

A Study of the Quality of Work Life for the Staff of Greek Academic Libraries

Noula Alvanoudi

Library and Information Centre of University of Macedonia, PhD Candidate of Department of Educational and Social Policy, University of Macedonia, Greece,

Abstract: The present study focused on the quality of work life for Greek academic libraries staff. The role of factors related to the working time and the participants characteristics in levels of quality of work life were additionally studied. A sample of 144 employees of Greek academic libraries was tested with the Work – Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale and with two questionnaires constructed for the study needs concerning their working time and individuals’ characteristics. According to the results, the WRQoL level was average for the participants. Although some differences were identified in the participants’ level of WRQoL with respect to the working time factors, these were not found to be statistically significant. In terms of individuals characteristics, it was found that the spouse/partner employment status, the library type, the job position and the department were significantly related to the quality of work life.

Keywords: quality of work life (QWL), quality of working life (QoWL), academic libraries, Greece, Work – Related Quality of Life (WRQoL), working time

1. Introduction

Today’s academic libraries environment is being turbulently reshaped by external environment changes and especially technological changes. As academic libraries struggle to keep up with changes, to meet new challenges and remain valuable to users, they depend more and more on their staff (Peng et al., 2010). As a user has a right to receive high quality services from library staff, so the library staff has a right to a quality of work life (QWL).

QWL is one of the most important issues of human resource management as it is linked to the quality of life. Today’s organizations in order to ensure their success need not only to attract high quality staff but to motivate and retain them as well by ensuring their high QWL. Gillespie et al. (2001) state that university employees play a key role in creating and developing knowledge and innovation, as well as in education and training to society as a whole. Libraries staff is no exception. QWL in libraries is not a concern just of administrators, managers and supervisors. QWL should be on the agenda of all library employees regardless of their job category. QWL is important because happy

and satisfied employees are productive, they relate well to patrons and co-workers and they are strong contributors to an institution's growth and improvement (Decker, 1985). According to Shamir and Salomon (1985) the phrase quality of working life (QoWL) covers the individual's job-related well-being and the extent to which his or her work experience is rewarding, fulfilling, and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences. Ketchum and Trist (1992) defined the concept of "quality of working life" as the overall state of well-being in the workplace. Sirgy et al.(n.d.) define QWL as an employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace. Moreover, QWL can be defined as "the quality of relationship between employees and the total working environment" (Aziz et al., 2011, p. 150). Martel and Dupuis (2006, p.355) suggested that: "QWL, at a given time, corresponds to a condition experienced by the individual in his or her dynamic pursuit of his or her hierarchically organized goals within work domains where the reduction of the gap separating the individual from these goals is reflected by a positive impact on the individual's general quality of life, organizational performance, and consequently the overall functioning of society".

A number of surveys have been carried out in library science about the components of the QWL job satisfaction (Adio & Popoola, 2010; Hart, 2010; Karim, 2017; Lim, 2008; Peng, 2014), job stress and burnout (Affleck, 1996; Kaur & Kathuria, 2018; Salaam et al., 2013; Shupe et al., 2015; Smith & Nelson, 1983). Moreover, some studies have been conducted for Greek libraries (Moniarou-Papaconstantinou & Triantafyllou, 2015; Togia, 2005; Togia et al., 2004; Tsigilis et al., 2004). However, the QWL of libraries' staff hasn't been the subject of many studies (Kaushik, 2012; Kazemi Koohbanani et al., 2019; Rasuli et al., 2014; Samira et al., 2012). Furthermore, only a few studies have been found for the QWL of higher education staff (Dorasamy & Letoane, 2015; Edwards et al., 2009; Hamid et al., 2014).

Job plays a major role in one's everyday life. Rising levels of concern exist about the impact that working time arrangements might be having on employees and their families and the effects of regular exposure to extended work schedules on employees' health and well-being (Wooden et al., 2009). As Aziz et al. (2011) refer work time is an important factor in the work domain and it is based on the conception that personal resources are scarce, thus time involvement in the work domain will rob time available for non-work activities. According to Ballout (2008) individuals who are highly involved in their jobs or careers may devote more time and effort to the work role than to the family role, which may cause work-family conflict. The perceived work schedule flexibility refers to an individual's subjective assessment that his or her work schedule provides the flexibility needed to handle family responsibilities, regardless of the type of schedule (Hammer et al., 1997). Findings of one study indicated that work variables such as work time and schedule inflexibility do matter in determining the QWL (Aziz et al., 2011). Thus, the changing nature of work,

and indeed changes in society itself, means that it is important to regularly update available information on the QWL. Additionally, a need for a more holistic approach, such as the QWL approach offers, exists.

The main purpose of the present study was to specify the level of QoWL for Greek academic libraries staff. Second, an important aspect of the research was the examination of factors related to the working time and the assessment of their role in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL. Finally, the role of variables related to participants characteristics (personal and occupational) in the level of QoWL was additionally studied.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Survey data was collected from 144 employees of Greek academic libraries (M=25, F=119). The majority of the participants (N= 76, 52.8% of the sample) belonged to the age group of 45-54, 48 belonged to the 35-44 group (33.3%), 13 to the age group of 55 and more (9%) and the remaining 7 (4.9%) to the 25-34 group. The 71.5% of the participants were married and the 28.5% unmarried, the 70.1% had a spouse or a partner employed (61.1% full-time and 9% part-time), while the majority of them were with children (67.4%). Regarding their educational level, the bulk of the participants (51.4%) held a master degree, the 41.6% held an undergraduate degree whilst the 6.9% had a PhD. The sample consisted mainly of librarians (N=128, 88.9%), whereas other staff categories participated in the study such as administrative (5.6%) and information technology (IT) staff (3.5%). With respect to participants current position, the 64.6% work in a central library and the 35.4% in a departmental and among the participated staff the 75% were employees, the 9.7% were library directors, whereas with the same percentage (7.6%) participated directors of departmental libraries and library department managers. Moreover, the 89.6% had a permanent employment relationship and the 10.4% a temporary. With regards to their work experience in the current library, this was more than 21 years for the 41% of the participants, for the 25% varied between 16 and 20 years, for the 13.9% between 11 and 15, for the 10.4% between 1 and 5, for the 8.3% between 6 and 10 and only for the 1.4% was less than a year. Additionally, more than half of the participants (57.63%) had also previous work experience in other libraries. Finally, the 44.4% were employed in departments with everyday contact and in departments without everyday contact with library users, the 20.8% in department/s without everyday contact with library users, the 14.6% in department/s with everyday contact with library users, the 8.3% only in management, the 9.3% in management and in other department/s as well and the 2.8% in all departments.

2.2. Instruments and procedures

Work – Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale

The Work – Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale is an evidence based measure of QoWL developed by Van Laar et al. (2007). A Greek version of the

WRQoL Scale was used to measure the QoWL of Greek academic libraries staff. The WRQoL scale incorporates a six factor structure. The six factors are based on responses to 23 items. The six factors (Table 1) are: General Well-Being (GWB), Home-Work Interface (HWI), Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS), Control at Work (CAW), Working Conditions (WCS) and Stress at Work (SAW). A 24th item (question 24) is included to provide an outcome variable for measuring the reliability and validity of the items without being included in factor or overall WRQoL scores. Participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with the 24 statements of the scale on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Factor scores are calculated by taking the average of the question scores contributing to that factor with any negatively phrased items (3 questions) first being reverse scored. Overall WRQoL factor score is determined by finding the average of all 23 WRQoL items the six factor scores.

Evaluation of WRQoL scale and sub-scale reliability

The reliability of the measurement using the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was $\alpha=.910$ for the 23 items, which indicates that the sample had reached an excellent level of reliability. Internal consistencies for the six sub-scales of the WRQoL as found in the study were also high (GWB $\alpha=.808$, HWI $\alpha=.805$, JCS $\alpha=.829$, CAW $\alpha=.799$, WCS $\alpha=.779$, and SAW $\alpha=.778$). and similar to Edwards et al. (2009) and Van Laar et al. (2007) (Table 1).

Working time: a 8item questionnaire was constructed and customized to academic libraries' needs and reality in order to collect data on working time factors (working hours, overtime, schedule- work shifts, commuting time, flexibility, work in free time). The questions were based on the Greek version of the 6th European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) questionnaire of European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working conditions (Eurofound, 2019) .

Individual characteristics: a 13item questionnaire was administered and customized to academic libraries' needs and reality in order to collect data on independent variables regarding:

- a. Personal data (6 questions): gender, age, family status, spouse/ partner work status, number of children, educational level
- b. Occupational data (7 questions): specialization, job position, employment relationship, years of work experience, department/s, library type (central or departmental)

The three questionnaires were tried out in a pilot study among five people in Greek academic libraries (three employees, one department manager and one library director) and were found to be suitable for the present study. Requests to

Sub-scale	Name	Abbreviation	Measurement of	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha	Edwards et al., (2009) Comparison	Van Laar et al., (2007) Comparison
1	General Well-Being	GWB	How much you agree you feel generally content with life as a whole	6	0.808	0.85	0.86
2	Home-Work Interface	HWI	How far you agree that the organization understands and tries to help you with pressures outside of work	3	0.805	0.90	0.82
3	Job & Career Satisfaction	JCS	How far you agree that you are generally happy with your ability to do your work	6	0.829	0.78	0.82
4	Control at Work	CAW	How far you agree you feel you are involved in decisions that affect you at work	3	0.799	0.81	0.81
5	Working Conditions	WCS	The extent you agree that you are happy with conditions in which you work	3	0.779	0.72	0.81
6	Stress at Work	SAW	How far you agree you feel you experience stress at work	2	0.778	0.79	0.75

participate in the study were distributed at Greek academic libraries staff via Acadelib Hellenic Libraries Electronic Mailing List (Acadelib). The

participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. The participants were assured that the results will be used exclusively for research purposes.

2.3. Data Analysis

Initially, descriptive analyses were conducted for the WRQoL scale and its six factors, the factors of the working time and the individual characteristics. The cut- offs (lower, average and higher level of QoWL) given by Easton and Van Laar, (2012) in UK higher education norms were followed. A series of analyses was run to examine the effects of working time factors and individual characteristics on the Greek academic libraries staff level of QoWL. The Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were used to find out whether the data show normal dispersion or not. For the data showing normal dispersion t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were applied. A follow-up (post hoc) Scheffé test was used when significant differences were present. Eta-square values were used to estimate effect sizes for each paired comparison in all ANOVAs. According to Green and Salkind (2016), eta-square values of 0.01, 0.06, and 0.15 represent, respectively, small, medium, and large effect sizes. For the data that didn't disperse normally Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests were used. For the statistical analysis of the quantitative data, SPSS 25.00 was used.

3. Findings

The findings from the study can be summarized under three major headings which are:

1. QoWL for Greek academic libraries staff
2. Working time factors and their role in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL
3. The role of individual characteristics in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL

QoWL for Greek academic libraries staff

The first aim of the study was to specify the level of QoWL for Greek academic libraries staff. According to the total descriptive statistics of WRQoL (Table 2), the QoWL was average ($M=79.93$, $SD= 12.84$), while the total score in the scale varied from 39 (low QoWL) to 109 (high QoWL).

Table 2
Overall WRQoL Score- Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mea n	Std. Deviation
Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL)	14	39	109	79.9	12.840
	4			3	

The descriptive statistics (minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation/SD for the six subscales of WRQoL can be found in Table 3. Levels of GWB, HWI, JCS, CAW were average ($M=22.10$ / $SD=3.722$, $M=10.52/SD=2.623$, $M=20.99/SD=4.313$, $M=10.34/SD=2.490$, respectively),

while levels of WCS and SAW were low (M= 10.47/ SD=2.394 and M= 5.551/SD=1.921, respectively). For none of the factors the mean was at the higher level.

Table 3
Scores on 6 WRQoL subscales- Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mea n	Std. Deviation
General Well-being (GWB)	14 4	12	30	22.1 0	3.722
Home-Work Interface (HWI)	14 4	3	15	10.5 2	2.623
Job and Career Satisfaction (JCS)	14 4	6	30	20.9 9	4.313
Control at Work (CAW)	14 4	3	15	10.3 4	2.490
Working Conditions (WCS)	14 4	4	15	10.4 7	2.394
Stress at Work (SAW)	14 4	2	10	5.51	1.921

Regarding participants answers in question 24 (“I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working life (OVL)”), these were between neutral and agree (M=3.61, SD= .820), with minimum and maximum 1 and 5 respectively. Closely linked with the OVL is GWB which was found to be average.

As can be seen in Table 4, the 37.5% of the sample belonged to the group experiencing higher QoWL, for the 35.42% the QoWL was average and for the 27.08% was low. Although there wasn’t big difference between the number of those with high QoWL (N=54) and those with average QoWL (N=51), most participants indicated a high QoWL. Regarding the six subscales, what is worth noting is that although HWI and CAW were average, for the bulk of the participants the level was high (45.14% and 36.8% respectively).

Table 4
Greek Academic Libraries Staff in the groups of low, average and high scores in QoWL and six factors and the respective levels

	Low	Average	Higher	Level
QoWL	N=39 (27.08%)	N=51 (35.42%)	N=54 (37.5%)	Average
GWB	N=26/ (18.05%)	N=60 (41.67%)	N=58 (40.28%)	Average
HWI	N=51 (35.42%)	N=28 (19.44%)	N=65 (45.14%)	Average
JCS	N=36 (25%)	N=55 (38.2%)	N=53 (36, 8%)	Average
CAW	N=43(29.86%)	N=48 (33.33%)	N=53 (36.8%)	Average
WCS	N=63 (43.75%)	N=26 (18.05%)	N=55(38.2%)	Low
SAW	N=68 (47.2%)	N=48 (33.3%)	N=28 (19.4%)	Low

Working time factors and their role in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL

The second aim of the study was to examine the factors related to the working time and to assess their role in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL. According to the descriptive statistics of working time factors the 67.4% of the participants work 40h/ week, the 26.4% between 25 and 38h/week and only the 6.3% work between 42 and 56h/week. Apart from the morning shifts that all the participants have, the majority of them have also afternoon shifts (74.3% with the 34% every week, the 32.6% 1-3 times/ month and the 7.7% less often), while only the 20.8% work on Saturdays (10.4% every two months, 8.3% 1-3 times/month, 0.7% every week and the rest 1.4% less often). Commuting time from home to work and back was found to be up to 30' for more than half of the participants (51.4%), between 35' and 60' for the 36.8% and more than an hour for the 11.8%. Moreover, the 31.2% work at least once in a month more than 10 hours a day and the 28.5% had in the last month at least once less than 11 hours between the end of one working day and the start of the next working day. Regarding working time arrangements, the majority of the participants can choose between several fixed working schedules determined by the organization (56.9%), for the 25% they are set by the organization, the 16% can adapt their working hours within certain limits (e.g. flextime) and only for the 2.1% working hours are entirely determined by themselves. Additionally, changes occur regularly to the working time arrangements for the 31.9% and the 15.3% of them are informed several days in advance, the 11.1% the day before, the 4.9% several weeks in advance and only one participant answered that he or she is informed the same day (0.7%). Finally, the 79.2% during the last 12 months had worked in their free time to meet work demands (2.8% daily, 5.6% several times a week, 18.8% several times a month and 52.1% less often).

The QoWL differences according to working time factors were examined. Although, some differences were identified in the participants' level of QoWL with respect to the working time factors, these were not found to be statistically significant. Only QoWL differences according to commuting time from home to work and back were found to be close to significance ($p=.060$). The descriptive statistics revealed that for the half of the participants (51.4%) the commuting time was up to half an hour, the QoWL was higher (82.58) than the rest of the participants that need more than 35' to commute from home to work and back (48,6%). The descriptive statistics of other working factors in relation to QoWL revealed also some important differences. The QoWL for the participants who work on Saturdays (20.93%) was higher (83.2) in comparison to the QoWL (79.07) of the big majority (79.2%) that don't work on Saturdays. More specifically, for those that work 1-3 times/month on Saturdays the QoWL was 81.08 (average), for those that work every 2 months was 82.73 (average), while for those that work less often the QoWL was at the higher level (101). Regarding the QoWL of those that changes to their working time arrangements occur on a regular basis (31.9%), the earlier the staff is informed about these changes the higher the QoWL is (83.57 if they are notified several weeks in advance and less if they are notified later). Moreover, the 79.2% of the

participants don't work in their free time to meet work demands and their QoWL is higher (82.10) compared to those that work (79.36, 20.8%).

Results for the factors of WRQoL revealed some significant differences in terms of some working time factors. Specifically, work in free time was found to be significantly related to CAW, JCS and SAW ($p=.049$, $.038$, $.035$ respectively), work on Saturdays to be significantly related to CAW ($p=.022$) and the less than 11 hours between the end of one working day and the start of the next working day (at least once in the last month) to be significantly related to HWI ($.032$). GWB differences according to commuting time from home to work and back were found to be close to significance ($p=.050$). No working time factor was significantly related to WCS factor.

The role of individual characteristics in Greek academic libraries staff QoWL

The third aim of the study was to assess the role of variables related to participants characteristics (personal and occupational) in the level of QoWL. The QoWL differences according to individual characteristics were examined. In terms of individual personal characteristics, it was found that the spouse/partner employment status was significantly related to the QoWL ($p=.034$). As the Scheffé test that followed the ANOVA indicated, the participants whose spouse/ partner is employed full-time reported higher QoWL ($M=81.48$, $SD= 12.786$) than those whose spouse/partner is employed part-time ($M= 70.92$, $SD= 11.779$), $F(3,140)=2.978$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2=.06$. No significant QoWL differences were found related to other personal characteristics of the participants. With respect to participants occupational characteristics, it is revealed that the library type, the job position and the department/s of this position were significantly related to the QoWL ($p= .010$, $p=.003$ and $p=.011$ respectively). Regarding library type the QoWL was higher for those that work in central library (82.13) than those that work in a departmental (75.92). Post-hoc analysis followed the ANOVA's for job position and department/s of this position. The Scheffé test indicated that library directors reported higher QoWL ($M=92.91$, $SD=13.932$) than employees ($M= 78.87$, $SD=12.2$), $F(4,139)= 4.157$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2=.107$) who experience average QoWL and that those who are only employed at library management experienced higher QoWL ($M= 91.33$, $SD=13.5$) than the participants that work in library management and in other departments in parallel who experience average QoWL ($M=79.15$, $SD= 11.796$), $F(5,138)= 3.104$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2= .101$. Moreover, QoWL differences according to specialization were found to be close to significance ($p=.051$). No significant differences were found on the level of QoWL regarding other occupational characteristics. Crosstabulations and Chi-Square Tests revealed that the majority of the women (79% within sex) work afternoon shifts compared to the half of men (52% within sex). Gender and work in the afternoon or not are found to be dependent ($\chi^2 =7884$, $df= 1$, $p=.005<.05$).

As regards the factors of WRQoL, statistically significant differences were found

mainly in relation to occupational data of the participants. Specifically, job position was found to be significantly related to the five factors GWB, HWI, JCS, CAW and WCS ($p=.022, .040, .002, .018, .007$ respectively), library type to be significantly related to HWI, JCS, CAW, WCS ($p=.001, .014, .001, .008$ respectively), department/s to be significantly related to GWB, JCS and CAW ($p=.007, .005, .007$ respectively), and work experience in other library/s to be significantly related to WCS ($p=.019$). With respect to personal data, HWI was found to be significantly related to spouse/partner work status ($p=.018$) and JCS to educational level ($p=.042$).

4. Conclusions

This study examined the QoWL for Greek academic libraries staff and the role of factors related to the working time and the participants characteristics in levels of QoWL. In line with the results, the QoWL of Greek academic libraries staff was average. According to WRQoL scale, the average level may indicate that their working life overall possibly does not provide participants with very high levels of satisfaction, but they are not wholly dissatisfied either. An average level of QoWL was also found in a study on Mazandaran province (Iran) public libraries managers (Samira et al., 2012), whilst QoWL experienced by library professionals in Haryana state (India) was also not found to be very high (Kaushik, 2012). Not consistent with the study were the results of another study that indicated that the librarians at the Iranian public libraries have a high QoWL (Kazemi Koohbanani et al., 2019). The level of QoWL was likewise found to be relatively high in one study to librarians of Tehran (Rasuli et al., 2014).

Findings of the study indicated also that the bulk of the respondents have achieved work life balance and they feel they are involved in decisions that affect them at work (HWI and CAW were at the higher level). Nonetheless, the majority of the participants proved to be dissatisfied with the working conditions in which they work (WCS were at the low level). The fact that participants proved to be dissatisfied with fundamental resources, work environment, safety and security to do their job effectively can have a significant adverse effect on their overall QoWL. Findings of another study in higher education employees indicated that they are not only dissatisfied with working conditions (WCS), but with their jobs and careers (JCS) and control at work (CAW) as well (Edwards et al., 2009). The unpleasant work environment was the most popular response among the reasons of leaving the profession of librarian in one study (Luzius & Ard, 2006). An important finding was that the majority of the participants didn't feel overloaded and stressed (SAW was at the low level). In contrast, higher education employees that participated in one study reported that they are stressed at work (SAW). The academic librarians of one study found to experience stress at or above the level experienced by other occupations (Shupe et al., 2015). Greek academic librarians of another study seem to experience relatively low levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization in burnout and moderate levels of personal accomplishment

(Togia, 2005) and the same was the case for other academic librarians (Smith & Nelson, 1983).

The findings of the study provide us with useful information about the working time factors for Greek academic libraries staff. The QoWL differences according to working time factors were also examined. Although some differences were identified in the participants' level of WRQoL with respect to the working time factors, these were not found to be statistically significant. However, results for the factors of WRQoL revealed some significant differences in terms of some working time factors. Specifically, work in free time was found to be significantly related to CAW, JCS and SAW, work on Saturdays to be significantly related to CAW and the less than 11 hours between the end of one working day and the start of the next working day (at least once the last month) to be significantly related to HWI.

The QoWL differences according to individual characteristics (personal and occupational) were examined too. In terms of individuals characteristics, it was found that the spouse/partner employment status, the library type, the job position and the department/s were significantly related to the QoWL. As regards the factors of WRQoL, statistically significant differences were found mainly in relation to occupational data of the participants. Specifically, job position was found to be significantly related to GWB, HWI, JCS, CAW and WCS, library type to be significantly related to HWI, JCS, CAW, WCS, department/s to be significantly related to GWB, JCS and CAW, and work experience in other library/s to be significantly related to WCS. With respect to personal data, HWI was found to be significantly related to spouse/partner work status and JCS to educational level. Individual characteristics such as gender, age, family status, number of children, specialization, employment relationship were not found to be significantly related to either the QoWL or the factors of WRQoL. According to the findings of one study in library professionals, individual characteristics such as gender, marital status and nature of job (supervisory or non-supervisory) were not significantly related to QoWL factors (Kaushik, 2012).

The WRQoL scale proved to be appropriate and useful in measuring QoWL of Greek academic libraries staff and the aims of the study were satisfied. It is proposed that it can appropriately be used in libraries to assess QoWL. The present study offers an important window on the academic libraries staff' perspectives on QoWL and contributes to an understanding of QoWL in the Greek library workplace. In national level there has not been any similar study in the field of Library science. Furthermore, the findings of this study advanced our knowledge on working time factors and shed light on the individual characteristics that can mainly affect the QoWL of Greek academic libraries staff. The usefulness of the results lies in the fact that the study can provide feedback on employers, trade unions, and lifelong learning and can also be

beneficial in trends in human resource management. The study can, also, provide a perspective for future research through WRQoL scale long-term exploitation.

Measuring and improving the QoWL could create a more capable and productive workforce for the benefit of all stakeholders (organization, employee and user). A QoWL plan can be a library's project, a department project, a management style. It can start anywhere, with anyone. Consideration of the subscales scores may help to identify areas that changes and adjustments should be done in order to best meet the needs of the participating staff. Such changes could result in a higher QoWL and help staff feel good about life in general.

References

- Adio, G., & Popoola, S. O. (2010). Job satisfaction and career commitment of librarians in federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Library Review*, 59(3): 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242531011031160>
- Affleck, M. A. (1996). Burnout among bibliographic instruction librarians. *Library & Information Science Research*, 18(2): 165–183. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188\(96\)90018-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188(96)90018-3)
- Aziz, R. A., Nadzar, F. M., Husaini, H., Maarof, A., Radzi, S. M., & Ismail, I. (2011). Quality of work life of librarians in government academic libraries in the Klang Valley, Malaysia. *International Information & Library Review*, 43(3): 149–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2011.10762893>
- Ballout, H. I. (2008). Work-family conflict and career success: The effects of domain-specific determinants. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(5): 437–466. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710810871781>
- Decker, J. S. (1985). QWL in Academic/Research Libraries. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 3(1–2): 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1300/J124v03n01_05
- Dorasamy, N., & Letoane, M. K. (2015). Job and career satisfaction in higher education institutions: A case study of university “A” in South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(4): 258–269 <http://openscholar.dut.ac.za/handle/10321/2205>
- Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2012). *User manual for the Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale: A measure of quality of working life* (2nd ed.). University of Portsmouth.
- Edwards, J. A., Van Laar, D., Easton, S., & Kinman, G. (2009). The Work-related Quality of Life Scale for Higher Education Employees. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(3): 207–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320903343057>
- Eurofound. (2019). 6th European Working Conditions Survey. Access date 01.04.2020. Available at: https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/page/field_ef_documents/el_questionnaire.pdf
- Gillespie, N. A., Walsh, M., Winefield, A. H., Dua, J., & Stough, C. (2001). Occupational stress in universities: Staff perceptions of the causes, consequences and moderators of stress. *Work & Stress*, 15(1): 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026783701117944>
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. (2016). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Hamid, Z., Zolfa, H., & Zahra, K. A. (2014). Identification the components of Quality of Work Life and measuring them in faculty members of Tehran University. *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 7(1): 41–66.

- Hammer, L. B., Allen, E., & Grigsby, T. D. (1997). Work–Family Conflict in Dual-Earner Couples: Within-Individual and Crossover Effects of Work and Family. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2): 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.1557>
- Hart, G. (2010). Job Satisfaction in a South African Academic Library in Transition. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(1): 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2009.11.006>
- Karim, N. H. A. (2017). Investigating the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction among Malaysian academic librarians. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 13(2): 69–88.
- Kaur, H., & Kathuria, K. (2018). Occupational Stress among Library Professionals Working in Universities of Punjab and Chandigarh. *International Journal of Information Dissemination and Technology*, 8(1): 22–24.
- Kaushik, S. (2012). Quality of Work Life among Library Professionals in Haryana State. *International Journal of Reseach in Commerce & Management*, 3(3): 131–134.
- Kazemi Koohbanani, H., Zarei, A., & Erfani, N. (2019). Measuring the librarians' quality of working life in the Iranian public libraries. *Library Management*, 40(8/9): 532–542. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-11-2018-0089>
- Ketchum, P. L., & Trist, E. (1992). *All Teams are not Created Equal: How Employee Empowerment Really Works*. Sage.
- Lim, S. (2008). Job satisfaction of information technology workers in academic libraries. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30(2): 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2007.10.002>
- Luzius, J., & Ard, A. (2006). Leaving the Academic Library. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(6): 593–598. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.06.004>
- Martel, J.-P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of Work Life: Theoretical and Methodological Problems, and Presentation of a New Model and Measuring Instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77(2): 333–368. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-5368-4>
- Moniarou-Papaconstantinou, V., & Triantafyllou, K. (2015). Job satisfaction and work values: Investigating sources of job satisfaction with respect to information professionals. *Library & Information Science Research*, 37(2): 164–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2015.02.006>
- Peng, Y.-P. (2014). Job satisfaction and job performance of university librarians: A disaggregated examination. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(1): 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2013.02.006>
- Peng, Y.-P., Hwang, S.-N., & Wong, J.-Y. (2010). How to Inspire University Librarians to Become “Good Soldiers”? The Role of Job Autonomy. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(4): 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2010.05.002>
- Rasuli, B., Naghshineh, N., & Fahimnia, F. (2014). Investigating the Quality of Work Life Experienced by Public Librarians in the libraries of Tehran. *Research on Information Science and Public Libraries*, 20(2): 317–331.
- Salaam, M. O., Alawiye, M. K., & Okunlaya, R. O. A. (2013). Occupational stress among university librarians in Nigeria. *PNLA Quarterly*, 77(2): 143–150.
- Samira, E., Abdolreza, N. C., & Hajar, Z. (2012). The study of Mazandaran province public libraries manager's views toward the quality of working life and its role in their performance. *Journal of Epistemology*, 5(16): 1–17.
- Shamir, B., & Salomon, I. (1985). Work-At-Home and the Quality of Working Life. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3): 455–464. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1985.4278957>
- Shupe, E. I., Wambaugh, S. K., & Bramble, R. J. (2015). Role-related Stress Experienced by Academic Librarians. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 41(3): 264–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.03.016>

- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D.-J. (n.d.). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(3): 241–302. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010986923468>
- Smith, N. M., & Nelson, V. C. (1983). Burnout: A Survey of Academic Reference Librarians (Research Note). *College & Research Libraries*, 44(3): 245–250.
- Togia, A. (2005). Measurement of burnout and the influence of background characteristics in Greek academic librarians. *Library Management*, 26(3): 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01435120510580870>
- Togia, A., Koustelios, A., & Tsigilis, N. (2004). Job satisfaction among Greek academic librarians. *Library & Information Science Research*, 26(3): 373–383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2004.01.004>
- Tsigilis, N., Koustelios, A., & Togia, A. (2004). Multivariate relationship and discriminant validity between job satisfaction and burnout. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(7): 666–675. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940410559365>
- Van Laar, D. V., Edwards, J. A., & Easton, S. (2007). The Work-Related Quality of Life scale for healthcare workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 60(3): 325–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04409.x>
- Wooden, M., Warren, D., & Drago, R. (2009). Working Time Mismatch and Subjective Well-being. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(1): 147–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8543.2008.00705.x>