TITLE PAGE:

Title: Assessing Quality of Working Life among Malaysian Workers

Authors:

Nur Suffia Sulaiman^{1,2}, Choo Wan Yuen², Abdul Rahim Mat Yassim³, Darren Van Laar⁴, Karuthan Chinna², Hazreen Abdul Majid².

¹Institute for Medical Research, Jalan Pahang, 50588 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

²Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

³Department of Malaysian Languages And Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Languages & Linguistics, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

⁴Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth, Winston Churchill Avenue, Portsmouth PO1 2UP, United Kingdom.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Nur Suffia Sulaiman

Phone: +60-3-2616 2733/ +60-12- 335 3234

Fax: +60-3-2692 6542

Email: nursuffia@imr.gov.my / nursuffia@gmail.com

Title: Assessing Quality of Working Life among Malaysian Workers

Abstract:

The Work-Related Quality of Life Scale-2 (WRQLS-2) has been used to measure quality of working life (QOWL) in the United Kingdom. In this study, the scale was translated and normalized into Malay. The scale was translated using the back translation method, pre-testing and pilot testing. It was conducted among healthcare and office workers. It was tested in three stages; confirmatory factor analysis at stage 1 and 3 and exploratory factor analysis at stage 2. The Malaysian WRQLS-2 had 5-factors: 'General Well-Being', 'Job and Career Satisfaction', 'Employee Engagement', 'Home-Work Interface' and 'Stress At Work'. The scale showed good convergent and construct validity and also reliability. Perception of good QOWL may differ due to cultural influences and varying work environments. The validated Malaysian WRQLS-2 can be used to determine the QOWL of Malaysian office and health care workers.

Introduction:

Occupational health is an important area of public health. Scales and questionnaires are used to assess different aspects of occupational health and tested for its reliability in different countries. In Malaysia, such reliability studies were undertaken for the 'Job Content Questionnaire' to assess job stress among Malaysian office workers and the Malay version of the Nursing Stress Scale for nurses^{1,2}.

In the United Kingdom (UK), the Work-Related Quality of Life Scale (WRQLS) was developed by psychologists and has been used to assess the quality of working life (QOWL) among many professions since 2007. 'Quality of Working Life' is that part of overall quality of life that is influenced by work. More than just job satisfaction, it is the widest context in which an employee would evaluate their work environment^{3,4}. A good QOWL is important for attracting and retaining workers in any organization. The original WRQLS contains the factors of 'Job and Career Satisfaction' (JCS), 'General Well-Being' (GWB), 'Stress at Work' (SAW), 'Home-Work Interface' (HWI), 'Control at Work' (CAW) and 'Working Conditions' (WCS)³. The "Job and Career Satisfaction" factor measures general satisfaction with job and career development. "Working Conditions" reflect the physical working environment and conditions and having the right tools and equipment to do the job. "Control At Work" measures involvement of workers in decision-making. "General Well-Being" means the psychological and physical well-being, wellness and happiness of workers. The "Home-Work Interface" measures how much the organization understands and tries to help workers with pressures outside work and includes organizational flexibility. "Stress At Work" determines the level of work-related stress^{3,4}. The scale has been translated into many languages, and used in many countries⁴. Validations of the scale were carried out in Turkey and Singapore^{5,6}. The WRQLS was used with few removals of its items in Turkish⁵. In Singapore, the WRQLS was validated in English, but the scale did not include CAW.

However, this study was limited among nurses of a teaching hospital, where CAW may not play a vital role⁶.

Since 2011, a newer Work-Related Quality of Life Scale-2 (WRQLS-2), with improved reliability has been used in the UK, including a seventh factor, 'Employee Engagement' (EEN), which reflects the positive attitude held by the employee towards the organization and its values⁴. The scale consists of 34 items, of which 33 items measure the factors of QOWL, while the last question measures the perception of overall quality of working life. Answers are rated on a Likert Scale of 1 to 5 regarding how much respondents agree on each item in the scale. In this study, we validated the new WRQLS-2 for use in the Malaysian population. The objective was to translate and normalize the WRQLS-2 into Malay and test for construct validity and reliability.

Methods

The scale was translated using the back translation method, followed by pre-testing and pilot testing⁷. Face validation was found to be satisfactory, where the translated scale was reviewed by three medical officers specialised in occupational health, an occupational psychologist and a public health specialist. The Malay questionnaires were distributed to office workers and health care workers (HCWs) as there is a lack of study on this subject among the latter group³. A minimum sample size of 150 respondents was calculated using suggestions by Hair et al (2010) for structural equation modelling⁸. Questionnaires were distributed to 170 office workers and 170 HCWs, in case of data loss due to poor response or incomplete questionnaires. Respondents for the validation process were purposively selected to include different categories of staff among healthcare and office workers from both government and private sectors in the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur and the Selangor

state. The HCWs included doctors, nurses, physiotherapists and hospital attendants. Office workers included administrators, managers, lawyers, bank officers, secretaries and clerks.

The new scale was tested in three stages; confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) at stages 1 and 3 and exploratory factor analysis at stage 2. A combination of several fit indices was used to assess the model, as there is no agreed single standard⁷. Fit indices used were Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Chi-Square test⁸⁻¹⁰. It is generally accepted that Chi-square/df index ratio value less than 3; CFI, GFI and AGFI values greater than .90; RMSEA $\leq$.07 indicate adequate model fit⁹. Data was analysed using the SPSS Version 16.0 (SPSS Inc., 2007) and SPSS AMOS software¹¹.

Results & Discussion:

Data was collected from 305 workers (90% response rate), consisting of 150 health care workers and 155 office workers. A total of 11% of cases had at least one randomly missing value in their WRQLS-2 responses and were removed, leaving a total of 272 cases for analysis (142 HCWs and 130 office workers). The mean age of respondents was 32 (SD=9) years and most (68%) were females. The majority (87%) were Malays while other respondents were of Indian, Chinese and other ethnicities. Most workers were either married (51%) or single (41%), while a small percentage widowed or separated. Many did not have chronic disease (83%) and nearly all (99%) had no disability. A total of 34% were university graduates, 39% had pre-university education and 27% were educated until high school. The mean duration of working at the current job was 7 years (SD=8). Most respondents were from the public sector (65%) while the minority were from the private sector (35%). A total of 35% were involved in shift work.

In the first phase, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) showed poor fit of the data to the original 7-factor model^{8,9}. Of the fit indices, only RMSEA showed a fit, RMSEA= 0.075 (≤ 0.08). Relevance of items within their construct was determined by exploring each measurement models for uni-dimensional fit using AMOS⁹. Low-loading items were removed from the model. An example of a low-loading item removed is “I have unachievable deadlines”. This may be irrelevant among healthcare workers where patient care is continuous, with passing over of responsibilities to the next shift. More importantly was capturing stress felt at work, than defining ‘deadlines’ as work stress. Work stress was captured by other items. Fitness indices showed good uni-dimensionality in constructs tested.

Upon checking each construct’s correlation with another to determine discriminant validity, multi-collinearity occurred between ‘Job and Career Satisfaction’ (JCS), ‘Working Conditions’ (WCS) and ‘Control At Work’ (CAW) constructs. Also, CAW items were low-loading, while WCS also showed multi-collinearity with ‘General Well-Being’ (GWB) and ‘Employee Engagement’ (EEN) constructs. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was 0.925 indicating sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test showed that the correlations between items were sufficiently large to conduct an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) ($p < 0.001$).

The EFA resulted in a 5-factor model, including GWB, EEN, SAW, HWI and one factor which had both JCS and CAW items. There was a clear grouping of items belonging to GWB which was the strongest factor and EEN items. However, only two SAW items were extracted, that is “I often feel pressured at work” (item 7) and “I often feel excessive levels of stress at work” (item 18). The HWI construct was also extracted with two items. Cross-loading items were removed to improve fit indices. See Table 1.

[Insert Table 1]

One factor extracted, which was the second strongest, was a mix of three JCS and three CAW items. It was shown that there was multicollinearity between the JCS and CAW constructs. The CAW items also had low loadings during pooled analysis, so it was decided to omit the CAW from the model, being redundant and multi-collinear with JCS. Only one item was extracted from the WCS construct, but it cross-loaded with GWB. As it was shown earlier that WCS was multi-collinear with JCS, GWB and EEN, it was decided that WCS was a redundant construct.

A Work-Related Quality of Life Malaysian model was created with 5-factors: GWB, JCS, EEN, HWI and SAW. A second confirmatory factor analysis showed good fit indices. The model showed good absolute fit (RMSEA=0.05; GFI=0.95), incremental fit (CFI=0.97; AGFI=0.92) and parsimonious fit (Chisq/dif=1.6)⁹. For convergent validity and also reliability, the average variance extracted (AVE) for all factors were 0.5 or more⁸. For construct validity, all fitness indices for the models have met the required level. There was good discriminant validity of the constructs, where correlations between constructs were less than 0.85⁹.

For internal reliability, the Cronbach's Alpha and composite reliability were all 0.7 or more except for HWI, which was 0.6. However, for composite reliability, all the values were at least 0.6 or higher, indicating good reliability¹⁰. Results from 1000 bootstrap re-samples showed good cross-validity of the new model (Bollen-Stein bootstrap $p = 0.14$). Table 2 shows items in the Malay translated WRQLS-2.

[Insert Table 2]

Differences in cultures may influence the relevance of certain items in a translated scale¹³⁻¹⁵. It appears that QOWL may be perceived differently in populations due to varying

work policy or ethos^{16,17}. The standards of WCS and CAW may be different between the UK and Malaysia. WCS, CAW and JCS can be differentiated well in the UK. For a developing country like Malaysia, it appears that these three factors are still highly inter-dependent. Due to the extended hours that many Malaysians spend working, it is possible that their GWB is highly correlated to their JCS.

Even though the Malay WRQLS-2 is different from the UK scale, it is of public health interest to know the QOWL among workers to improve occupational health, even though factors for perceived QOWL may vary. It could be that this succinct Malay Scale is most appropriate for capturing QOWL in the Malay-speaking population. This is something to consider when comparing QOWL between countries. Even though the results may not be directly comparable, it is still an important aspect of occupational health to assess.

A study limitation is that only two groups of workers were used for the validation process. Test-retest was also not carried out. Future studies could be done among more categories of workers with the test-retest procedure to determine the scale's usefulness among other worker groups which may vary in work norms. A validation of the original untranslated scale among English-speaking Malaysian workers may reveal if the same model applies, and whether the Malay model is different due to translational biases. As Malaysia is trying to improve its status to a developed country in the near future, a validation of the scale may be appropriate with an elevated status, to ensure its current applicability with more expectations from organisations.

Conclusion

Perception of good QOWL may differ between countries due to cultural influences and varying work environments. The validated Malaysian WRQLS-2 can be used to determine the QOWL of Malaysian office and healthcare workers.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was granted by the Medical Ethics Committee of University Malaya Medical Centre, Kuala Lumpur (Project Grant Reference: 860.4) and funded by the Postgraduate Research Fund of University of Malaya (Reference number PV095-2011A). Respondents signed an informed consent before participation and questionnaires labelled by identification numbers to protect confidentiality. All procedures performed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. Information on research data can be obtained from the corresponding author.

References:

1. Maizura H, Masilamani R, Aris T. (2009). Reliability (Internal Consistency) of the Job Content Questionnaire on Job Stress Among Office Workers of a Multinational Company in Kuala Lumpur. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*.2009; 21(2): 216-222.
2. Rosnawati MR, Moe H, Masilamani R, Darus A. The Bahasa Melayu Version of the Nursing Stress Scale Among Nurses: A Reliability Study in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*. 2010; 22 (4): 501-506.
3. Van Laar D, Edwards JA, Easton S. The Work-Related Quality of Life scale for healthcare workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2007;60(3): 325-333.
4. QOWL. Quality of Working Life. <http://www.qowl.com> . Accessed on 9th July 2011.
5. Duyan EC, Aytac S, Akyildiz N, Van Laar D. Measuring Work Related Quality of Life and Affective Well-being in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2013, 4(1): 105-116.
6. Zeng X, Chaiear N, Klainin P, Khiewyoo J, Koh D, Hien PWH, Lee SY. Work-related quality of life scale among Singaporean nurses. *Asian Biomedicine*. 2011,5(4):467-474. doi: 10.5372/1905-7415.0504.061

7. Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
8. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE. Multivariate Data Analysis (7th Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010.
9. Awang Z. Structural Equation Modelling Using Amos Graphic (2nd Edition). Malaysia: UiTM Press, 2013.
10. Holmes-Smith P, Coote L, Cunningham E. Structural Equation Modeling: From the Fundamental to Advanced Topics. Melbourne: Streams, 2006.
11. Arbuckle JL. Amos (Version 7.0) [Computer Program]. Chicago: SPSS, 2006.
12. Hair JF, Ringle CM, Starstedt M. PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 2011; 19(2):139-151.
13. Weeks A, Swerissen H, Belfrage J. Issues, challenges and solutions in translating study instruments. *Evaluation Review*. 2007; 31: 153-165.
14. Cha ES, Kim KH, Erlen JA. Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: issues and techniques. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2007; 58(4): 386-395.
15. Liu C, Borg I, Spector P E. Measurement equivalence of the German Job Satisfaction Survey used in a multinational organization: Implications of Schwartz's Culture Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2004; 89(6): 1070-1082.
16. Schwartz SH. A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 1999; 48(1): 23-47.
17. Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. Cross-cultural organizational behaviour. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2007; 58: 479-514.

Tables

Table 1: Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) summary for all constructs

Construct	Item	Factor Loading (L) (standardised)	Cronbach's Alpha (>0.7)	Composite Reliability (>0.6)	AVE (≥0.5)
Job & Career Satisfaction (JCS)	Q1	Items deleted due to low factor loadings	0.71	0.71	0.5
	Q3				
	Q8				
	Q17	Item deleted due to cross-loading			
	Q11	0.68			
	Q19	0.66			
	Q23	0.68			
Stress At Work (SAW)	Q7	0.83	0.8	0.80	0.7
	Q18	0.81			
	Q22	Item deleted due to low factor loading			
	Q30	Items deleted due to cross-loading			
	Q31				
Employee Engagement (EEN)	Q26	0.71	0.84	0.84	0.6
	Q27	0.84			
	Q28	0.84			
	Q25	Items deleted due to cross-loading			
	Q29				
General Well-Being (GWB)	Q10	0.61	0.81	0.81	0.5
	Q14	0.72			
	Q16	0.66			
	Q20	0.88			
	Q9	Item deleted due to cross loading			
	Q4	Item deleted due to low factor loading			
Home-Work Interface (HWI)	Q5	0.60	0.61	0.62	0.5
	Q6	0.74			
	Q24	Item deleted due to cross loading			
Control At Work (CAW)	Q2	Constructs deleted due to extremely high correlation (multicollinearity) with JCS.	--	--	--
	Q12				
	Q32				
Working Conditions (WCS)	Q13				
	Q15				
	Q21				
	Q33				

Table 2. Items included and excluded in the Malay translation of the Work-Related Quality of Life Scale-2 (WRQLS-2)

<p>Items included in the WRQL-2 Scale:</p> <p><i>Respondents rate each item on a Likert Scale of ‘Strongly Disagree’, ‘Disagree’, ‘Neutral’, ‘Agree’ and ‘Strongly Agree’.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>My employer provides adequate facilities and flexibility for me to fit work in around my family life.</i> 2. <i>My current working hours / patterns suit my personal circumstances.</i> 3. <i>I often feel under pressure at work.</i> 4. <i>I am satisfied with my life.</i> 5. <i>I am encouraged to develop new skills.</i> 6. <i>In most ways my life is close to ideal.</i> 7. <i>Generally things work out well for me.</i> 8. <i>I often feel excessive levels of stress at work.</i> 9. <i>I am satisfied with the training I receive in order to perform my present job.</i> 10. <i>Recently, I have been feeling reasonably happy all things considered.</i> 11. <i>My work is as interesting and varied as I would want it to be.</i> 12. <i>The organisation communicates well with its employees.</i> 13. <i>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organisation.</i> 14. <i>I would recommend this organisation as a good one to work for.</i> 15. <i>I am satisfied with the overall quality of my working life.</i>
<p>Items <i>not</i> included in the scale due to high multi-collinearity or low-loading:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>I have a clear set of goals and aims to enable me to do my job.</i> 2. <i>I feel able to voice opinions and influence changes in my area of work.</i> 3. <i>I have the opportunity to use my abilities at work.</i> 4. <i>I feel well at the moment.</i> 5. <i>When I have done a good job it is acknowledged by my line manager.</i> 6. <i>Recently, I have been feeling unhappy and depressed</i> 7. <i>I am involved in decisions that affect me in my own area of work.</i> 8. <i>My employer provides me with what I need to do my job effectively.</i> 9. <i>I work in a safe environment.</i> 10. <i>The working conditions are satisfactory.</i> 11. <i>I have unachievable deadlines.</i> 12. <i>I am able to achieve a healthy balance between my work and home life.</i> 13. <i>I feel motivated to do my best in my current job.</i> 14. <i>I get a sense of achievement from doing my job.</i> 15. <i>I am pressured to work long hours.</i> 16. <i>I have unrealistic time pressures.</i> 17. <i>I have sufficient opportunities to question managers about change at work.</i> 18. <i>I am satisfied with the career opportunities available for me here.</i> 19. <i>I am happy with the physical environment where I usually work.</i>