derive from their work. Results show that there is an inverse relationship between organizational politics and satisfaction. Which means that the higher the perception of organizational politics, the lower the job satisfaction of the employees. Some researchers have linked political behaviors to lack of pleasure workers derive from their work, absenteeism, and anxiety among workers (Ferris et al., 1996; Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000). This means that, the quality of work life of the employees have been compromised. If perceived organizational politics has been found to have a negative impact on the pleasure workers derive from work, absenteeism and anxiety among workers, then their quality of work life has been affected and this will prevent them from attaining high quality of work life. It further explained that the involvement of
management in organizational politics has a greater negative effect on job satisfaction of workers.

Gull and Zaidi (2012) conducted a research to ascertain the relationship between organizational politics and job satisfaction of employees. The research studied whether there was a relationship between organizational politics on job satisfaction of employees and if there was a relationship, does it affect employees negatively or positively. Their findings stated that the behavior of employees acting in a self serving way to attain valued outcomes is not due to their dissatisfaction with the job. Also, employees who engage in political behaviors in order to find favor from the organization and to attain their personal benefits did not attain job satisfaction anyway. While the actions of the organization that were political; which came in the form of their policies did help raise the job satisfaction level of the employees either. The research concluded that the perception of organizational politics is negatively related to the job satisfaction level of the employees. Inverse relationship between the perception of organizational politics and job satisfaction was found. That is, the higher perception of organizational politics leads to a decrease in the level of employees’ job satisfaction and lower perception of organizational politics leads to increase the level of employees’ job satisfaction.

According to studies conducted by Ferris et al. (1996) there are employees who cannot cope with a political work environment and those people usually quit their jobs when they have another job offer. However, there are others who do not have any other option so they will choose to stay and decide whether to develop strategies to fight the system or just adjust and conform (Selye, 1975). Those who choose to stay in the organization are however exposed to a greater risk of stress if they cannot cope properly with the political realities of the organization because organizational politics has only become a workplace stressor, which may end in increased physical and psychological stress and strain.
reactions. Vigoda (2002) in a recent study analyze many studies and after the analysis, the results proved that perceived organizational politics is directly linked with stressful outcomes. These outcomes include nervousness (Ferris, Frink, Gilmore & Kacmar, 1994), job strain (Valle & Perrewe, 2000), job pressure and physiological tension like tiredness (Cropanzano et al., 1997). These negative outcomes will prevent the employees from attaining high quality of work life since these outcomes affects them psychologically and physiologically. The literature on organizational politics and job stress shows that there is a relation between both of them and it has been highly investigated in developed countries but little has been done in African countries. That is why this study seeks to examine the nature of this relation, with respect to Ghana; which is a gap that needs attention.

Moderating effect of perceived organizational support between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life

Generally, social support is noted for its ability to weaken the negative effects of job stress on the physical and psychological health of people. The stressor/stress relationship has been found to be weakened by social support in different ways (Karasek, Triantis & Chaudhry 1982; Parasuraman, Greenhaus & Granrose, 1992). Coping mechanisms are adopted by people all the time when they are faced with challenging events. Social support has also been identified as one of those mechanisms used by people to overcome stressful events (Beehr, 1985; Gore, 1987; Greehaus & Parasuraman, 1994; House, 1981). LaRocco, House and French (1980), pointed out that, different forms of social support available have different outcomes on people when dealing with a stressful events. For example, social support has been found to minimize the impact of stressful events and also improved the satisfaction of employees. This suggests that the relationship between
different organizational stressors and indicators of wellbeing can be moderator or mediator by support. In light of this, the present study seeks to research another form of support which is perceived organizational support.

Perceived organizational support has become an important field of study in current years with attention being given to the views of both employers and employees (Watt & Hargis, 2010). Perceived organizational support makes employees feel that while the organization is willing to reward them fairly in exchange for what they have to offer, assist them when the need arises to make their working conditions good and favorable, and to also make their work environment exciting and motivating perceived organizational politics does the exact opposite to employees. Employees who perceive organizational support more often report that they are happy with their job and this is more likely to lead to a good mood at work which will help reduce other physical effects such as headache and stress (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

In recent times, Bukhari and Kamal (2015) studied the relationship between perceived organizational politics, quality of work life and organizational citizenship behavior. They also looked at how perceived organizational support could dampen the relationship between perceived organizational politics, quality of work life and organizational citizenship behavior. They predicted that when employee’s perception of organizational support is high, it dampens the negative effect it has on quality of work and their organizational citizenship behavior. As predicted, the perception of organizational support significantly dampened the negative effects of perceived organizational politics on quality of work life; however, the negative effect of perceived organizational politics on organizational citizenship behavior was not weakened by perceived organizational support. In brief, it was noted that in a work environment where the perception of
organizational politics is high, perceived organizational support is vital in order to maintain quality of work life.

Rong and Cao (2015) inferred that the commitment of employees could be weakened by their perception of organizational politics. However, this negative relationship was likely to be weakened when they perceive some level of support from their organization. Organizational support’s major value is offering support to employees. So it focuses on unity, teamwork and standing in for each other. In so doing, trust is built among the workers and makes them feel important. Thus, they predicted that the negative effects of perceived organizational politics on organizational commitment would be dampened when support from the organization is high.

Beheshtifar, Ali-Nezhad and Nekoie-Moghadam (2012) investigated how perceived organizational impact the positive attitudes of employees toward work. In other words, they studied whether the perception of organizational support in any way influence a positive attitude from employees. Self administered perceived organizational support and employees’ positive attitudes work questionnaires were used to measure POS and employees positive attitudes towards work respectively. The result of the study shows that the perception support from the organization leads to positive attitude towards work; with all the subsections: support from supervisor, fairness, incentives and the working conditions; depicting a positive attitude toward work. The way an employee sees his/her working environment directly or indirectly affects his/her behavior, attitude toward work, enthusiasm and health (Vigoda, 2000). They added that if the perception of one’s environment could affect their attitude toward work, then perceived organizational support was necessary to change employees’ attitude at the work place.
Again, they suggested that because support from supervisors, fairness, incentives and working conditions incite positive attitudes of employees’ toward work, they should be given the needed attention to get the needed result.

Beheshtifar et al. (2012) also postulated a worker's perception of support from the organization may be important for determining his/her attitudes that will be beneficial to the organization. They deduced that though perceived organizational support was not put in place to influence the behavior and attitudes of employees, it eventually does by making them feel valued. In so doing, it makes them feel indebted to the organization and give out their best to make the organization successful. So while the organization is promoting the wellbeing of its workers by supporting them, they are rather aiding the success and growth of their organization. They also stated that it is not only the perception of support from the organization or the pride that comes with working with a particular organization that is important to the employee and their view of the exchange relationship they have with their organization; however, their perception of events influences their attitudes toward work, their behavior and also how they give back to their organization.

In view of these, managers are to put in enough effort to unearth resources in the organization that individuals place premium on and work toward the provision of such resources where possible.

In short, they are suggesting that, there are activities that organizations take part in that affects the health, external prestige and motivation of its employees. Such activities as politics may hinder the attainment of quality of work life of employees. However, perceived organizational support impacts employee attitudes and behaviors making them have a bond with the organization and improving their quality of work life.
Jain, Giga and Cooper (2013) also looked at the impact of organizational stressors on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and how perceived organizational support (POS) will moderate in the relationship between stressors and citizenship behavior. A questionnaire was administered to operators from call center organizations in five different organizations. The results highlighted a significant negative relationship between organizational stressors and OCB, a significant positive relationship between POS and OCB, and confirmation that POS moderates in the relationship between organizational stressors and OCB.

POS has been found by researchers to moderate stressor-outcome effects. Some of these stressors include perceived organizational politics and psychological contract breach (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006).

In brief, quality of work life and its consequences is a critical but neglected aspect of employees’ development particularly in Ghana hence the need to thoroughly explore it.

Rationale of the Study

Human resource has been highly recognized as the backbone of every organization’s effectiveness and also its survival. Quality of work life is one of the most important and fundamental subjects in today’s organizational behavior. Every organization puts things in place to ensure the smooth running of the organization. One of such things the organization cannot avoid is its workforce because without the worker the organization cannot function by itself. Sufficient attention to manpower leads to flourishing of the talents and prevents further problems for the organization and management. In Ghana for instance, employees are just entreated to work hard and less attention is paid to their wellbeing, pay, family and the development of the employee both in and out of the organization. The lack of quality of work life of employees is a major issue in Ghana. This
explains why people go on demonstrations all the time demanding better working conditions like increase in salary and safe working environment. As such, proper quality of work life programs are vital to ensure that employees have the best from their work and its ripple effect on their lives and family and more importantly to the organization now and in the future.

There is the need for quality of work life because in this competitive work environment where organizations put in less but expect a great output; quality of work life is possible when employees find their work environment as comfortable. So it is very important for an organization to create a comfortable atmosphere for its employees. Nowadays, the pressures from the work environment has made the attainment of balance between the family and work life difficult. Currently, workers are faced with no choice but to do what their supervisors instruct them to do. There is no autonomy and if you do not do according to how you have been instructed, you can easily be laid off.

Workers and their unions from all over the world are demanding for the best of work life now because they have realized they have been taken for granted. They are now more interested in how to enhance their quality of life at work rather than just retaining their jobs. It is therefore difficult to understand the issue of enhancing quality of work life of employees has lost its importance in Ghana.

Work life is an important stage in the life of every worker; it can either aid or impede the growth of the employee in different ways that will affect him/her positively or negatively within the job environment and in the social environment outside the job.

Also, literature on quality of work life has overly focused on work-life balance disregarding the role of other important occurrence such as perceived organizational politics and organizational culture whose presence or absence can affect the quality of
work life of employees and also the organization. Lewin (1936) argued that people are affected by their assumption of events rather than the event itself. Consequently, the perception of organizational politics may impact one’s quality of work life.

Furthermore, the concept of quality of work life has long been a subject of study in the manufacturing companies and hospitals, but not in the public sector given the significant role the public sector plays in the economy. It is a well-known knowledge that the highest number of employees in most countries is hired by the public sector (Vigoda, 2000). The public sector which generates most of the resources for national development in Ghana is the highest employer under the formal sector (Boachie-Danquah, 2003). Not only that but a lump of the national income is spent on the salaries of public sector workers just like in the case of Ghana as reports from the Fair Wages and Salary Commission points to the fact that, more than half of the nation’s revenue is used on the salaries of the workers (GOG, 2009). Given this background, it is necessary to look at quality of work life in the public sector as well. In brief, quality of work life is an important aspect of employees’ life and it is a critical but neglected aspect of most organizations (Barker, 2006) particularly in Ghana, hence the need to thoroughly explore it. Also, there is limited literature on quality of work life. Most of the researches done are in the western world and not much has been done in Africa and Ghana in particular. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate perceived organizational politics, organizational culture and quality of work life in Ghanaian setting.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

In the light of the literature discussed, the following hypotheses are proposed:

1. Organizational culture will significantly predict quality of work life.
2. Clan culture would account for more variance in quality of work-life compared to competitive, bureaucratic and innovative cultures.

3. Perceived organizational politics will significantly predict quality of work life.

4. Perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life such that the introduction of perceived organizational support will dampen the relationship.

Conceptual Model

A well-managed organizational culture and perceived organizational politics is supposed to lead to an employee attaining quality of work life. In some instances, however, the strength of such relationships depends on other factors among which include perceived organizational support which is part of the focus of the study. Figure 2.0 below shows a conceptual model of the study.

![Conceptual Model](image)

Figure 1.1: Summary of hypothesized relationship between study variables.
The proposed conceptual model indicates that organizational culture and perceived organizational politics will significantly predict quality of work life. Perceived organizational support is proposed to moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life.

**Definition of Terms**

**Organizational Culture:** It refers to the value systems of organizations that encourage sense of togetherness, innovative behaviors, competitive spirit and policies and procedures that influence employees behavior and wellbeing (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000) as measured in the organizational culture scale.

**Perceived Organizational Politics:** It refers to the extent to which employees view their work environment to be promoting the self-interests of others, engaging in political behaviors, so making it unfair and unjust from the view of the individual (Vigoda & Cohen, 2002) as measured in the perceived organizational politics scale.

**Quality of Work life:** A measure of employee’s evaluation of the organization’s response to their needs in terms of their job and career satisfaction, general wellbeing, stress at work, control at work, home-work interface and work conditions (Easton & Van Laar, 2012) as measured by the quality of work life scale.

**Perceived Organizational Support:** Perceived organizational support is how much the organization values employees’ contributions and cares about them (Allen et al., 2008) as measured in the perceived organizational support scale.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter captures the methodology of the research; made up of the summary of the research design, the population, the sample size, the procedure used in sampling and also the instruments used for the collection of data and their psychometric properties. The piloting and the procedure used are also outlined in this chapter.

Population of Study

The population for this study was selected from the Greater Accra Region. It is the industrial hub of Ghana and also hosts the seat of government. Accra is the second most populated city in Ghana, with many residents from different parts of the country working in various organizations (Ghana Statistical Service, 2012). For this reason it was prudent to select a sample from this population. Specifically, organizations like Social Security and National Insurance Trust (SSNIT) and State Insurance Company (SIC) were considered for the study. These sectors are important source of employment for the Ghanaian people. Social Security and National Insurance Trust (SSNIT), a major pension scheme regulatory body in Ghana and State Insurance Company (SIC), which is a major insurance company in the country, were picked for the study. The head offices of these organizations were chosen for the study because they had people from different parts of the country working in different department of the organization. Also permanent employees with at least a Higher National Diploma and not less than six months working experience were chosen because they will be familiar with the organization’s beliefs, values and policies. Questionnaires were given to employees who were willing and ready to participate in the study from these selected organizations.
Sample Size and Sampling Technique

For this study, sampling was done in two stages; the selection of the organizations appropriate for the study and the selection of participants within the selected organizations. Non-probability sampling technique was used in selecting the organizations and participants, specifically, convenience sampling technique. The organizations used in this study were selected based on the convenience sampling technique. This is because the organizations were ideal for the study. In view of this, those organizations where approval could be easily acquired and who gave their consent to partake in the research were used. Likewise, participants were selected using the convenience sampling technique, since this was a more practicable technique to use. Ideally, the simple randomization technique is more appropriate to use to give all employees an equal chance of being selected. However, not all employees were willing to participate in the study. For this reason, employees who consented to take part in the study and had tenure of at least six months in the organization were used. This was to make sure that at least the employees have acquired some knowledge about policies and programs in the organization.

A total number of two hundred (200) questionnaires were distributed to employees who consented to take part in the research from the selected organizations. That is, one hundred (100) questionnaires were given to each of the two organizations. This sample comprised employees of different demographic background such as employees of different job positions, tenure, education, age and gender. Out of total number of questionnaires administered, one hundred and thirty-seven (137) were completed and returned. However, out of the questionnaires that were returned, only one hundred and thirty-one (131) were used in the analysis, resulting in a response rate of 65.5 %. Six (6) questionnaires were excluded from the data analysis because responses to some questions in those
questionnaires were left blank. For an answered questionnaire to be meaningful and useful for data analysis, all the sections were supposed to be filled.

The total number of one hundred and thirty-one (131) responses for the study is adequate for regression analysis because as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), for regression analysis, the minimum sample size (N) should be $N > 50 + 8M$; where M = the number of independent variables to be used and N is the sample size in the research. This study has one independent variable, which means that a sample size of not less than 58 would be required.

Out of 131 respondents used, the analysis indicated that 73 respondents were males (55.7%) and 58 were females (43.3%). Also, with respect to the respondent’s positions in their organizations, 7 were in management (5.3%), 78 were senior staff (59.5%) and 46 were junior staff (35.1%). Furthermore, for these participants, 15 had been employed between 7 month-1 year (11.5%), 40 had been employed between 2-4 years (30.5%), 41 had been employed from 5-10 years (31.3%) and 35 had been employed for 11 years and above representing 26.7%. In terms of respondents’ age, 6 respondents were between 18 to 25 years (4.6%) whereas 71 respondents were between 26-35 years (54.2%), 24 respondents were between 36-45 years (18.3%) whereas 30 were 46 years and above representing 22.9%.

**Research Design**

A cross-sectional survey design was used for this study. This design was chosen because the study is being carried mainly to investigate associations between the variables of interest and the strengths of those associations with a sample drawn from various backgrounds like different organizations, job positions, departments, experience, age, tenure, sex, etc. The study also investigates the moderation effect of perceived
organizational support using multiple regression analysis. Also, the study made use of questionnaires as the main tool for data collection.

Precisely, data was collected on the following variables; organizational culture and perceived organizational politics (independent variables), perceived organizational support (moderating variable) and quality of work life (dependent variables).

**Measures**

The instrument for the collection of data in this study was a set of questionnaires categorized into four sections namely, A, B, C, D and E. In section A, information on demographic characteristics such as age, job position, organizational tenure, sex and level of education was collected. In sections B and C information about organizational culture and perceived organizational politics were collected respectively. In sections D and E information on quality of work life and perceived organizational support were collected. The details about the measures are provided below.

*Organizational culture*

Organizational culture was measured using the scale developed by Deshpandé, Farley and Webster (1993). The original instrument is a 16-item scale which consists of four items each for innovative culture, competitive culture, bureaucratic culture, and clan culture, in that order. Also, the original construct on organizational culture was initially used in a product-oriented organizations, thus items that contained the words “production” and “products” were change to “service” since the current study used service oriented organizations.

Responses were scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Scoring pattern was through simple addition, thus, the possible minimum and maximum scores will be
sixteen (16) one hundred and twelve (112) respectively. A higher score means a high perceived support for such a culture in an organization whilst a low score indicates the perceived non supportiveness of such a culture. The cronbach alpha coefficient values for this scale in Ogbonna and Harris (2000) research were, 0.77 for competitive culture, 0.76 for innovative culture, 0.70 for clan culture, and 0.67 bureaucratic culture.

**Perceived organizational politics**

Kacmar and Carlson (1997) perceived organizational politics scale was used to measure perceived organizational politics. The 15-item scale which is the most accepted measure of Perceived Organizational Politics Scale in the literature will be adapted and adjusted to fit the organizational environment and cultural context. Participants were to report on how much they agreed or disagreed with the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A higher score meant higher perception of organizational politics. Examples of some items on the scale include, “Rewards only come to those who work hard” and “I have seen changes made in policies that only serve the purpose of a few individuals and not that of everyone”. Negatively worded items like item 6, “In this organization, it is difficult to tell which extension employees must go in order to be rewarded”, were reversed scored.

So a higher score indicated a high perception of politics in the organization and a score indicated a low perception of politics in the organization. The possible highest and lowest score on the POP Scale was 75 and 15 respectively.

**Quality of work life**

Quality of work life was measured using the Work Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) scale. It is a 24-item scale with six subsections designed by Easton and Van Laar (2012) to
provide information on the individual, his/her social life and work life to help in promoting best work place practices. Participants responded to how much they agreed with the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A higher score meant higher perception of quality of work life and the lower score meant a lower perception of quality of work life. The possible total scores ranged from 23 to 115. Item 24, which measures the overall QWL, is not included in the total score. A reliability and item analysis of the scores obtained by Van Laar et al. (2007) is 0.91–0.94 for the overall scale and 0.72–0.91 for the subscales study indicated acceptable internal consistency (Van Laar et al., 2007).

**Perceived organizational support**

Perceived Organizational Support Scale (POSS) developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) was used to measure perceived organizational support. The original POSS measure had 36 items from the (Eisenberger et al., 1986). A reliability and item analysis of the scores obtained in the original study indicated acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of 0.97, with item-total correlations ranging from 0.42 to 0.83. The mean and median item-total correlations were 0.67 and 0.66, respectively.

The shorter version eight-items (8-items) of POS developed by Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli, (2001) were adopted in this study but were reworded to be twelve-items (12) after piloting. Examples of items on the SPOS are: “My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor”, “If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me”; “My organization shows little concern for me.” Participants responded to how much they agreed with the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
Pilot Study

A pilot study was done to assess the appropriateness of the various measures on a Ghanaian population so as to address any cross-cultural validity of the measures if the need be since all the scales were used outside Ghana, mostly, in the western parts of the world with different cultural viewpoints. The scales that were piloted included: organizational culture; perceived organizational politics; quality of work life and perceived organizational support. In conducting a pilot study to pre-test the scale 10 participants were sampled from Social Security and National Insurance Trust. The participants and the organizations were selected using the convenient sampling method. The sample included males, females and employees of different job positions and tenure. After the pilot study, the test retest reliability values were 0.89, 0.74, 0.77 and 0.79 for organizational culture, perceived organizational politics, quality of work life and perceived organizational support scale respectively. A total of sixty-seven (67) items were on the scale. Items on the scales that were difficult to understand were reworded for better understanding by participants. For instance, the items that read “Favoritism rather than merit determines who get ahead around here”, was reworded to read “People get promoted based on how much effort they put in their work and not based on partiality” and “There is no place for Yes Man here, good ideas are desired even when it means disagreeing with supervisor”, was reworded to read “It is safer to agree with people than to say what you think”. Because most participants asked for clarification of these items, they needed to be reworded. Thus the piloting helped to modify the scale for easy understanding of the participants.
Data Collection Procedure

The following steps were taken by the researcher in order to ensure a satisfactory response rate to the survey. Initially, a verbal pre-survey permission was taken from the Human Resource Department of the selected organizations to make them aware of the intention of using their organizations for the study and ask for their assistance and cooperation. A letter seeking approval to carry out the study was obtained from the Department of Psychology and taken to the Ethics Committee for Humanities (ECH) including the research proposal and other relevant documents for approval before data collection begun. A certificate of ethical clearance endorsed by the Chairman of the Board was then issued after which an introductory letter to the organizations of study was requested and granted from the Psychology Department. A copy of the certificate for ethical clearance, introductory letter, consent form and sample of questionnaire were sent to the selected organizations that consented to take part in the study, purposely to seek formal consent to use their organization for the study. After permission had been granted, the researcher, with the help of the human resource officers, progressed to identity prospective participants who could and would answer the questionnaires. After prospective participants had been identified as being suitable for the study, their permission was sought to participate in the study and those who consented were given the self-report questionnaires to respond to. Participants were drawn from different ranks and departments of the organizations. The questionnaires were on organizational culture; perceived organizational politics; quality of work life and perceived organizational support (see Appendix II). There was also a section for demographic data.
Ethical Consideration

The first step taken in this research to ensure that these principles were followed was a formal request to the Department of Psychology by the researcher to be given a letter seeking permission to conduct the study which was taken to the ECH including the research proposal and other relevant documents for approval before data collection begun. The ECH’s mandate is to oversee and regulate the ethical conduct of research within the disciplines in the humanities at the University of Ghana.

Furthermore, in every organization used in this research, permission was sought from the human resource department and their assistance also sought in administering the questionnaires. Also, the purpose of the study was explained to participants, both in words and in writing and their consent was sought (see Appendix I). Specific instructions regarding the purpose of the study and voluntary participation in the research were clearly spelt out on the questionnaire. Likewise, it was explained to participants that there was no foreseen risk, discomfort or adverse effect should they participate or decline to participate in the research. Also, nobody was induced to participate in the study. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity of responses, participants were instructed not to write their names on the questionnaires or mark the questionnaire in ways that would reveal their identity. In anticipation that the workers may be busy at the time the researcher gets to their organization, participants were given about two weeks to respond to the questionnaires and submit them to the Human Resource Officers at the Human Resources Department after which the researcher went to collect them. The time needed to respond fully to a questionnaire was however about fifteen to twenty minutes. Additionally, participants were advised that they were not in any way obliged to partake in the study and could also pull out at any point in the study. Finally, contacts (email addresses and phone numbers) were made available to participants so that they could contact the researcher in
case they wanted to seek any clarification(s) about the research. The duration for the data collection was about a month. Data collection started in the second week of April, 2015 and ended in the second week of May, 2015. After data had been collected, it was then scored and coded for statistical analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter consists of the summary of results from the analysis of the data collected using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0. The analyzed data was presented in two parts; the preliminary analysis for the first part and tested hypotheses for the second part. The findings of the results were summarized at the end of the chapter.

Preliminary Analysis

The preliminary analysis consists of the following steps: descriptive analysis, analysis of normal distribution of the variables, reliability analysis and finally, Pearson’s Product moment correlation coefficient among the core variables of the study.

Analysis of the normal distribution of variables

In accordance with a major assumption underlying regression analysis that at least the dependent variable must follow the normal curve, normality test using skewness and kurtosis analysis was used to determine normality in the study. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), a variable is normal when, the value for skewness and kurtosis range between ±2. Normality test using the values of skewness and kurtosis found all the variables to be normally distributed (See Table 4.0).

Reliability Analysis of the Scales

The coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) was computed prior to the main study to ascertain the reliability of the scales being utilized in the study. The Cronbach’s alpha values observed are as follows: Perceived Organizational Politics (number of items
= 15, \( \alpha = .674 \)), Organizational Culture (number of items = 16, \( \alpha = .939 \)); Quality of Work-Life (number of items = 23, \( \alpha = .779 \)); Perceived Organizational Support (number of items = 12, \( \alpha = .677 \)) (See Appendix 3 for details). According to Brewerton and Millward (2001), acceptable level of internal scale reliability has been varied among different researchers but it normally ranges between 0.6 and 0.7 as absolute minimum. As observed, all the scales used in this analysis yielded acceptable results of Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, hence reliable.

### Descriptive statistics

An analysis involving computation of means, standard deviation, reliability test, and normality test involving the study variables was done before the main test of hypotheses. Below is the table to that effect.

#### Table 4.0

*Summary of the Means, Standard Deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>46.85</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.0, the mean and standard deviation of perceived organizational politics is 46.85 and 9.14 respectively with minimum and maximum scores of 30 and 105 respectively with a Cronbach Alpha of .674. Also, organizational culture reported a mean and standard deviation of 85.26 and of 18.42 respectfully with minimum and maximum scores of 32 and 110 respectively with a Cronbach Alpha of .939. Furthermore, quality of work-life had a mean and standard deviation of 79.30 and 11.68 respectively with minimum and maximum scores of 45 and 134 respectively with a Cronbach Alpha of .779.
Additionally, the mean and standard deviation of the study sample on perceived organizational support is 52.12 and 6.49 respectively with minimum and maximum scores of 36 and 73 respectively with a Cronbach Alpha of .677.

**Pearson correlations among study variables**

The preliminary analysis had its final step being the computation of the Pearson Product moment correlations among all the variables in the study. Table 4.1 below shows a summary of the outcome.

**Table 4.1:**

*Summary of Pearson Correlation between the Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived Organizational Politics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational Culture</td>
<td>-.285**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of Work-Life</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the correlation matrix above, perceived organizational politics had a significant negative relationship with organizational culture ($r = -.285$, $p < .01$). Quality of work-life also related significantly and negatively with perceived organizational politics ($r = -.211$, $p < .01$). Quality of work-life further related significantly and positively with organizational culture ($r = .591$, $p < .01$). Perceived organizational support did not relate to perceived organizational support ($r = -.018$, $p > .01$) and quality of work-life ($r = .128$, $p > .01$) but related significantly and positively with organizational culture ($r = .215$, $p < .01$).
**Hypothesis testing**

Based on the objectives of the study, three hypotheses were formulated. The simple linear regression and the standard regression were used to test hypotheses one and two. Also, the hierarchical multiple regression was used to test hypothesis three. Results from the test are as presented below.

**Hypothesis One**

The first hypothesis stated that organizational culture will significantly predict quality of work life. This hypothesis was tested using simple linear regression because the amount of variance accounted for quality of work-life by organizational culture was assessed. The result is as presented below.

**Table 4.2**

*Simple Linear Regression coefficients for Organizational Culture and its Sub-Constructs as predictors and Quality of Work-Life as criterion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>68.648</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .349$, **$p < .01$**

The regression analysis showed that organizational culture significantly accounted for 34.9% of the variance in explaining quality of work-life ($F_{(1, 130)} = 65.075$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .349$). As observed, organizational culture significantly predicted quality of work-life ($\beta = .591$, $p < .01$). Therefore, the hypothesis that organizational culture will significantly predict quality of work-life was supported.
**Hypothesis Two**

The second hypothesis states that clan culture would account for more variance in quality of work-life compared to competitive, bureaucratic and innovative cultures. This hypothesis was analyzed using standard regression.

**Table 4.3**

*Standard Regression coefficients for Organizational Culture Sub-Constructs as predictors of Quality of Work-Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>48.129</td>
<td>3.834</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Culture</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Culture</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Culture</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan Culture</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .416$, **p < .01**

Table 4.3 shows that the model with the predictor variables was significant ($F_{(4, 127)} = 22.220, \ p < .01$), accounting for 41.6% ($R^2 = .416$) of the variation in quality of work-life.

It was observed that bureaucratic culture had a greater effect on quality of work-life ($\beta = .555, \ p < .01$) than innovative culture ($\beta = .257, \ p < .01$), competitive culture ($\beta = .063, \ p < .01$), and clan culture ($\beta = -.231, \ p < .01$). Therefore, hypothesis two which states clan culture would account for more variance in quality of work-life compared to competitive, bureaucratic and innovative cultures was not supported.

**Hypothesis Three**

The third hypothesis states that, perceived organizational politics will significantly predict quality of work life. The simple linear regression was used to test this hypothesis. The result is as presented in Table 4.4 below.
Table 4.4

Summary of Regression Coefficients of Organizational Politics as Predictor of Quality of Work-Life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Politics</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>5.404</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .045, **p < .01 \)

As indicated in Table 4.4 above, perceived organizational politics accounted for 4.5% of the variance in explaining quality of work-life \([F_{(1,129)} = 5.404, p < .01, R^2 = .045]\). Also, it is observed that perceived organizational politics significantly predicted quality of work-life \((\beta = -.201, p < .01)\). Therefore, the hypothesis that perceived organizational politics will significantly predict quality of work-life was supported.

Testing for Moderation Effect

The last hypothesis states that perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life such that the introduction of perceived organizational support will strengthen the relationship.

As a requirement for testing for moderation effect, there should be a relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion variables (Holmbeck, 1997). This requirement, therefore, was satisfied as indicated in Figure 4.0.

To test for this hypothesis, the procedures proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) for testing moderation effect were used. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a common framework for illustrating moderating effect from both correlational and experimental perspectives is possible using a causal path analysis. The three causal paths as illustrated...
on the Figure 4.0 below (a, b, and c) was used. This involved the criterion or dependent variable (DV), quality of work-life: the effect of the IV (organizational politics) on the DV (quality of work-life) (path a), the effect of the moderation variable (perceived organizational support) on the DV (quality of work-life) (path b), and the interaction or product of these two paths on the DV (path c). According to Baron and Kenny, (1986) the moderator hypothesis is supported if the interaction term (path c) is significant. With respect to the interaction term, the independent and the moderating variables were centered to reduce the effect of multicollinearity (Aiken & West, 1991). In centering, the mean value of the variable was subtracted from the individual scores of the variables.

Figure 4.0: Path diagram of the moderating model (Baron & Kenny, 1986)

Figure 4.0 above has three paths that are causal that relate to the outcome variable (quality of work-life). The influence of perceived organizational politics is a predictor that fall
along the first path (a). The second path (b) has the influence of perceived organizational support as a moderator. Finally, the third path (c) has the interaction of the predictor (perceived organizational politics) and the moderator on the outcome variable. On the basis of this model, the moderation hypothesis is supported if the interaction that is path c is significant.

**Hypothesis Four**

The fourth hypothesis states that perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life such that the introduction of perceived organizational support will strengthen the relationship. The hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to test this hypothesis. The result is presented in Table 4.5 below.
From Table 4.5, the analysis indicated that the model in step one was significant accounting for a (4.1%) variance in explaining quality of work-life \( [F(1, 129) = 5.404, \rho < .01, R^2 = .041] \). Thus, perceived organizational politics significantly predict quality of work-life (\( \beta = -.201, p < .01 \)). At step two of the model, perceived organizational support contributed (5.6%) in explaining the variance in quality of work-life, \( [F(2, 128) = 3.757, \rho < .01, \Delta R^2 = .056] \). That notwithstanding, perceived organizational support did not significantly predict quality of work-life (\( \beta = .124, p > .01 \)). The third step revealed that the model accounted for (8.2%) variance in quality of work-life \( [F(3, 127) = 3.770, \Delta R^2 = .082] \). In the third step, organizational politics did not interact significantly with perceived...
organizational support (POP * POS) to predict quality of work-life ($\beta = .164, \rho > .01$).

Therefore, the hypothesis that stated that perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life such that it will strengthen the relationship was not supported.

In summary, the results indicated that:

1. Organizational culture significantly predicts quality of work life.
2. Clan culture did not account for more variance in quality of work-life compared to competitive, bureaucratic and innovative cultures.
3. Perceived organizational politics significantly predicted quality of work life.
4. Perceived organizational support did not moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work-life.

Figure 4.1. A summary of the observed relationships between independent, dependent and moderating variables.

Figure 4.3 is the final conceptual framework showing the significant relationships between the variables used in this study. Findings reveal that organizational culture significantly
has an effect on quality of work life ($\beta = .591$). The finding also revealed that perceived organizational politics has an effect on quality of work life ($\beta = -.201$). However, it was observed that the effect of organizational culture is greater on quality of work life than perceived organizational politics.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study was aimed at examining the relationships that exist among organizational culture, perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. Specifically, it explored the relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life and also the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. It further examined the moderating role of perceived organizational support in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work. The purpose of investigating the moderating effect was to better understand the conditions under which perceived organizational politics would most strongly relate to quality of work life. This discusses the findings of this research, in light of the guiding theoretical framework and previous literature. Additionally, the implications of these findings on theory and practice as well as its limitations and recommendations for future research will be discussed.

Organizational culture and quality of work life.

The first major objective of this study was to investigate whether organizational culture will significantly have any relationship with quality of work life. The results as expected indicated a significant positive relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life. The results showed that individuals who scored high on organization culture tended to have a high quality of work life. For example, Valizadeh and Ghahremani (2012); Bond (2013); Benjamin (2015); Abbaspour and Noghreh (2015); Webber, Sarris and Bessell (2010) found organizational culture to have a significant positive relationship with quality of work life.
In the case of the study of Valizadeh and Ghahremani (2012), they examined the relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life of employees in Islamic University of Tabriz. Findings of the research show that there is direct and significant relation between organizational culture and quality of employees work life. Employees appreciated their shared beliefs and values so much that they attain satisfaction on the job and also in the job environment.

Webber, Sarris and Bessell (2010) further in their studies showed that when employees perceive that their organization has a supportive culture they are committed to the organization and do not experience work–life conflict. The employees also do not have the intention to leave. Particularly, organizational culture was investigated in relation to how individuals perceive culture in the organization. They also looked at other factors like the support of WLB initiatives by management, working hours that may eat into non work activities, autonomy and leave systems. This means that when employees perceive that management is interested in contributing positively toward their work-life balance, the initiatives put in place are used. Organizational culture does not only affect the employee at work but also it also has an effect on them outside the work environment. Therefore, when the employees perceived that their organizational culture is supportive, quality of work life is attained and therefore makes the employees committed to the organization.

The finding of this study further finds ample support in a recent study conducted by Benjamin (2015) who studied the impact of organizational culture and leadership style on quality of work life. The study revealed that organizational culture and leadership style significantly influenced quality of work life experience. Not only that, but also, organizational culture and leadership style together had a significant influence on quality
of work life. The individualistic dimension of organizational culture and democratic dimension of leadership style combine to impact more positively on quality of work life.

According to Kandula (2006) the key to good performance is a strong culture. He further maintains that due to difference in organizational culture, same strategies do not yield same results for two organizations in the same industry and in the same location. A positive and strong culture can make an average individual perform and achieve brilliantly whereas a negative and weak culture may demotivate an outstanding employee to underperform and end up with no achievement due to the effect organizational culture has on their quality of work life. Therefore organizational culture has an active and direct role in performance management and wellbeing of workers (Ahmad, 2012).

**Clan/supportive culture and quality of work life**

The second major objective of this study which states that clan/supportive culture would account for more variance in quality of work life compared to competitive, bureaucratic and innovative cultures was not supported by the study. However, bureaucratic culture accounted for the variance in quality of work life. The results showed that though organizational culture had a significant positive effect on quality of work life, clan culture did not account for the variance but rather bureaucratic culture. This implies that individuals did not score high on quality of work life because of clan culture but rather bureaucratic culture.

When an organization is said to have a bureaucratic culture, it means the organization values formality, rules, standard operating procedures, and hierarchical co-ordination. Long-term concerns of bureaucracy are predictability, efficiency, and stability. Its members highly value standardized goods and customer service. Behavioral norms support
formality over informality. Managers view their roles as being good co-coordinators, organizers, and enforcers of certain rules and standards. Tasks, responsibilities, and authority for all employees are clearly defined. The organization’s many rules and processes are spelled out in thick manuals and employees believe that their duty is to go by the book and follow legalistic processes. According to Weber (1946), a bureaucratic culture ensures that there is a fixed division of labor, a hierarchy of positions and authority, administration based on written documents and adherence to general rules and full-time commitment to official activities.

This Finding contradicts other findings that have found that clan culture/supportive culture is associated with quality of work life. For example, Zamini, Hosseini and Zarei (2011), found out that, collaborative organizational culture (clan culture), has the highest level of job satisfaction. Again, Bond (2013) also indicated that without a supportive work-life organizational culture, the provision made to ensure work-life balance in themselves which included flexible working hours, provision of nursery places to take of babies for working mothers, will not necessarily lead to better work-life balance outcomes. This finding may not be consistent with other findings based on issues like the Ghanaian setting and our perception of the organization. Other findings are from the western countries where their culture and view of the organization is different. Possibly, Ghanaians do not like the clan culture that is loose in terms of rules and regulations but like a formalized culture like the bureaucratic culture where procedure, rules and regulations are spelt out clearly and everyone knows what they are up to and what is due them.

**Perceived organizational politics and quality of work life.**

The third major objective of the study that states that perceived organizational politics will significantly predict quality of work life was supported by the results of the study. The
results showed that individuals who scored high on perceived organizational politics tended to have a low quality of work life. For example, Javed, Abrar, Haq and Shabir (2014); Rashid, Karim, Rashid and Usman (2013) and Kodisinghe (2010) found perceived organizational politics to have a significant effect on quality of work life.

Javed, Abrar, Haq and Shabir (2014) researched the effects of perception of organizational politics (POP) and core self-evaluation (CSE) on employee job satisfaction. The study also examined core self-evaluation as a moderator in the relationship between perception of organizational politics and job satisfaction. Results show that when employees perceive politics in the organization their job satisfaction is affected negatively. However, the negative effect of POP on job satisfaction was moderated by CSE such that when CSE was high, it weakened the negative relationship between perception of organizational politics and job satisfaction.

Also, Rashid, Karim, Rashid and Usman (2013) conducted a study looking at link between employee’s perception of organizational politics and stress. The source to job stress was investigated in this study and the result was that stress from job badly affects people’s physiological and mental health. Their study viewed perceived organizational politics as a stressor that affects the physiological as well as mental health of employee. It is obvious that when the physiological and mental health of the employee is affected quality of work life has not been achieved.

Not only these but also, Kodisinghe (2010) investigated the influence of perceived organizational political affairs on the pleasure employees derive from work. Results show that there is an inverse relationship between organizational politics and satisfaction. Which means that the higher the perception of organizational politics, the lower the job satisfaction of the employees. Some researchers have named political behaviors as having
impact on the pleasure employees derive from work, anxiety and absenteeism (Ferris et al., 1996; Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000).

These studies explain the negative effects perceived organizational politics had on the work pleasure, job satisfaction and mental health of the workers. This is an indication that, perceived organizational politics has negative implications on workers and that is why in the current study, it affected the quality of work life of workers.

The perception theory states that what people perceive influence their actions and behaviors rather than what is really happening. They may then act in ways that depict what they perceive (Lewin, 1936). Thus Lewin (1936) stated that the study of politics should be what people think and not the reality. This means that employees may put up certain actions and behaviors when they perceive that processes and procedures are unfair. Perception theory can then explain the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. That is, as soon as one perceives that the work environment is politicized and therefore not fair in their activities, they will feel betrayed and also perceive that their wellbeing is not valued by the organization. This will also alter their perception of their quality of work life.

**Moderating effect of perceived organizational support on perceived organizational politics and quality of work life**

Contrary to the predictions perceived organizational support did not moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. The prediction was that perceived organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life such that the introduction of perceived organizational support will dampen the relationship. However
the results of the study shows that perceived organizational support did not dampen the negative effects of perceived organizational politics on quality of work life.

This finding is different from findings from Imran and Anila (2015), and Rong and Cao (2015) that state that, perceive organizational support will moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life.

POS has been linked with the health and wellbeing of employees in organizations (Leather et al., 1998). In a study by Jain and Sinha (2005) they found that POS had a direct positive impact on the general health of employees. Chang, Rosen, and Levy (2009) identified perceived support as a potentially key moderator that may help alleviate the negative impact of perceptions of organizational politics. This line of reasoning has not, however, been explored systematically by researchers to date.

Imran and Anila (2015) studied how perceived organizational politics could affect affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. They also tested whether perception of organizational support could moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and affective commitment. The result of the study show that perceived organizational support dampened the negative effect of perceived organizational politics on the affective commitment of the employees. The study demonstrated that perceived organizational support can moderate the undesirable effects of perceived organizational politics on employee outcome and wellbeing.

More generally, organizational support theory and research suggests that the link between POS and organizationally focused outcomes, such as QWL and intention to stay, is more pronounced when employees believe that the support they receive from the organization is given voluntarily and unconditionally (Eisenberger et al., 1986).
It will therefore be expected that individuals who perceived their work environment as politicized to view any organizational support as a strategy by the organization to get something from them and, therefore, as generally less ‘genuine’ and more insecure. And this, in turn, is likely to reduce their felt obligation to reciprocate, as well as their sense of psychological fulfillment from the organization. Hence, it is expected that POS will attenuate the negative relationship between POS and QWL.

Rong and Cao (2015) also inferred that employees’ commitment to their organization would be destroyed when they perceive organizational politics because their QWL has been tempered with. However, perceived organizational support was likely to weaken this negative effect because organization support strengthens employees to live in unity and value each other. Moreover, perceived organization support makes them feel important. Hence, they speculated that the negative impact of perceived organizational politics on organizational commitment would diminish with a high perceived organization support.

However, contrary to the earlier studies, the current study found that POS did not moderate the relation between POP and QWL. This relationship can be explained further by the perception theory (Lewis, 1936) which states that perception plays a role in people’s reaction more often as compared to the reality. Thus they may behave in ways to conform to what they perceive to be there. Therefore, the perception of politics alone can cause reactions from the employees and also affect their perception of their quality of work life. These mental representations have effect on their actions, emotions and the way they think and view the organization. So no matter the support offered by management, it cannot alleviate the harsh effects of perceived organizational support on quality of work life.
**Limitation of the study**

The present study like all previous studies conducted is not without limitations. The limitations of the current study range from limited time to resources. These limitations are deliberated comprehensively below.

The major limitation in this study is the use of self-report measures to examine the variables of study. Though this method was the most appropriate given the size of the sample and the time involved, sensitive questions, especially those regarding perceived organizational politics, and perceived organizational support may boost social desirability bias. This bias refers to the affinity of survey respondents to answer questions in a way that will be viewed positively by others. Some of the respondents expressed fear that their employers may see the answers they provided to the questions. The researcher, however, assured them of confidentiality in order to reduce their likelihood of answering questions to increase their social desirability.

Regardless of this limitation, this study extends our understanding on the effects of organizational culture and perceived organizational politics have on quality of work life.

Secondly, due to limited time and resources, the researcher’s efforts towards obtaining more responses were significantly hampered, coupled with the tall list of items on the questionnaire which is likely to have resulted in not achieving a 100% response rate. The findings, for that matter, could have improved if more responses were obtained for analysis. This notwithstanding, based on the recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the sample size used was enough to get a reliable equation.

Although associations were observed among the study variables, the design was not robust enough to establish a direct cause-effect relationship, between the variables but rather a predictive relationship. However, a moderating hypothesis according Field (2005) help to
establish a relationship close to a cause-effect relationship. This is because the moderation helps to identify the conditions under which the relationship between the predictor and outcome variables can be strengthened or weakened. This therefore enhances the ability to better predict (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Hence the test of moderation in the current study helps to reduce to some extent the defects that come about as a result of the inability to draw cause – effect relationship. Field (1995) further added that experiments which determine a cause-effect relationship could not be used in the workplace setting because it creates a non-natural environment and may inconvenience both employers and employees. Nevertheless, a study incorporating the use of longitudinal design could improve the ability to make stronger causal statements than were found in this current study.

It is important to note that despite these limitations, the findings are significantly valid, with some theoretical and practical implications which are discussed as follows.

**Implications for practice**

First, findings from the study have both theoretical and practical/managerial implications. Theoretically, findings of this study add on to the existing body of knowledge on the general subject of organizational culture, perceived organizational politics, quality of work life and perceived organizational support in Ghana. Since there is inadequate literature on quality of work life in Ghana, findings of the study provide benchmark data which can be used for future research not only in Ghana but internationally.

Also, findings of this study revealed that perceived organizational politics and organizational culture significantly predicted quality of work life. This should inform management of public sector organizations to take quality of work life with all the seriousness it demands. The continued existence and development of organizations in this
turbulent business world mainly depend on their level of effectiveness in terms of goal achievement and the availability of a committed workforce who are ready to stay with them to fight on. Therefore, if perceived organizational politics and organizational culture have been found to have an effect on employees’ quality of work life which goes a long way to affect the level of productivity as this study have proved, then it is about time policy makers in our organizations take a second look at their quality of work life.

Furthermore, employees form the backbone to the success of these companies and their success affects the organization’s effectiveness positively. For organizations to keep their scarce employees, management need to view quality of work life as a strategic part of an organization’s policy to make employees feel loved and cared for by the organization. When this happens, they will stay committed to the organization and go the extra mile just to see it prosper. Additionally, it has also become very important for organizations and its managers to attach more importance to the physical, emotional, social, financial and psychological wellbeing of their employees. This is because this study has also revealed that perceived organizational politics and organizational culture significantly predict quality of work life.

**Recommendation for future research**

First, in this current study, the researcher largely employed the use of regression in testing the various hypotheses establishing the relationships between and among various variables. The researcher took this decision with the assumption that the relationships were linear. However, it will not be farfetched that possible non-linear relationships could exist between and among the variables. As a result, further research would use of non-linear regression models as well as different operationalization of the variables such as perceived
organizational politics and organizational culture that will also allow for use of other analytical techniques to test the hypothesized relationships for similar study.

Also, it is recommended that this study be replicated using samples from both private and public sector. This could allow for more varied view of quality of work life from both the private and public sector.

Moreover, the mixed method would be used so that the weaknesses of purely quantitative method would be taken care of.

Other moderating variables could be tested to see if they would moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. Variables such as the demographic variables could also be considered.

**Conclusion**

The focus of the present study was to investigate the relationship between perceived organizational politics, organizational culture and quality of work life. The moderating role of perceived organizational support in the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life was also explored.

Four hypotheses were tested in this study. As hypothesized, it was observed that there was a significant relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. The results further show an inverse relationship among the two variables, such that as one rose, the other fell. In other words, employees who perceived higher levels of organizational politics have less quality of work life. Employees, on the other hand, who perceived low levels of organizational politics, have high quality of work life. Results also show a positive relationship between organizational culture and quality of work life with bureaucratic culture accounting for the variance. This means that when things are done in
a bureaucratic way it accounts for high quality of work life as compare to clan, innovative and competitive culture.

Finally, findings from the study revealed that perceived organizational support did not moderate the relationship between perceived organizational politics and quality of work life. This means that employees who perceived organizational politics will have low quality of work life regardless of the strengths of the perceived organizational support.

It is the expectation of the researcher that these findings will not only be valuable for literature on organizational behavior but will also stir up interest in the public sector and aid government in formulating policies which will benefit employees in the sector.
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APPENDIX I: CONSENT FORM

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

OFFICE OF RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
Ethics Committee for Humanities (ECH)

PROTOCOL CONSENT FORM

Section A - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Title of Study: Organizational Culture, Perceived Organizational Politics and Quality of Work Life in Selected Public Sector Organizations.

Principal Investigator: BELINDA KLU

Certified Protocol Number: 10280660

Section B - CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

General Information about Research

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship among Organizational Culture, Perceived Organizational Politics and Quality of Work Life in Selected Public Sector Organizations.

It is expected that participants will use an average of 25 minutes to complete a questionnaire.

The research team consisting of the investigator and his two research assistants will verbally seek your consent to take part in the study after which you will be presented with this form to sign. Participants will be encouraged to call the attention of the researcher or any of his assistants if help is needed.
Benefits/Risk of the study
There will be no health risks or direct benefits involved in the study. This study will not involve any physical or psychological.

Confidentiality
Once your consent has been sought, you are assured of anonymity and confidentiality of the information obtained from you. The investigator will be the only one with access to research records.

Compensation
Compensations will not be made after participating in the study.

Withdrawal from Study
Participation is voluntary and participants are allowed to terminate or withdraw their participation before, during and after the study. Withdrawal does not come with any consequence, sanction or penalty.

Contact for Additional Information
Belinda Klu, M.Phil Industrial and Organizational Psychology student, Department of Psychology, University of Ghana, Legon.
0201889733
belindaklu@yahoo.com

Section C-VOLUNTEER AGREEMENT
"I have read or have had someone read all of the above, asked questions, received answers regarding participation in this study, and am willing to give consent for me, my child/ward to participate in this study. I will not have waived any of my rights by signing this consent form. Upon signing this consent form, I will receive a copy for my personal records."

Name of Volunteer

Signature or mark of volunteer Date

If volunteers cannot read the form themselves, a witness must sign here:
I was present while the benefits, risks and procedures were read to the volunteer. All questions were answered and the volunteer has agreed to take part in the research.
Name of witness

________________________________________________   _______________________
Signature of witness       Date

I certify that the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research have been explained to the above individual.

________________________________________________
Name of Person who Obtained Consent

___________________________________________    ______________________
Signature of Person Who Obtained Consent     Date
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following survey by marking your response to each of the questions in the appropriate section of the questionnaire, with a pen or pencil. After completing the survey, please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and seal it.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation.

Section A: Demographics

1. Gender: Male □ Female □

2. Age: 18-25 □ 26-35 □ 36-45 □ above 46 □

3. Marital status: Single □ Married □ divorced □ widow/widower □

4. What is your highest level of education?
   O/ A Level □ JHS/ SSCE □ Diploma/ HND □ Degree □ Masters/ PhD

5. Respondent’s Organization ……………………………

6. How long have you worked with your current organization?
   Less than 6 months □ 6 months-1 year □ 1-4 years □ 5-10 years □
   Above 10 years □

7. Organizational Status: Junior Staff □ Senior Staff □ Senior membe □
Please indicate, by circling, the number that corresponds with the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements (1) No, I strongly disagree (2) No, I disagree (3) I'm not sure, (4) Yes, I agree, (5) Yes I strongly agree

**Section B: Perceived Organizational Politics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>People get promoted based on how much effort they put into their work and not based on partiality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rewards only come to those who work hard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are a group of people in this organization who always get things their way because no one wants to challenge them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have seen changes made in policies here that only serve the purpose of a few individuals and not that of everyone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is safer to agree with people than to say what you think</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In this organization, it is difficult to tell which extension employees must do in order to progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are a lot of uncertainties in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Those who work hard are adequately rewarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>People in this organization attempt to build themselves by tearing others down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When it comes to pay rise and promotion decisions, policies are irrelevant here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>People in this organization often use the selection system to hire only people that can help them in their future or who see things the way they do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have seen people deliberately distort information requested by others for purposes of personal gain, either by withholding it or by selectively reporting it.

My coworkers help themselves, not others.

**Section C: Organizational Culture**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements which measures organizational culture. Answer by ticking (✓) only one answer in each case. Use the scales below as a guide.  
*Strongly agree (7), Agree (6), Slightly agree (5), Neutral (4), Slightly disagree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Readiness to meet new challenges is important in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This company is dynamic and entrepreneurial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employees are willing to take risks in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commitment to innovation and development is core in this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This company emphasizes goal and task accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Competitive actions, achievements and measurable goals are important in this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The major concern in this company is getting the job done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This company is service-oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>This company is very formalized and structured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Established procedures generally govern what people do here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Permanence, stability, efficient and smooth operations are important in this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Formal rules and policies are important in this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Loyalty and tradition are important in this company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>This company is personal, it is like an extended family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High cohesion and morale in the firm are important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Commitment to this firm runs high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: Work Related Quality of Work Life Scale

Please read each of the following items carefully and indicate the extent to which you tend to exhibit each of the following behaviors. Please answer each one of the items objectively based on your own experiences. There is no right or wrong answer.

(1) No, I strongly disagree (2) No, I disagree (3) I’m not sure, (4) Yes, I agree, (5) Yes I strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What extent do you agree with the following?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I feel well at the moment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in around my family life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 My current working hours/patterns suit my personal circumstances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I often feel under pressure at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 When I have done a good job, it is acknowledged by my line manager.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I am encouraged to develop new skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I am involved in decisions that affect me in my own area of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 My line manager actively promotes flexible working hours/patterns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 In most ways my life is close to ideal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 I work in a safe environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Generally, things work out well for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I often feel excessive levels of stress at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy on all things considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The working conditions are satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am involved in decisions that affect members of the public in my own area of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section E: Organizational Support**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My organization strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My organization really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, my organization would fail to notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If given the opportunity my organization would take unfair advantage of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My organization would ignore any complaint from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My organization is willing to help me, if I need a special favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My organization values my contributions to its well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My organization would grant a reasonable request for a change in my working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My organization shows little concern for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>If my organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary it would do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: RELIABILITY OF STUDY VARIABLES

Scale: Perceived Organisational Politics

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.674</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Organisational Culture

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.939</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale: Perceived Organisational Support

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.677</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Quality of Work-Life

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.779</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CORRELATION TABLE AND DESCRIPTIVES OF STUDY VARIABLES

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>POS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.285**</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>-.285**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

#### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>46.8540</td>
<td>9.14497</td>
<td>-.562</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>85.2577</td>
<td>18.42997</td>
<td>-.834</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>79.3037</td>
<td>-1.47237</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>52.1241</td>
<td>-.344737</td>
<td>-1.152</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX IV: REGRESSION OUTPUT

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.596a</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>9.12573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), OC*

### ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5879.857</td>
<td>68.648</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>83.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: QWL*

*b. Predictors: (Constant), OC*

### Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.330</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>11.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: QWL*

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.646a</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>8.78220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Cl_C, IC, CC, BC*

### ANOVA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1724.673</td>
<td>22.361</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: QWL*

*b. Predictors: (Constant), Cl_C, IC, CC, BC*
### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>45.197</td>
<td>3.704</td>
<td>12.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl_C</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>-.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: QWL

### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.187 a</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>11.12539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.214 b</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>11.12873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.375 c</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>10.57860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), POP  
b. Predictors: (Constant), POP, POS  
c. Predictors: (Constant), POP, POS, POP_POS

### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>571.211</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>571.211</td>
<td>5.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15843.097</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>123.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16414.308</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>685.527</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>342.764</td>
<td>3.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>15728.780</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>123.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16414.308</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2314.055</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>771.352</td>
<td>3.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14100.253</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>111.907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16414.308</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: QWL  
b. Predictors: (Constant), POP  
c. Predictors: (Constant), POP, POS  
d. Predictors: (Constant), POP, POS, POP_POS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Constant)</th>
<th>POP</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>POP_POS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.218</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.148</td>
<td>3.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.217</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.199</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.174</td>
<td>3.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79.270</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>3.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.996</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.650</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: QWL*