

# **The Impact of Work Climate Factors on the Quality of Work Life – Case Study: Food and Beverage Industry Sector, Gaza Strip**

الهابيل وسيم إسماعيل الهابيل, دكتور, الجامعة الإسلامية بغزة, walhabil@iugaza.edu.ps, PALESTINE

الحايك رمضان رزق الحايك, الباحث, الجامعة الإسلامية بغزة, walhabil@iugaza.edu.ps, PALESTINE

Wasim I. Al-Habil is an associate professor working at the College of Commerce in the Islamic University of Gaza, Palestine. His research focuses on public administration in the Middle East and Palestine.

Ramadan Rizeq Elhayek is a researcher working as a Palestinian public administrator.

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to investigate the impact of work climate on the quality of work life of the staff members in the food and beverage industry sector in the Gaza strip, Palestine. We used an adaptable model generated to represent the work climate through the supportive management, intrinsic and extrinsic reward, decision autonomy, social support, health and safety at work and the physical work environment to investigate the impact of these elements on quality of work life. We discussed the impact of work climate factors on the quality of work life and made recommendations for further researches and organizations.

## **Key words:**

work climate, quality of work life, food and beverage industry sector.

## INTRODUCTION

An efficient management and human resources play a major role in achieving the organization's goals and objectives. Their role in the developing systems is undeniable. So, any organization based its success on how it attracts, recruits, motivates, and retains its workforce. Today's organizations need to be more flexible so that they are equipped to develop their workforce and enjoy their commitment.

Therefore, organizations are required to adopt a strategy to improve the QWL to satisfy both the organizational objectives and employee needs. (Sajjad & Abbasi, 2014)

Basically, QWL is all about employee involvement, which consists of methods to motivate employees to participate in decision making and enhance the organization's value. (Venkatram, 2005)

Studies have proven that organizations offering better QWL are more likely to gain leverage in hiring and retaining its valuable work force. Organizational turnover has been a central research topic for nearly 90 years, which can result in severe negative consequences for the organization. (Korunka et al., 2008)

Performance improvement at most organizations is not depending only on the successful deployment of tangible assets and natural resources but also on the effectiveness of the intangible resources which almost became the most important assets that the organization may gain. Therefore, motivating and retaining workers push the performance level toward high levels, in which raise the organization's value. It can be done by improving the working conditions and enhancing the QWL among the labor. (Conklin, 2001)

Just as weather climates affect people who live in them, the same can be said about a work climate. Healthy, communicative work environments support an efficient work force that is ready to commit daily to its assigned tasks to keep the company running profitably. A poor work climate, on the other hand, doesn't support a strong, motivated team environment. In a poor work climate and conditions such as one of ineffective communication and unfocused supervision, the productive goals can become unclear. Employees may lack interest or motivation which is likely to decrease productivity even further. Even if employees are still productive, it may be wasted if they are working on tasks that don't

fit into crucial company goals. In this way, a good work climate is one that is supported and enhanced by effective management. (Cyprus and Bailey, 2014)

In Palestine, especially in Gaza strip, the industrial sector faces obstacles due to several reasons such as the Israeli occupation's actions and lack of protection by the Palestinian authorities in which affect the work climate directly or indirectly, as well as the QWL among the workforce. Therefore, this study investigates the impact of work climate factors on QWL among the workers and employees in the food and beverages industry sector in Gaza strip, Palestine.

### **Problem statement**

The problem generated primarily from the suffering of Palestinian economy which faces difficulties by the Israeli occupation in which led to a weak economy that cannot meet the needs of the Palestinians. According to the ministry of labor statistics; in the first half of 2014, 48 Palestinian workers at the food and beverage industry sector in Gaza strip were injured during their work due to non-safe and non-appropriate work climate. In 2013, more than 870 complaints have been submitted by the workers to the ministry. Most of these complaints were created due to unacceptable quality of work life and work climate surrounding the workers.

Besides highlighting the importance of the work climate and QWL, the study aims to investigate the influence of work climate factors on the QWL, so the research problem can be summarized by answering the following question:

What are the major factors of work climate that influence the level of quality of work life in the food industry sector?

In addition, the research tries to answer other sub-questions including:

- How far do the factors of work climate affect QWL at the food industry sector in Gaza strip?
- How do staff members perceive their managers in relation to supporting their work conditions?
- What role can the food industry sector play in helping to shape QWL that aim to provide and improve better work climate and conditions?

## Research Objectives

The research pursues to achieve the following objectives:

- Identify, highlight, and characterize the concepts of work climate and QWL.
- Create the awareness of the importance of work climate and QWL at organizations.
- Explore as much as possible the relationship between QWL and the work climate.
- Explore the most affecting factors of work climate on the food Industry sector, Gaza.
- Examine what employees perceive as positive and negative aspects of their work conditions.
- Suggest some recommendations to increase the effectiveness of work climate and to improve the QWL at the food industry sector, Gaza strip.

## Research Hypotheses

To examine the effect of the work climate factors on the QWL, the following hypotheses are formulated:

- Hypothesis 1: There is a statistical significant relationship between work climate and QWL.

And hence the following sub hypotheses are generated:

1. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “supportive management” and QWL.
2. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “intrinsic & extrinsic reward” and QWL.
3. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “decision autonomy” and QWL.
4. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “health and safety” and QWL.
5. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “social support” and QWL.
6. There is a statistical significant relationship between the “physical work environment” and QWL.

- Hypothesis 2: There is a statistical significant effect of the work climate factors (supportive management – intrinsic and extrinsic reward – decision autonomy – health and safety at work – social support – physical work environment) on the QWL.
- Hypothesis 3: There is a significant difference among respondents toward (the effect of work climate on the QWL) due to personal traits (age, education, years of experience, position).

### **Research Variables:**

*Main independent variable is: work climate.*

- **Sub-variables:**

1. Supportive management.
2. Intrinsic & extrinsic reward.
3. Decision autonomy.
4. Health & safety at work.
5. Social support.
6. Physical work environment.
7. Individual characteristics (age, education, years of experience, position).

- **Dependent Variable:**

1. QWL.

### **Research Terms**

**Quality of work life (QWL):** Gayathiri and Ramakrishnan (2013) defined QWL as the favorable conditions and environments of a workplace that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing them with rewards, job security, and growth opportunities. In addition, they found that some researchers pointed out that QWL is not only related to personnel's well-being and their attitudes and feelings towards their job but also goes beyond job satisfaction.

Studies found that also job satisfaction beside the employees' life outside of work is affected by QWL.

When employees' needs are not met, they are likely to experience work-life stress which may have

adverse consequences on their well-being and job performance (Li and Yeo, 2011). QWL programs attempt to address almost every aspect of an employee's working life, many of that are related to human resources policies and strategies (Harrington and Ladge, 2009). The perceived QWL is often associated with fulfillment of complex psychological needs of the individual to achieve optimal experience and functioning (Ryan and Deci, 2001).

**QWL constructs:** No one can deny that QWL is a systematic approach in which people generally have a perception toward it. To focus on the improvement of satisfaction and productivity of employees, it is urgently needed to enhance and improve the autonomous work groups, job enrichment and active-involvement. Therefore, it requires employee commitment to the organization and an environment in which this commitment can flourish. Various authors and researchers have proposed models of QWL which include a wide range of factors. Studies concluded that the family's psychological support and the diversion that it entails make it a crucial factor affecting QWL. They concluded that studies support the facts that a happy family life has a positive effect on the greater job satisfaction and objective career achievement with a directly proportional relationship. As well as, they found that the most important factors of QWL are work environment, supervisory behavior, ancillary programs, organizational commitment, job involvement, health & safety, and compensation and retirement benefits. So, QWL could be considered as a holistic concept. (Sheel et al., 2012)

**Work climate:** Cyprus and Bailey (2003) defined work climate as an expression of the working conditions available in the workplace. In addition, they added that business climates affect how well company goals are being met because maximum efficiency, production and employee motivation are impossible when the work climate is poor. Moreover, they stated that effective work climates ensure that employees are clear about their purpose in the larger realm of the company and know exactly what is expected of them. In this way, companies can better function as a whole to meet their goals.

## **Work climate components**

**Supportive management:** Supportive management refers to managers' concerns and support for subordinates' work and represents the degree to which they create a facilitative climate of support, trust, and helpfulness. Studies view supportive management as a major dimension of employees' psychological safety in the workplace. (Yoon et al., 2001)

A definition by D'Ambrosio (2011), defined supportive management as a genuine respect for all employees. He said that it doesn't matter whether someone sweeps the floor or directs human resources; each person deserves to be treated with respect and civility.

**Intrinsic & extrinsic reward:** Wigfield and others (2004) explained intrinsic motivation as a motivation that is driven by an interest or enjoyment in the task itself, and exists within the individual rather than relying on any external pressure. Intrinsic motivation is based on taking pleasure in an activity rather working towards an external reward.

Extrinsic motivation refers to the performance of an activity in order to attain an outcome, which then contradicts intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation comes from outside of the individual. Common extrinsic motivations are rewards like money and grades, coercion and threat of punishment.

Competition is in general extrinsic because it encourages the performer to win and beat others, not to enjoy the intrinsic rewards of the activity. A crowd cheering on the individual and trophies are also extrinsic incentives. (Ryan & Deci, 2001)

**Decision autonomy:** Ghoshal and Nohria (1989) clarified decision (or decision-making) autonomy in which it affords the freedom to implement changes at the subsidiary level, and it can be one of the mechanisms used by managers to implement their strategies.

Researchers stated that "it is important to note that the level of decision autonomy afforded to subsidiary managers and the managers' perceptions of global integration pressures are two distinct constructs: global integration pressure concerns the characteristics of an organization as a whole (i.e.,

the construct relates to strategy), and decision autonomy concerns the characteristics of the subsidiary (i.e., the construct relates to implementation).” (Takeuchi et al., 2008, pp. 46)

**Social support:** The European Union Health Information System (2009) stated that social support is a concept that is generally understood in an intuitive sense, as the help from other people in a difficult life situation. As well as, it mentioned that Cobb (1976) was the first who put forward for the definition of social support. He defined social support as ‘the individual belief that one is cared for and loved, esteemed and valued, and belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligations’. In the MINDFUL project (2008) social support is defined as ‘the perceived availability of people whom the individual trusts and who make one feel cared for and valued as a person’.

**Health & safety:** As an employee, he or she has rights that protect him/her against health and safety hazards on the job. He or she has the right to participate in workplace health and safety issues and to know about any potential hazards. Therefore, he or she also has the right to refuse work that they believe is dangerous and to stop working in certain circumstances.

Oak Ridge National Lab (2008) defined health and safety at work as an area concerned with protecting the safety, health and welfare of people engaged in work or employment. The goals of occupational safety and health programs include to foster a safe and healthy work environment.

The European Commission for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (2010) reported that a safe and healthy working environment is an essential element of the quality of work. Health and safety at work represents today one of the most important advanced fields of the social policy.

**Physical work environment:** Sirgy and others (2001) stated that the physical work environment centers on the physical space that the employee is working in or a space that will be used in the future. They recommended that the physical environment should be safe and healthy, and provide the resources necessary to complete the assigned task. An ideal physical environment is mentally stimulated with all of the necessary job tools present and ready for use.



The World Health Organization (WHO) (2010) defined physical work environment as the part of the workplace facility that can be detected by human or electronic senses, including the structure, air, machines, furniture, products, chemicals, materials and processes that are present or that occur in the workplace, and which can affect the physical or mental safety, health and well-being of workers. If the worker performs his or her tasks outdoors or in a vehicle, then that location is the physical work environment.

### **Palestinian food industry sector**

Definitely, food is considered as one of the basic needs of humans and animals alike. It has been known since old times how individual and collective practices followed several ways of keeping dietary and storage from time to time for self-preservation and the rights of the struggle for survival, these rights were used in several ways, including salting, drying and storing grain in drilling covered. Before 60 years ago, the food industries in Gaza strip started manually by making carbonated beverages such as "7-up" (Abu Ful, 1996). But after the year (1967), new industries started to enter to the region affected by the pattern of new quote from Israeli industries, and continued until the end of April (1999) to become more than 140 manual and a semi-automatic and automatic factories (Mahmoud, 1999). The number of institutions operating in the industry of food products and beverages in the Gaza governorates is (551) establishments, until the end of 2010. While the number of institutions in the entire industrial sector in Gaza governorates is (3777), and this means that the food and beverage industries represented in terms of the number of institutions (14.6%) of the volume of industry in the Gaza Strip in 2012. (PCBS, 2011)

Food industries represent in terms of the number of workers (16%) of the total manpower in the industrial sector of Palestine in 1998, this had risen to (17.3) in 2004, while in 2010 the food industry employs (3,133) workers in the Gaza Strip, representing (25.2%) of the total manpower in the industrial sector in the provinces of Gaza. (PCBS, 2011)

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### ➤ Bahar and Nassar, 2014

#### **The influence of QWL on Work Engagement**

This study aimed to investigate the level of QWL at the Ministry of Education and the education department at the UNRWA – principals and teachers. As well as, its purpose was to determine the QWL factors that affect the work engagement at both bodies – UNRWA and government. The study found that there is a statistical relationship between QWL and work engagement at both bodies – UNRWA and government. In addition, it found that QWL in both bodies is acceptable as well the work engagement.

### ➤ Bindu and Yashika, 2014

#### **QWL with Special Reference to Academic Sector**

This study aims to investigate the aspects of employee's life – QWL, specially his work and work environment. As well as, it identified the main factors affecting QWL. The findings showed that QWL of teachers at academic sector is below satisfaction.

### ➤ Norton, Zacher, and Ashkanasy, 2014

#### **Organizational Sustainability Policies and Employee Green Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Work Climate Perceptions**

The aim of this study is to investigate green work climate perceptions as mediators of the relationships between the perceived presence of an organizational sustainability policy and two forms of employee green behavior EGB. The study revealed that there are positive relationships between the perceived presence of an organizational sustainability policy and self-report task-related and proactive EGB, and confirmed that these relationships were fully mediated by green work climate perceptions of the organization and of co-workers, respectively.

➤ **Sajjad and Abbasi, 2014**

**Studying the Relationship between QWL and Organizational Commitment**

The purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between the qualities of work life with organizational commitment amongst the customs employees of Iran/Guilan province. The results proved that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between the QWL and its dimensions including safe and healthy environment, development of human capabilities, constitutionalism, social integration and the total life space with the organizational commitment. The results of model fit indices have an acceptable range, which allows the conclusion that the fit of the model is acceptable.

➤ **Greenan, Narcy, and Volkoff, 2013**

**Ageing, Changes, and Quality of Working Life**

The aim of this study is to examine whether company level changes affect differentially the quality of working life according to employees' age. The researchers used data from a French linked employer-employee survey. The results showed that the influence of changes in the use of information and communication technologies ICTs and management tools on the QWL of older workers have a less negative effect than expected. As well as, the indicator of fair work recognition that they used is the only one that is found sensitive to changes, with a lower frequency in changing firms compared with inert ones.

➤ **Mosadeghrad, 2013**

**Quality of Working Life and Turnover Intentions: Implications for Nursing Management**

The main purpose of this study was to explore the status of QWL among hospital nurses in Isfahan, Iran. The findings showed that hospital nurses reported low levels of QWL. The most important predictor of QWL was disturbance handling, followed by job proud, job security and job stress.

➤ **Singh and Srivastav, 2012**

**QWL and Organization Efficiency: A Proposed Framework**

The purpose of this paper was to understand and develop the concept of QWL in an organization and to identify factors especially in the internal environment of an organization that leads to QWL. The results showed that the proposed conceptual model provides a good justification for determining the level of satisfaction with QWL in an organization whether it is adequate or superior. A superior level of QWL in an organization suggest that the gap between the employee and employer/organization perception on various factors of QWL is less or negligible while QWL adequacy in an organization suggest that the gap is quite prominent and needs to be amended or reduced for organizational efficiency. Moreover, the study found that the QWL level can be related to measurable organizational efficiency variables in terms of either employee own perception of organizational efficiency related to various factors or their satisfaction on them.

➤ **Asgari, Taleghani and Abadikhah, 2012**

**The Relationship between QWL and Demographic Characteristics of Information Technology Staffs**

The purpose of this study is to first measure the level of QWL of information technology staffs and second to investigate the relationship between QWL and some demographic characteristics among them. The results suggest that the level of QWL is medium and needs managers' attentions to enhance. No significant relation was approved between gender and QWL, but relationships between QWL and 1) age, 2) work experience and 3) income were approved.

➤ **Slatten, Svensson, and Svaeri, 2011**

**Empowering Leadership and the Influence of a Humorous Work Climate on Service Employees' Creativity and Innovative Behaviour in Frontline Service Jobs**

The purpose of this study is to describe and explain the relationships between empowering leadership and a humorous work climate; and service employees' creativity and innovative behavior in frontline

service jobs. The findings indicated a strong relationship between frontline cognitive creativity production of novel ideas and the behavioral implementation of these ideas into their respective work role. Moreover, the empirical findings indicate that both empowering leadership and a humorous work climate are able to trigger frontline service employees' creativity. In addition, service employees' creativity appears to be a mediating variable in the relationship between empowering leadership, a humorous work climate, and the service employees' innovative behavior. This study has indicated that both leadership practice and work climate play important roles in explaining service employees' creativity and innovative behavior.

➤ **Crespell and Hansen, 2008**

**Work Climate, Innovativeness, and Firm Performance in the US Forest Sector: in Search of a Conceptual Framework**

This aim of this research was to integrate into a unifying model the concepts of work climate, innovativeness, and firm performance using structural equation modeling. Its case study was industry sector, the US forest products industry. The research found that there is a positive and significant relationship among all factors. Having innovation as a core part of a company's strategy and fostering a climate for innovation positively affects the degree of innovativeness and performance of a company.

➤ **Huang, Lawler and Yi Lei, 2007**

**The Effects of QWL on Commitment and Turnover Intention**

The aim of this study was to examine the effect of QWL on auditors' career and organizational commitment in Taiwanese public accounting firms, and how those commitments, in turn, affect turnover intention. The findings indicated that different dimensions of QWL result in distinctive effects on organizational and career commitments and turnover intentions. According to the authors, the most important finding was that different dimensions of QWL may result in different kinds of human resource outcomes. For example, job characteristics and compensation and benefits are good for the development of professionalism.

➤ **Griffith, 2006**

**A Compositional Analysis of Organizational Climate-Performance Relation: Public schools as Organizations**

The purpose of the study was to examine specific aspects of organizational climate related to job satisfaction, employee turnover, and organizational performance in public elementary schools. It found that there was no evidence for the mediating effects of job satisfaction on relations of organizational climate to organizational performance and to employee turnover. Results were consistent with the broader organizational literature, which has shown the importance of orderly work environments, collegial relations, and supportive leaders for effectively functioning groups and organizations.

➤ **Gelade and Ivery, 2003**

**The Impact of Human Resource Management and Work Climate on Organizational Performance**

This paper examined relationships between human resource management (HRM), work climate and organizational performance in the branch network of a retail bank. It extends previous research on group-level climate-performance and HRM-performance relationships and examines how climate and HRM function as joint antecedents of business unit performance. Significant correlations were found between work climate, human resource practices, and business performance. The results showed that the correlations between climate and performance cannot be explained by their common dependence on HRM factors, and that the data are consistent with a mediation model in which the effects of HRM practices on business performance are partially mediated by work climate.

➤ **Yoon, Beatty, and Suh, 2001**

**The Effect of Work Climate on Critical Employees and Customer Outcomes**

This research aimed to examine several work climate variables and their effects on service quality. It investigated two components for successful implementation of internal marketing, service climate and supportive management. This study, which combined perceptions from customers and their contact

employees, showed that both climate variables contribute directly to job satisfaction and work effort, and indirectly influence on customers' perceptions of employee service quality.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research adopted the analytical descriptive technique to sustain quantitative and qualitative measurement and analysis.

### Population and Sample

The target population of this study is the employees and workers at the food and beverage industry sector, male and female. The researchers chose 10 industries located in Gaza strip as a sample. The total number of employees is 96, while the target population found 90, 6 were not available - vacations. A total of 96 questionnaires were distributed while 89 filled and returned within one month which formed a response rate 92%. The study adopted the complete census by which the whole study population used as the sample.

### Research Instruments

The research main instrument is survey questionnaire consisted mainly from two parts; first the socio-demographic data about the respondents such as the age, years of experience, vacancy level and the education level, the second part was consisted of 7 divisions, each is to detect the effect of one of work climate factors on QWL. The questionnaire was formulated in Arabic and then back translated to English after it has been judged by the experts and academic team.

### Data Validity and Reliability Test

The questionnaire validity has been examined and measured by two methods

#### The Experts Validation

The questionnaire evaluated by number of experts in the field from the university and from the company itself and the final questionnaire has been modified as per the experts' recommendations.

#### Pilot Study

A pilot study conducted to assess reliability of the questionnaire by distributing the questionnaire on a random sample consist of 30 respondents from the study population where these pilot questionnaires used to assess the validity and reliability of the data. It provides a trial run for the questionnaire, which involves testing the wordings of question, identifying ambiguous questions, testing the techniques that used to collect data, and measuring the effectiveness of standard invitation to respondents.



## Data Measurement

In order to be able to select the appropriate method of analysis, the level of measurement must be understood. For each type of measurement, there is/are an appropriate method /s that can be applied and not others. In this research, numerical scale 1-10 is used, where "1" indicates a weak answer while "10" indicates a strong answer.

**Table (1) : Kolmogorov-Smirnov test**

| Field                                      | Kolmogorov-Smirnov |         |
|--|--------------------|---------|
|  | Statistic          | P-value |
| Supportive management                      | 0.891              | 0.406   |
| Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards            | 1.221              | 0.102   |
| Decision Autonomy                          | 1.055              | 0.215   |
| Social Support                             | 0.592              | 0.874   |
| Health & safety at work                    | 0.631              | 0.821   |
| Physical work environment                  | 0.905              | 0.386   |
| QWL  | 1.007              | 0.263   |
| <b>All paragraphs of the questionnaire</b> | 0.989              | 0.282   |

### Test of Normality for Each Field:

Table (1) shows the results for Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality. From Table (1), the p-value for each field is greater than 0.05 level of significance, then the distribution for each field is normally distributed. Consequently, parametric tests were used to perform the statistical data analysis.

### Reliability of the Research

The reliability of an instrument is the degree of consistency which measures the attribute; it is supposed to be measuring (Polit & Hunger, 1985). The less variation an instrument produces in repeated measurements of an attribute, the higher its reliability. Reliability can be equated with the stability, consistency, or dependability of a measuring tool. The test is repeated to the same sample of people on two occasions and then compares the scores obtained by computing a reliability coefficient (Polit & Hunger, 1985).

**Table (2): Cronbach's Alpha for each field of the questionnaire**

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Field</b>                               | <b>Cronbach's Alpha</b> |
|------------|--|-------------------------|
| 1.         | Supportive management                      | 0.906                   |
| 2.         | Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards            | 0.913                   |
| 3.         | Decision Autonomy                          | 0.926                   |
| 4.         | Social Support                             | 0.840                   |
| 5.         | Health & safety at work                    | 0.869                   |
| 6.         | Physical work environment                  | 0.878                   |
| 7.         | QWL  | 0.895                   |
|            | <b>All paragraphs of the questionnaire</b> | <b>0.967</b>            |

Table (2) shows the values of Cronbach's Alpha for each field of the questionnaire and the entire questionnaire. For the fields, values of Cronbach's Alpha were in the range from 0.840 and 0.926. This range is considered high; the result ensures the reliability of each field of the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha equals 0.967 for the entire questionnaire which indicates an excellent reliability of the entire questionnaire. Thereby, it can be said that the researchers proved that the questionnaire was valid, reliable, and ready for distribution for the population sample.

**Table (3): Correlation coefficient of each field and the whole questionnaire**

| No. | Field                           | Pearson Correlation Coefficient | P-Value (Sig.) |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| 1.  | Supportive management           | .858                            | 0.000*         |
| 2.  | Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards | .929                            | 0.000*         |
| 3.  | Decision autonomy               | .752                            | 0.000*         |
| 4.  | Social support                  | .522                            | 0.001*         |
| 5.  | Health & safety at work         | .849                            | 0.000*         |
| 6.  | Physical work environment       | .567                            | 0.000*         |
| 7.  | QWL                             | .917                            | 0.000*         |

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Table (3) clarifies the correlation coefficient for each field and the whole questionnaire. The p-values (Sig.) are less than 0.05, so the correlation coefficients of all the fields are significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , so it can be said that the fields are valid to be measured what it was set for to achieve the main aim of the study.

**Table (4): Distribution of participants' gender, age, education, positions, and experiences**

| Age               | Frequency | %            | Education                     | Frequency | %            | Position                 | Frequency | %            | Experience             | Frequency | %            |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Less than 30      | 54        | 60.7         | Secondary Certificate or less | 39        | 43.8         | Technician or less       | 37        | 41.6         | Less than 5 years      | 51        | 57.3         |
| 30 – less than 40 | 19        | 21.3         | Diploma                       | 15        | 16.9         | Engineer                 | 14        | 15.7         | 5 – Less than 10 years | 19        | 21.3         |
| More than 40      | 16        | 18.0         | Bachelor                      | 34        | 38.2         | Head of Department       | 10        | 11.2         | 10 years and more      | 19        | 21.3         |
|                   |           |              | Higher education              | 1         | 1.1          | Deputy manager or higher | 8         | 9.0          |                        |           |              |
|                   |           |              |                               |           |              | Other                    | 20        | 22.5         |                        |           |              |
| <b>Total</b>      | <b>89</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>Total</b>                  | <b>89</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>Total</b>             | <b>89</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>Total</b>           | <b>89</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Table (4) shows the personal traits distribution among the sample participants - age, education, positions, experience.

Table no. (4) shows the majority of the respondents have ages less than 30 years, and this represents 60.7%. 21.3% of the respondents have ages "30 – less than 40" and 18.0% of respondents have ages "More than 40 years ". This indicates that the participants are diversified in terms of ages. Most of them are less than 30 and that is due to the nature of the food factory sector activities' requirements such as handy activities. In addition, the physical stamina for those workers (less than 30) is higher than others.

In addition, 43.8% of the respondents hold " Secondary Certificate or less ", 16.9% of the respondents hold " Diploma ", 38.2% " Bachelor's degree" and 1.1% of the sample hold " Higher education ". This means that (43.8%) of the workers attained low education – secondary certificate or less. This is due to the nature of the food industry sector activities' requirements from researcher point of view. In other words, facilities or firms that employ laborers don't require universities or academic education because the workforce won't use it and benefit from it in their work; this is due to the facility activities in which most of these activities are handy.

On the other hand, the technician or less represents 41.6%, engineer 15.7%, head of department 11.2%, deputy manager or higher 9.0% and other position represents 22.5% of the study sample. This shows the nature of the organizational structure and the hierarchy at the food industry sector.

Moreover, 22% work as drivers and administrators, and accountants in which play a major role in the sector.

Moreover, 57.3% of the respondents have experience " less than 5 years ", and 21.3% of the respondents have experience " 5 – less than 10 years and 10 years and more " . This indicates that the participants have low experience and that is due to several reasons, the most important reason is the fluctuated and unstable economic situation in Gaza strip in which many of the factories stopped operating or closed, after while they re-operate and need new workers. In addition, 60.7% are less than 30 years old, in which the experience is low. As a result, there is an interrupted experience due to the political and security reasons.

### Analysis for Each Field

The first main hypothesis stated that, there is a statistically significant relationship between work climate factors and QWL at 0.05 level, where it was divided into the following sub hypothesizes dimensions.

**There is a statistical significant relationship between supportive management and QWL at 0.05 level.**

**Table (5): Means and Test values for “Supportive management”**

| No. | Item   | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|--|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | The facility management shows respect to teamwork during work.   | 8.02 | 80.23                 | 8.83       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 2.  | The facility management takes into consideration the opinion of its team regarding the work of the management. | 6.93 | 69.32                 | 4.32       | 0.000*         | 4    |
| 3.  | The facility management seeks to create an environment of credibility and trust between them and their team.   | 7.60 | 76.02                 | 5.68       | 0.000*         | 3    |
| 4.  | I can communicate easily with senior management.   | 7.84 | 78.39                 | 6.92       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 5.  | The facility management offers financial incentives to the team.   | 5.93 | 59.32                 | -0.24      | 0.406          | 6    |
| 6.  | The facility management offers psychological support to the team (morale and good treatment).                  | 6.85 | 68.52                 | 3.03       | 0.002*         | 5    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>   | 7.20 | 71.97                 | 5.63       | 0.000*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (5) shows that the mean of paragraph #1 “The facility management shows respect to the team work during work” equals 8.02 (80.23%), Test-value = 8.83, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph. The analysis results show that 71.97% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between supportive management and QWL, this reveals that, supportive management is an effective factor to represent work climate and it has a direct effect on improving QWL. Improving and enhancing the supportive management will prevent the organization/facility from a creation of distrust, useless, and weakness between its employees/workers and management. As a result, the

supportive management will contribute in raising the organization's value and guide to a good psychological safety for the workforce in the workplace.

These findings are consistent with Griffith's (2006) study which shows that a warm and supportive climate increases employees' job satisfaction and performance at the organizational level. This result agrees with the both studies of Bindu (2014) and Yashika (2014) which show that supportive management, in addition to other dimensions, relates to job satisfaction and once job satisfaction is ensured the worker/employee might deliver better performance. In addition, this agrees with the study of Slatten (2011) which shows the importance of leadership support to create an effective and humorous work climate in which will lead to an effective QWL.

There is a statistical significant relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic reward and QWL at 0.05 level.

**Table (6): Means and Test values for “Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reward”**

| No. | Item   | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|--|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | When the employee/worker executes the required tasks, the facility management makes him/her feel that the work has been done properly and effectively.   | 7.27 | 72.73                 | 4.98       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 2.  | The facility management offers awards and financial benefits for the well-performed teamwork.  | 6.05 | 60.45                 | 0.15       | 0.439          | 8    |
| 3.  | The facility management enhances the spirit of competition among employees   | 6.40 | 63.98                 | 1.57       | 0.060          | 6    |
| 4.  | The facility management enhances the sense of satisfaction regarding the performance of tasks.   | 6.52 | 65.23                 | 2.02       | 0.023*         | 5    |
| 5.  | The facility management assigns the employee with some supervisory functions after he/she showed distinctive skills in comparison to his/her colleagues. | 6.97 | 69.66                 | 3.97       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 6.  | The facility management increases the salaries as a performance excellence.  | 6.38 | 63.79                 | 1.36       | 0.089          | 7    |
| 7.  | The facility management varies the rewards and incentives (is not limited to annual financial incentives)  | 5.82 | 58.16                 | -0.63      | 0.264          | 9    |
| 8.  | The facility management applies the “reward and punishment” system on the employees depending on the dereliction and excellence of performance.          | 6.80 | 68.05                 | 3.25       | 0.001*         | 3    |
| 9.  | The employee feels pleasure in performing the required-tasks.  | 6.55 | 65.52                 | 2.02       | 0.023*         | 4    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>   | 6.53 | 65.33                 | 2.71       | 0.004*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (6) shows that the mean of paragraph #1 “When the employee/worker works out the required tasks, the facility management makes him/her feel that the work has been done properly and effectively” equals 7.27 (72.73%), Test-value = 4.98 and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.



The analysis results show that 65.33% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and QWL, this reveals that, the intrinsic and extrinsic reward play a major role in creating an effective and well work climate in which it will raise the performance and quality of production. As well as, it has a direct effect on enhancing and improving QWL. However, due to financial vulnerability of the facilities, they can't implement the motivation and reward system.

The results agree with Bahar (2014) and Asgari (2012) who demonstrated the importance of rewards to QWL and organizational citizenship behavior. As well as, the findings are consistent with Gupta (2011) who shows the importance of rewards and compensation to the QWL and level of satisfaction. The results agree with the study of Bolhari (2011) which shows the relationship between QWL and income and rewards. Normala (2010) in his study agreed with the study findings where he concluded the importance of pay and benefits to QWL, in which will lead to an organizational commitment. Also, the findings are consistent with Huang (2007) who demonstrated the effect of compensation and benefits on QWL and their major role in development of professionalism. In addition, Saraji (2006) found that income and rewards have positive and negative effects on QWL.

**There is a statistical significant relationship between decision autonomy and QWL at 0.05 level.**

**Table (7): Means and Test values for “Decision Autonomy”**

| No. | Item  | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|---|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | The team participates in the decision making together with the facility management.   | 5.56 | 55.58                 | -1.50      | 0.069          | 6    |
| 2.  | The facility management takes into account the public interest of the facility during the decision-making process.                          | 7.34 | 73.45                 | 5.49       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 3.  | The facility management takes into account the negative and positive feedback from employees during the decision-making process.            | 6.46 | 64.60                 | 1.71       | 0.046*         | 3    |
| 4.  | The facility management takes into account the negative and positive feedback from external environment during the decision-making process. | 6.99 | 69.89                 | 4.51       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 5.  | The team’s opinion has an effect on the facility management’s decision.   | 5.52 | 55.23                 | -1.75      | 0.042*         | 7    |
| 6.  | The values of the facility influence the facility management’s decision.  | 6.32 | 63.18                 | 1.21       | 0.115          | 4    |
| 7.  | The employees contribute in collecting the required-information for decision-making.  | 5.94 | 59.42                 | -0.21      | 0.419          | 5    |
| 8.  | The team is allowed to make a decision without the intervention of senior management.   | 4.36 | 43.60                 | -5.69      | 0.000*         | 8    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>  | 6.04 | 60.45                 | 0.25       | 0.402          |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (7) shows that the mean of paragraph #2 “The facility management take into account the public interest of the facility during the decision-making process” equals 7.34 (73.45%), Test-value = 5.49, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.

The analysis results show that 60.45% of the workers agreed for the presence of decision autonomy and its effect on QWL. Unfortunately, most of the workers reported that they are not allowed to participate in the decision making and its process. It is worth mentioning that most of the private sector businesses are family-owned, in which their decision-making policies are decentralized. The owner is the decision maker. However, decision autonomy plays a major role in raising the organization’s value, in which the worker will satisfy with his work by allowing him to participate in the decision making process.

The findings are consistent with the both studies of Bindu (2014) and Bahar (2014) which show the importance of decision autonomy and its effect on QWL. The results agree with the study of Sajjad (2014) which shows the relationship between decision autonomy and QWL, as well as, it concluded that decision autonomy relates to job satisfaction. Slatten (2011) in his study agreed with the study findings where he concluded the importance of decision autonomy as a work climate factor that affects the employee behavior and commitment to the organization. In addition, Normala (2010) in his study agreed with the study findings where he concluded the importance of decision autonomy and QWL, in which will lead to an organizational commitment. Moreover, Markham (2010) agreed with the findings with the present study where he concluded that decision autonomy is a major factor that affects QWL. Also, the findings are consistent with Suliman (2005) who concluded that the employer should take into consideration the employee participation in the decision making process for a better work climate. As well as, Gelade (2003) found that decision autonomy has an effect on business performance in which will lead to a well work climate and QWL.

**There is a statistical significant relationship between social support and QWL at 0.05 level.**

**Table (8): Means and Test values for “Social Support”**

| No. | Item  | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|---|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | The team feels that it belongs to one team during its work with the management.   | 7.26 | 72.64                 | 5.11       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 2.  | The facility management follows up the social status of the employees.            | 6.71 | 67.13                 | 2.49       | 0.007*         | 4    |
| 3.  | The facility management organizes trips for the employees.                        | 5.33 | 53.33                 | -2.08      | 0.020*         | 7    |
| 4.  | The facility management organizes social visits for the employees.                | 6.97 | 69.66                 | 3.15       | 0.001*         | 2    |
| 5.  | The facility management organizes informal meetings with the workers.             | 5.92 | 59.20                 | -0.30      | 0.384          | 6    |
| 6.  | The facility management cares about the workers by communicating with them.       | 6.67 | 66.67                 | 2.64       | 0.005*         | 5    |
| 7.  | The facility management enhances the sense of worth and importance among workers. | 6.90 | 68.97                 | 3.21       | 0.001*         | 3    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>  | 6.54 | 65.37                 | 2.53       | 0.007*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (8) shows that the mean of paragraph #1 “The team work feels that it belongs to one team during its work with the management” equals 7.26 (72.64%), Test-value = 5.11, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.

The analysis results show that 65.37% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between social support and QWL, this reveals that, the social support has a direct effect on improving QWL. Improving the workers’ QWL will contribute in raising the organization’s value. The results agree with Sajjad (2014) who concluded that social support and integration has a major effect on QWL, as well as, it has a meaningful relationship with QWL. The findings are consistent with Gupta (2011) who found that social support plays a major role in enhancing QWL. The results also agree with the study of Normala (2010) which shows the extent that social support can affect QWL and lead to an organizational commitment. In addition, the findings agree with the conclusions of Saraji (2006) study which found the effect of social support on QWL. Moreover, the results agree with Fortune

(2006) who found a relationship between social support and QWL, as well as it contributes in enhancing the QWL depending on the level of effect. Finally, the study agrees with Singh (2012) who concluded the effect of social support on QWL and organization efficiency.

**There is a statistical significant relationship between health and safety at work and QWL at 0.05 level.**

**Table (9): Means and Test values for “Health & Safety at Work”**

| No. | Item  | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|---|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | Health and safety are the most important priorities of the facility management.                   | 7.96 | 79.65                 | 7.72       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 2.  | The facility management conducts training courses for the safe use of the equipment and machines. | 6.43 | 64.30                 | 1.45       | 0.076          | 5    |
| 3.  | The facility management addresses errors facing the security, safety and health of workers.       | 7.41 | 74.07                 | 5.24       | 0.000*         | 3    |
| 4.  | In the event of a fire, the team has the skills to use fire hose.                                 | 6.98 | 69.77                 | 3.61       | 0.000*         | 4    |
| 5.  | In the event of natural and non-natural disasters, the facility has exit stairs.                  | 6.02 | 60.23                 | 0.07       | 0.471          | 7    |
| 6.  | The facility management uses detergent to clean the workplace.                                    | 7.89 | 78.86                 | 7.77       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 7.  | There are health and safety signs within the facility.  | 6.39 | 63.86                 | 1.24       | 0.109          | 6    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>  | 7.02 | 70.19                 | 4.91       | 0.000*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (9) shows that the mean of paragraph #1 “Health and safety are the most important priorities of the facility management” equals 7.96 (79.65%), Test-value = 7.72, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.

The analysis results show that 70.19% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between health and safety at work and QWL, this reveals that, the health and safety at work is an essential element of the QWL. Improving the health and safety at work will contribute in raising the organization’s value. The results are consistent with both, Sajjad (2014) and Singh (2012), who concluded in their studies that there is an effect of health and safety at work on QWL and it leads to an organizational efficiency and commitment. The findings also are consistent with Asgari (2012) who proved the relationship between health and safety and QWL, as well as it enhances the organizational

citizenship and the working conditions of the workplace. In addition, Gupta (2011) agreed with these findings where he demonstrated that health and safety at work affects and enhances QWL. The finding is consistent also with the study of Shahbazi (2011) which shows that health and safety at work affects QWL and performance. As well as, Normala (2010) concluded the relationship between health and safety and QWL. Moreover, Markham (2010) proved that health and safety play a significant role in determining the level of QWL. The findings are consistent also with Rethinam (2008) who found a strong relationship between health and safety and QWL. Finally, Saraji (2006) demonstrated the effect of health and safety on QWL.

**There is a statistical significant relationship between physical work environment and QWL at 0.05 level.**

**Table (10): Means and Test values for “Physical work environment”**

| No. | Item   | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|--|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | The working hours are enough to complete the required-tasks.   | 6.83 | 68.30                 | 2.91       | 0.002*         | 4    |
| 2.  | Lighting affects the workers' performance.   | 6.23 | 62.27                 | 0.76       | 0.224          | 6    |
| 3.  | The noise of machines affects the workers' performance.  | 5.50 | 55.00                 | -1.72      | 0.044*         | 8    |
| 4.  | The workplace's layout affects the workers' performance.   | 5.92 | 59.20                 | -0.26      | 0.397          | 7    |
| 5.  | The use of tools and machines affects the workers' performance.  | 6.38 | 63.75                 | 1.34       | 0.092          | 5    |
| 6.  | It is possible to access and reach equipment and machine easily.   | 7.80 | 77.95                 | 7.89       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 7.  | Equipment and machines are arranged in a proper way.   | 7.89 | 78.85                 | 8.33       | 0.000*         | 1    |
| 8.  | The facility management provides the required capabilities to create an appropriate work environment to accomplish the required tasks. | 7.55 | 75.45                 | 6.57       | 0.000*         | 3    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>   | 6.75 | 67.54                 | 4.66       | 0.000*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (10) shows that the mean of paragraph #7 “Equipment and machines are arranged in a proper way” equals 7.89 (78.85%), Test-value = 8.33, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. We conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.

The analysis results show that 67.54% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between physical work environment and QWL, this reveals that, the physical work environment is an essential element of the work climate. Improving the physical work environment will contribute in raising the organization's value. As well as, it is an important determinant of health. The findings are consistent with Bahar (2014) who concluded that it is important to improve the physical work environment in order to raise the level of QWL. Moreover, the results agree with the study of Greenan (2013) which proved that physical work environment has a meaningful relationship with QWL. The findings are also consistent with Normala (2010) who concluded that physical work environment



represents the conception of QWL; this means there is a significant relationship between physical work environment and QWL. The results are also consistent with Adhikari (2010) who proved the relationship between physical work environment and QWL. In addition, Markham (2010) agreed with this finding where he found that there is a major relationship between physical work environment and QWL, the physical environment had influenced the QWL to a certain degree.

## Quality of work life (QWL)

**Table (11): Means and Test values for “QWL”**

| No. | Item  | Mean | Proportional mean (%) | Test value | P-value (Sig.) | Rank |
|-----|---|------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| 1.  | Offering a QWL to workers by the facility management is supported by the management.  | 7.31 | 73.15                 | 5.35       | 0.000*         | 2    |
| 2.  | QWL offers workers intrinsic and extrinsic rewards by the facility management.        | 6.73 | 67.30                 | 2.78       | 0.003*         | 7    |
| 3.  | QWL leads to safety, health and security of workers within the facility.              | 7.19 | 71.91                 | 4.72       | 0.000*         | 3    |
| 4.  | QWL contributes to provide social support for the workers by the facility management. | 6.98 | 69.78                 | 3.77       | 0.000*         | 5    |
| 5.  | QWL contributes to create an appropriate work environment.                            | 7.09 | 70.90                 | 4.24       | 0.000*         | 4    |
| 6.  | QWL affects the personal life of the worker.  | 6.81 | 68.09                 | 2.98       | 0.002*         | 6    |
| 7.  | QWL improves the workers' performance within the facility.                            | 7.55 | 75.51                 | 7.21       | 0.000*         | 1    |
|     | <b>All paragraphs of the field</b>  | 7.09 | 70.95                 | 5.41       | 0.000*         |      |

\* The mean is significantly different from 6

Table (11) shows the mean of paragraph #7 “QWL improves the workers’ performance within the facility” equals 7.55 (75.51%), Test-value = 7.21, and P-value = 0.000 which is smaller than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The sign of the test is positive, so the mean of this paragraph is significantly greater than the hypothesized value 6. The researchers conclude that the respondents agreed to this paragraph.

The analysis results show 70.95% of the workers agreed for the presence of the relationship between QWL and work climate factors (supportive management, social support, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, decision autonomy, health and safety at work, physical work environment), this reveals that, QWL is an important consideration for both employees and employers. QWL plays a major role at the economic health of the organization. Improving QWL will contribute in raising the organization’s value. As well as, QWL emphasizes development of employees and the organization.

It is worth mentioning that there is a relationship between work climate factors and QWL. Therefore, the results agree with both studies of Bindu (2014) and Yashika (2014) which show that supportive management, in addition to other dimensions, relates to job satisfaction and once job satisfaction is

ensured the worker/employee might deliver better performance, as well as, they showed that QWL could be enhanced and supported by the organization management.

**There is a statistical significant effect of the work climate factors (supportive management – intrinsic and extrinsic reward – decision autonomy – health and safety at work – social support – physical work environment) on the QWL at 0.05 level.**

We use Stepwise regression, and obtain the following results:

R Square = 0.725, this means 72.5% of the variation in QWL is explained by “Social Support, Health & Safety at Work, and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reward”.

**Table (12): ANOVA test**

|                   | <b>Sum of Squares</b> | <b>Df</b> | <b>Mean Square</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>Sig.</b> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| <b>Regression</b> | 229.696               | 3         | 76.565             | 71.226   | 0.000       |
| <b>Residual</b>   | 87.072                | 81        | 1.075              |          |             |
| <b>Total</b>      | 316.767               | 84        |                    |          |             |

Table (12) shows the Analysis of Variance for the regression model. Sig. = 0.000, so there is a significant relationship between the dependent variable " QWL " and the independent variables " Social Support, Health & Safety at Work, and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reward".

**Table (13): The Regression Coefficients**

|                                | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | T     | Sig.  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|                                | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |       |
| (Constant)                     | 0.798                       | 0.468      |                           | 1.706 | 0.092 |
| Social Support                 | 0.541                       | 0.085      | 0.550                     | 6.382 | 0.000 |
| Health & Safety at Work        | 0.184                       | 0.079      | 0.182                     | 2.314 | 0.023 |
| Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reward | 0.227                       | 0.099      | 0.218                     | 2.302 | 0.024 |

Table (13) shows the regression coefficients and their P-values (Sig.). Based on the Standardized Coefficients, the most significant independent variable is Social Support, Health & Safety at Work, and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Reward.

**The regression equation is:**

$$\underline{OWL = 0.798 + 0.541* (Social Support) + 0.184* (Health \& Safety at Work) + 0.227* (Intrinsic \& Extrinsic Reward)}$$

There is a significant difference at 0.05 level among respondents toward “The effect of work climate factors on the QWL” due to personal data (age – education – years of experience – position).

Table (14): Analysis of Variance for Personal Traits

| No | Personal Traits     | Test Name            | Test Value | P-value(Sig.) |
|----|---------------------|----------------------|------------|---------------|
| 1. | Age                 | Analysis of Variance | 0.098      | 0.907         |
| 2. | Education           | Analysis of Variance | 0.182      | 0.908         |
| 3. | Years of Experience | Analysis of Variance | 1.195      | 0.316         |
| 4. | Position            | Analysis of Variance | 1.242      | 0.315         |

Table (14) shows that the p-value (Sig.) is greater than the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  for each

Personal Traits, then there is insignificant difference in respondents' answers toward the effect of work climate factors on the QWL. We conclude that the Personal Traits have no effect on “the effect of work climate factors on the QWL”.

The findings indicate that the workers' demands and requirements don't relate to their personal traits. Their demands are similar despite the different traits among them. In other words, the situation in Gaza - political and economic issues - affects similarly on the people. They want to be satisfied with their work to gain a better QWL and work climate.

## CONCLUSIONS

This research investigated the impact of work climate factors on the QWL through an empirical study of the employees and workers at the food and beverage industry sector in Gaza strip. Six elements of work climate (supportive management – intrinsic and extrinsic reward – decision autonomy – health and safety at work – social support – physical work environment) are considered to represent the effect of work climate on QWL. In light of the findings, the most notable conclusions were:

1. There is a relationship between supportive management and QWL. Supportive management relates to job satisfaction and the facility's value.
2. Intrinsic and extrinsic reward strongly affects QWL. It contributes in raising the level of satisfaction among workers and improving performance.
3. Most of the workers are not allowed to participate in the decision making and its process with the facility management because most of these facilities are owned by families.
4. Social support plays a major role in enhancing and improving QWL. The study found that social support is one of the most important factors that affect QWL due to the traditions of the Gazans.
5. Most of the workers agreed that there is a strong relationship between health and safety at work and QWL. As well as, most of the facilities consider health and safety as an important priority for them.
6. There is a relationship between physical work environment and QWL. The environment in most of facilities is suitable for working, especially the arrangements of equipment and machines in which it let the work more facilitating and easy for the workers.
7. In general, most of the workers agreed that there is a relationship between work climate factors and QWL. As well as, the performance is related positively to QWL. In other words, work climate and QWL are an excellent predictor of organizational and employee performance.
8. According to the analysis, the most important factors that strongly affect QWL are: (intrinsic and extrinsic reward - social support – health and safety at work).
9. Personal traits have no effect on deciding the effect of work climate factors on the QWL.

## Recommendations

In order to enhance the concepts of work climate and QWL in the organizations and in light of the aforementioned results, we formulated the following recommendations. The recommendations weren't suggested to match only the need of the case study (food and beverage industry sector), but also they are acceptable and useful to other organizations and institutes.

1. Training, personal growth, valuable participation in decision making, modification in promotion scheme etc. are some of the ways through which can improve QWL.
2. Increasing the awareness of the organization's management and staff about the importance of QWL and its great role in raising the organization's value.
3. Enhancing supportive management by showing respect, building credibility and trust between the management and workers, and encourage open communication between employees in order to prevent the organization from a creation of useless, distrust, and weakness between its employees and management through conducting workshops and trainings.
4. Improving the motivation system – intrinsic and extrinsic rewards – in which it will raise the performance and quality of production, and QWL by outsourcing experts and consultants specialized in human resources management and financial issues.
5. The family – owned organizations allow for the participation of employees in decision making and its process.
6. Increasing the employees' satisfaction with jobs security, professional recognition, and work conditions in order to improve the level of QWL.
7. Jobs should be designed in ways that provide meaning, motivation and opportunities for employees to use their skills and abilities.
8. Reinforcing the social support to increase the organization efficiency and enhance the QWL.
9. Improving health and safety at work by conducting training courses, using signs and implementing international standards for keeping the workplace more safe and health in which it enhances the level of QWL and performance.



10. Enhancing and improving the work environment by creating an appropriate work environment and conditions to accomplish the required tasks.
11. Preparing a handbook that contains clear and achievable goals, policies and strategies. Then, distribute it to all the employees and ensure the understood from each person in the organization. It may be preferable to share the staff in setting these goals and hence to believe and adapt the organization's policies which will guide to these goals. In other words, develop and implement a flexible work policy and procedure.
12. Management should continually addresses the challenges by utilizing personnel flexibilities and establishing programs that help employees meet their work and personal obligations.

### **Suggestions for Future Studies**

According to the researchers' knowledge, this is the first Arabic study conducted on the effect of work climate on QWL. This field of research is completely new and deserves more exploration. Because of the importance on this topic, we suggest the following research areas and ideas for further studies:

1. A study should be done separately to assess the effect of each of the factors of work climate on QWL.
2. A similar study could be conducted in other organizations or sectors across the country to increase the generalizability of the study and to compare the results.
3. The effect of work climate factors on performance at the Palestinian organizations – public sector.
4. The role of QWL in maximizing and raising the organization's market value.
5. The role of human resources management towards QWL at the Palestinian universities and institutes.
6. To study the relationship between QWL and organizational structure (centralization – decentralization) among the high and low management levels.

## REFERENCES

- Abu Ful, Naser, (1996). The reality of Food insutries sector in Gaza (Problems and Solutions, Palestinian National Center for Agricultural Studies, Gaza, Palestine.
- Adhikari, D. and Gautam, D. (2010). Labor Legislations for Improving Quality of Work Life, *International Journal of Law and Management*, Vol. (52), No. (1), pp. 40-53.
- Asgari, M., Taleghani, M. and Abadikhah S. (2012). The Relationship between Quality of Working Life with Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Office of Education Staff in Rasht City, *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, Vol. (4), pp. 3547-3551.
- Bahar, Y. and Nassar, I. (2014). The impact of Quality of Work Life on Work Engagement, Arab Administrative Development Organization.
- <http://www.arado.org.eg/homepage/PublicationDetail.aspx?bID=733>, accessed March 2014.
- Bindu, J. and Yashika, S. (2014). Quality of Work Life with Special Reference to Academic Sector, *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, Vol. (3), No. (1), pp. 14-17.
- Bolhari, A. and others (2011). The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Demographic Characteristics of Information Technology Staffs, *International Conference on Computer Communication and Management*, Vol. (5).
- ConKlin, Jeff. (2001). Designing Organizational Memory: Preserving Intellectual Assets in Knowledge Economy. CogNexus Institute.
- Crespell, P. and Hansen, E. (2008). Work Climate, Innovativeness, and Firm Performance in the US Forest Sector: in Search of a Conceptual Framework, *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, Vol. (38), pp. 1703-1715.
- Cyprus, S. and Bailey, H. What is Work Climate?. <http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-a-work-climate.htm>, accessed January 2014.
- Fortune, Darla. An Examination of Quality of Work Life and Quality of Care within a Health Care Setting, Master thesis, University of Waterloo in Canada, 2006.
- Gagnon, S. and others (2009). Measurement and Management of Work Climate, *Helathcare Management Forum*, pp. 57-65.

- Gayathiri, R. and Ramakrishnan, L. (2013). Quality of Work Life-Linkage with job Satisfaction and Performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, Vol. (2), pp. 01-08.
- Gelade, Garry and Ivery, Mark (2003). The Impact of Human Resource Management and Work Climate on Organizational Performance, *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. (56), pp. 383-404.
- Ghoshal, S., & Nohria, N. (1989). Internal differences within multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. (10), pp. 323–337.
- Greenan, N., Narcy, M. and Volkoff, S. (2013). Ageing, Changes, and Quality of Working Life, *Institute for Labor Studies and Public Policies*, Vol. (1), pp. 18-48
- Griffith, J. (2006). A Compositional Analysis of Organizational Climate-Performance Relation: Public Schools as Organizations, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. (36), No. (8), pp. 1848-80.
- Gupta, M. and Sharma, P. (2011). Factor Credentials Boosting Quality of Work Life of BSNL Employees in Jammu Region. *Sri Krishna International Research & Educational Consortium*, Vol. (2), No. (1), pp. 79-89.
- Harrington, B. and Ladge, J.J. (2009), Quality of Work Life integration: present dynamics and future directions for organizations, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. (38), No. (2), pp. 148-57.
- Huang, Tung-Chun, Lawler, John and Lei, Ching-Yi (2007). The Effects of Quality of Work Life on Commitment and Turnover Intention, *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. (35), No. (6), pp. 735-750.
- James V. D'Ambrosio, <http://jamesdambrosio.com/2011/01/08/supportive-management-a-must-for-nonprofits-and-everyone-else/>, accessed January 2014
- Korunka, C. Hoonakker, P. and Carayon P. (2008). Quality of Working Life and Turnover Intention in Information Technology Work, *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, Vol. (18) No. (4), pp. 409-423.
- Li, Jessica and Yeo. Roland K. (2011). Quality of Work Life and Career Development: Perceptions of Part-Time MBA Students. *Employee Relations*, Vol. (33) Iss: (3), pp.201 – 220.
- Markham, Lyle “QWL as predictor of employees’ mental health”, Master thesis, University of the Free State Bloemfontein, 2010.

MINDFUL Database, Indicators, Determinants of health- Social and Cultural Environment (2008) Metadata. <http://info.stakes.fi/mindful/EN/database/indicators.htm>, accessed February 2014.

Mosadeghrad, A. (2013). Quality of Working Life and Turnover Intentions: Implications for Nursing Management, *International Journal of Research in Nursing*, Vol.(4), pp. 47-54.

Normala, D. (2010). Investigating the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment amongst Employees of Malaysia, *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. (5), No. (10), pp. 75-82.

Norton, T., Zacher, H. and Ashkanasy, N. (2014). Organizational Sustainability Policies and Employee Green Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Work Climate, *Journal of Environment Psychology*, Vol. (38), pp. 49–54.

Oak Ridge National Lab Safety Document, <http://www.ornl.gov/>, accessed February 2014.

Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (2011). Economic Surveys Series, 2010: Main Results. Ramallah – Palestine.

Rethinam, Guna and Ismail, Maimunah (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. (7), No. (1), pp. 58-70.

Ryan, R.M., and Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potential: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. (52), pp. 141-166.

Sajjad, Noushin and Abbasi, Badri, (2014). Studying the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment, *Research Journal of Recent Sciences*, Vol. (3), pp. 92-99.

Sheel, Shalini and others, (2012). Quality of Work Life, Employee Performance and Career Growth Opportunities. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, Vol. (2), No. (2), pp. 291-300.

Singh, T. and Srivastav, S. (2012). Quality of Work Life and Organization Efficiency: A Proposed Framework, *Journal of Strategic human Resource Management*, Vol. (1), No. (1), pp. 1-13.

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. (55), pp. 241–302.

- Slatten, T., Svensson, G. and Svaeri, S. (2011). Empowering Leadership and the Influence of a Humorous Work Climate on Service Employees' Creativity and Innovative Behavior, *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, Vol. (3), No. (3), pp. 267-284.
- Suliman, A. and Abdulla, M. (2005). Towards a High-Performance Workplace: Managing Corporate Climate and Conflict, *Journal of Management Decision*, Vol. (43), No. (5), pp. 720-733.
- Takeuchi, R., Shay, J., and Li, J. (2008). When Does Decision Autonomy Increase Expatriate Managers' Adjustment? An Empirical Test. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. (51), No. (1), pp. 45-60.
- Venkatraman, Sneha (2005). A Project Report on Quality of Work Life, T.Y.B.M.S Khalsa College.
- Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's Motivation for Reading: Domain Specificity and Instructional Influences. *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. (97), No. (6), pp. 299-309.
- Yoon, M., Beatty, S., and Suh J. (2001). The Effect of Work Climate on Critical Employee and Customer Outcomes, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. (12), No. (5), pp. 500-521.