

## Repositório ISCTE-IUL

---

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2022-04-05

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Barroso, M. (2018). Quality of work research: a methodological review. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*. 17 (1), 89-103

Further information on publisher's website:

[10.1386/pjss.17.1.89\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/pjss.17.1.89_1)

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Barroso, M. (2018). Quality of work research: a methodological review. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*. 17 (1), 89-103, which has been published in final form at [https://dx.doi.org/10.1386/pjss.17.1.89\\_1](https://dx.doi.org/10.1386/pjss.17.1.89_1). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

---

### Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

---

## **Quality of work research: A methodological review**

**Margarida M. Barroso**, University Institute of Lisbon (CIES-IUL)

### **Abstract**

The research on quality of work experienced remarkable resurgence during the noughties, partially as a result of the inclusion of the topic in European and international policy-making agendas. In the second half of the decade, the global economic crisis largely redirected the attention to the quantitative dimensions of labour market policy. Nonetheless, academic production on job quality has maintained its vitality over the years. As in many other relevant research topics, consensus over the conceptualization and measurement of quality of work has been difficult to achieve among academics and policy-makers. Apart from the lack of a commonly agreed definition, measurement also tends to be varied and supported by different methods. In fact, both academics and policy-makers claim the need for a more consensual definition as a way of improving the comparability between countries, sectors of activity or occupations. In this article, we compare the methodological designs of a selected group of quality of work studies to identify the degree to which there are significant discrepancies within the academic community and to assess progress regarding the challenge of conceptualizing and measuring quality of work. The article offers a review of the most-cited articles indexed at the Scopus database between 2000 and 2015, and a comprehensive analysis over the question of conceptualization and measurement.

### **Keywords**

quality of work

job quality

quality of working life

methodological review

literature review

analytical frameworks

## **1. Introduction**

The concept of quality of work (hereafter, QoW) is often used indistinctively from the notions of ‘quality of life at work’, ‘quality of working life’ or ‘job quality’. In a rigorous conceptual discussion, one could argue that each one of these terms allow for interpretative and operative limitations. ‘Life at work’ or ‘working life’ are expressions that presuppose a disintegrated perspective of human life, perhaps leading to an interpretation of work as an isolated sphere. In this assumption, it would be possible to have a quality of life at work and a quality of life ‘outside work’, or a quality of working life distinct from the quality of the private life. To a large extent, these different approaches are interrelated. All life spheres are interconnected to the point of affecting each other. In this regard, research has shown that a good working life is often reflected in the personal domain and vice versa and that general quality of life tends to be higher for those who have a job (Gallie and Russel 1998; Gallie 2002).

In the literature, QoW studies often refer to the work aspects that influence the quality of life, recognizing that these features can be generally associated to the work itself, to the context where it takes place, or to the workers’ characteristics. However, although there is a latent understanding of the common sense meaning of QoW, conceptual divergences on the best way to define and measure it still dominate academic and policy discussions. Present-day research has not reached a universally accepted definition and some authors argue that this constitutes an obstacle not only to scientific advancement but also to the achievement of good working conditions.

The quest for a robust conceptualization of QoW has been present over time, and its importance has been increasingly noticed in recent debates (Findlay et al. 2013; Muñoz de Bustillo et al. 2011a; Bustillo et al. 2011b). However, debating the conceptualization of QoW does not necessarily mean aspiring to a single definition and measurement framework. As Findlay et al. (2013) argue, the multidimensional, multidisciplinary and contextual nature of the phenomenon makes it difficult to establish single definitions. Additionally, with so many decades of accumulated knowledge on the theme, one cannot truly say that there is no agreement over the main dimensions that allow us to define and measure QoW.

In this article, we examine different research approaches of QoW, to discuss their main methodological differences and their impact on the general understanding of the concept. The central objective of the analysis is to identify the degree to which there are significant discrepancies within the academic community and to assess progress regarding the challenge of conceptualizing and measuring QoW.

After describing the methods used for selecting and analysing the studies present in this article, we start with a brief overview of the main theoretical and methodological approaches, mapping the evolution of some definitions and identifying the contact points between different conceptualizations. In the subsequent sections, we analyse the methodological designs of a selected group of studies on the topic, giving special attention to its theoretical influences, analytical levels and data used. We conclude with an overview towards a more unified look over the different contributions, arguing that a significant degree of conceptual harmonization is already present in today's research.

## **2. Methods**

The present methodological overview was based on the analysis of selected relevant contributions on the topic of QoW. We have used the Scopus bibliographic database in the area

of social sciences and searched for scientific articles published between January 2000 and December 2015, including the keywords ‘quality of work’, ‘job quality’ and ‘quality of working life’.

After careful consideration of these extractions, we have only included for review the articles that clearly presented a definition and methodological framework for measuring QoW. The articles whose primary focus was not the study of QoW, or whose objective was to discuss the relationship between QoW and other social phenomena were also excluded. To limit our sample of publications to a reasonable number for analysis, we have only considered the most-cited English language publications. Consequently, and although we have extended our search until the year 2015, the articles under analysis refer to the period between 2000 and 2010. For each paper, we have identified the operationalization dimensions used, the main theoretical influences and the data sources. These were then grouped according to their correspondences.

### **3. Key theoretical and methodological approaches**

Gallie (1996, 2003, 2007b) has identified two main analytical traditions in the study of QoW: a neo-Marxist perspective, underlying the effects of work organization in worker’s alienation; and a subjective well-being perspective, mainly focused on workers’ satisfaction and motivation. While both developed as a reaction to the effects of Taylorist models of production, the emphasis is significantly diverse. The neo-Marxist approach, strongly supported by the work of Friedmann ([1950] 1967), 1963 [1946]), Naville (1963) and Braverman (1974), stresses task fragmentation as a factor that limits human potential. On a different perspective, the well-being tradition, grounded in the Hawthorne experiences and in the work of Mayo ([1932] 1972, 1949), focuses more on the reduction of workers’ satisfaction and motivation, and on its impact on the general productivity of organizations (Gallie 1996, 2003, Gallie 2007b).

Some authors have been defending the existence of a third school of thought that emerged especially after the 1980s with the intensification of globalization. Largely influenced by the neo-Marxist tradition, this third approach concentrates on employment structures. It includes the contributions from labour market segmentation theories, arguing the increasing job polarization and the creation of unequal and contrasting segments in the labour market (Berger and Piore 1980; Doeringer and Piore 1985; Gordon et al. 1982), and the institutionalist approaches (namely Esping-Andersen's welfare regimes approach (1990) and Hall and Soskice's varieties of capitalism perspective [2001]), underlying the effect of institutional differences in explaining working conditions' variations (Gallie 2007a, Gallie 2007b, 2007c).

Regardless of the analytical tradition, concerns over the definition of QoW remain present. The request of a precise conceptualization has been defended as one possible way of finding a consensual measurement of QoW, avoiding the diversity of perspectives and results in the field.

In their baseline article, Nadler and Lawler (1983) analysed the evolution of QoW studies up to the year 1980. According to the authors, the concept started to be understood as a 'variable' to evaluate organizational efficacy and as an 'approach' to improve working conditions and organizational performance, after which it started to be seen as a 'method' of task enrichment and as an ideological 'movement' about the nature of work and the relationship between the worker and the organization (Nadler and Lawler 1983: 22–23). The variety of interpretations and usages of the term led the authors to fear its understanding as a 'panacea' for all organizational problems (Nadler and Lawler 1983: 24). In a clearly pessimistic perspective, the authors were concerned that the lack of a precise definition would dissipate its academic and organizational interest (Nadler and Lawler 1983).

In fact, QoW studies have suffered different flows of general and academic attention over the years. The first half of the noughties clearly showed a burst of awareness on the topic,

followed by a decline in interest in the final years of the decade, especially by policy-makers, as a result of the global economic crisis that redirected the attention to the ‘quantity’ of jobs and to the need to create employment. In any case, considering the academic production on the theme, it is clear that QoW remains in the academic and organizational agendas, and that there have been several attempts to conceptualize and measure the notion of quality.

There are two elements generally present in QoW definitions: the individual, as protagonist and beneficiary of the QoW; and the organizations, as producers of the working conditions that impact workers’ lives. For instance, Hackman and Suttle (1977), defined quality of working life as ‘the degree to which members of a work organisation are able to satisfy important personal needs through their experiences in the organisation’; Cascio (1986) defined QoW ‘in terms of employee’s perceptions of their physical and mental well-being at work’; and Sirgy et al. (2001) define it ‘as employee satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace’. Accordingly, the discussion about the meanings of QoW cannot be separated from the debate on the definition of the working conditions and working contexts that can guarantee a good job. If QoW is associated to both individuals and organizations, one would expect its conceptual components to differ according to the working and production conditions considered to be important by each person or organization. This argument is, in itself, sufficient to justify the variety of definitions existing in the literature. In that sense, as Cooke et al. (2013) point out, the contextual and broader aspects of life and work can influence the perceptions of QoW, leading to different understandings of its meaning.

In order to debate variations in meaning, it is also important to address measurement. The two main analytical traditions mentioned above are associated to different methodological approaches. The neo-Marxist perspective has been privileging the identification of the specific working conditions that affect personal development. In this case, the analysis is based on the

identification and evaluation of the work features considered to be relevant for the QoW. This evaluation can be done by the worker or by the researcher. In some cases, it can result in a single measure of quality, usually taking the form of an index (Dahl et al. 2009; Gallie 2007b; Kalleberg and Vaisey 2005). Critics of this approach point out the fact that the list of aspects identified can be easily insufficient and miss important dimensions of job quality, not considering, for example, individual work preferences (Dahl et al. 2009; Gallie 2007b; Kalleberg and Vaisey 2005).

In contrast, the methodological approach of the subjective well-being tradition has been associated with general appraisals of quality standards at work, frequently measured as work satisfaction. In this case, the worker carries out the evaluation of his/her working conditions to reach a global assessment, often in terms of a satisfaction scale. This method is usually criticized because it is not always possible to recognize which work aspects lay behind that individual evaluation (Dahl et al. 2009; Gallie 2007b; Kalleberg and Vaisey 2005). We could also add to this discussion the problematic use of satisfaction as a job quality indicator, which has also been a point of debate in QoW research. Satisfaction and quality are autonomous concepts that are associated to different types of work evaluation. This means that one could have work satisfaction even in low-quality jobs or, on the contrary, enjoy good working conditions without feeling satisfied. In any case, although there are still studies that treat quality and satisfaction indistinctively, we can say that there has long been a general agreement among academics that work satisfaction is just one of the many components of quality (Seashore 1975).

As Gallie defends, QoW studies tend, more and more, to aggregate elements from different traditions (2003, 2007b). In this sense, we could say that we are developing towards a greater convergence. But the diversity of analytical approaches in the literature goes beyond this broad distinction between neo-Marxist and subjective well-being schools of thought.

Therefore, we propose a closer look at some of them, considering the immediate relation between definition and measurement.

#### **4. From definition to measurement: Diversity and consensus**

In the beginning of the 1980s, Castillo and Prieto analysed the different definitions of the term ‘working conditions’, concluding that the theoretical perspectives adopted by researchers would condition the operational dimensions included in their studies (Castillo and Prieto 1983). Nevertheless, more than defining working conditions and knowing “where they start and where they end”, they defended the need to focus on workers’ preferences (Castillo and Prieto 1983: 120). Considering that research on working conditions is pertinent because it affects the lives of those who work, the authors claimed that individuals should be at the centre of the analysis. Consequently, in their perspective, the conceptualization of the notion of working conditions would vary according to the attributions that each researcher gives to the worker. If workers were to be considered only in their physiological dimension, the research focus would certainly be on the physical working conditions, security or health. If workers were seen as social and psychological beings, other working conditions had to be taken into account (Castillo and Prieto 1983). Clark (1998) has also defended that the only way of knowing if a job has quality is by asking the worker. However, the extensive research on QoW that has been done over the years have delivered significant contributions on the work dimensions that prove to influence workers’ lives.

Many QoW studies have been criticized for neglecting a rigorous conceptual discussion, using its analytical dimensions as definitions in itself. This means treating the ‘operational definition’ as a ‘definition of meaning’ (Sartori 1970: 1045). For some authors, this contributes to the lack of consensus around what a job with quality should be (Martel and Dupuis 2006). In fact, the definition of a concept should not be misled by the analytical

dimensions and indicators used for its measurement, although these can still be considered as ‘declarations of meaning’, since they indicate the potential ways of measuring the concept (Sartori 1970: 1045).

A methodological review of existing research is therefore useful to assess progress regarding the conceptualization and measurement of QoW and to debate possible trends towards operational harmonization, or contrarily, divergence.

### **5. Quality of work research: A methodological review**

In the following table, we present the selected studies developed under the theme of QoW and its corresponding analytical frameworks. From the analysis of these models, we have found three relevant discriminating axes: (1) the theoretical references; (2) the analytical levels and empirical objects; and (3) the data sources. After a careful analysis of each analytical approach, the operational dimensions were categorized in nine general thematic dimensions: health and safety, employment security, economic capacity, skills, social dialogue, work organization, work-life integration, interpersonal relations and general well-being.

[Insert table 1 about here]

#### ***Theoretical references***

As we can see from the table, some studies combine elements from both the neo-Marxist and the subjective well-being traditions, but the employment structures approach, and particularly the theories of labour market segmentation, have been gaining more predominance.

The analytical proposals that fall under the labour market segmentation theories measure QoW in terms of the characteristics that make a job good or bad. Some examples can be found in the studies of Clark (2005), Kalleberg, Reskin and Hudson (2000), McGovern,

Smeaton and Hill (2004) or Kalleberg and Vaisey (2005). In these approaches, labour markets are perceived as a discriminating arena where jobs with good working conditions are clearly separated from those whose characteristics are mainly associated to poor working conditions (Goos and Manning 2003; Gallie 2003). Bearing in mind that the features that make a good job are not necessarily the ones that make it bad (Kalleberg and Vaisey 2005), these studies often confirm the concentration of good or bad characteristics in one same job. The example of wages is elucidative: contrary to the compensating wage differentials theory (Smith [1776] 1993) that defends that a job exposed to a higher level of risk should be compensated with a higher salary, evidence of the employment structures analysis of QoW show that, in contemporary societies, the higher paid jobs are also those with better general working conditions and vice versa (Clark 2005; Kalleberg et al. 2000).

The influence of the institutionalist theories is also strong in our selected QoW studies. Inspired in the work of Hall and Soskice (2001), these approaches argue that QoW would depend on the institutional configurations of the countries, namely the relationship between companies, unions or the education system. In this case, the distinction between QoW and quality of employment deserves special attention. The first considers the job in itself, and the latter, the relation between employment demand and supply. Research focused on the quality of employment tends to analyse employment dynamics in a particular context, usually at a national level, and to give special attention to education and lifelong learning, social protection, pensions or unemployment. Quality of employment is a concept recurrently present in social policy documents, namely at the European level, where those elements are often privileged in detriment of the intrinsic characteristics of work. It is also a concept adopted in some academic studies that analyse the effect of national institutions in the determination of quality (e.g.: Davoine et al. 2008). In contrast, the majority of studies that adopt a QoW perspective tend to be more wide-ranging. They are not restricted to the analysis of employment and

unemployment, also including the analysis of the task and of the context where work takes place.

Apart from the broader distinction between the main analytical traditions, some of the selected studies are inspired in specific theoretical frameworks referring to other research topics and then applied to the study of QoW. Maslow's (1954), McClelland's (1961) and Herzberg's (1966) behaviourists and motivationalist theories, mainly present in the subjective well-being approaches, are implicit in many QoW studies (e.g., Sirgy et al. 2001). According to these theories, there is a group of necessities at work that need to be satisfied so that workers can feel motivated. Having this hypothesis in mind, these authors identify a set of basic needs responsible for QoW. Spillover theories (Hill et al. 2003), which state that the experience in one life sphere has reciprocal implications in all other spheres, are also present in most analysis, especially the ones that address work-life reconciliation.

The question of adapting work tasks to the individual skills, characteristics and needs of workers is also recurrent in the studies of QoW. Hackman and Oldham's proposal (1980) to redesign work tasks in order to improve worker's satisfaction and organizational performance is one of the constant references. According to the work design perspective, task characteristics like variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy or feedback impact different mental states (meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of the results), which influence motivation, satisfaction and productivity in a general sense (Hackman and Oldham 1980).

Karasek's model for the study of fatigue (1979) has also influenced several QoW studies. According to the author, work-associated tension and fatigue are a result of the combination between work demands and decision-making latitude. Limits to the worker's latitude of decision-making, together with high work demands, are usually the cause of tension. This input proved to be relevant for QoW studies essentially for two reasons. First, it allowed the assumption that the same level of demand can have different responses by the worker

depending on its level of autonomy. Second, it showed that it is possible to decrease fatigue levels by increasing decision-making latitude without influencing work demands, which means improving workers' mental health without compromising organizational performance.

Other proposals presented in our analysis follow even more concrete theoretical references. Martel and Dupuis (2006), for example, combine Turcotte's analysis on the quality of working life (1988, in Martel and Dupuis 2006), with Kohl and Schooler model of work structures (1982). In this combination, Martel and Dupuis develop an extensive list of QoW indicators entitled 'Quality of Life Systemic Inventory' (Martel and Dupuis 2006: 362–63).

### *Analytical level and empirical objects*

In the selected studies, QoW research tends to combine macro (education and training, employment relations), meso (task design, physical working conditions, work organization) and micro (individual needs and resources) factors of analysis. However, the attention given to each one of these levels of analysis is strongly dependent of the empirical objects in question.

Studies aimed at comparing countries tend to focus on the dimensions that allow the analysis of the employment structures. Inversely, research that focuses on a specific national or occupational context is more oriented towards giving more attention to work organization, task characteristics or individual resources. Taking the example of Sirgy et al. (2001), the authors initially applied a survey restricted to university employees and to workers from an accounting company. Kalleberg and Vaisey (2005) have also applied a survey to a sample of workers from a labour organization in the air transportation and aerospace industry. Both studies took place in the United States. The study by Kalleberg et al. (2000) is also a good example of an analysis undertaken at a specific national context, also the United States. Some of the key dimensions that are used to measure QoW, like the access to health insurance or to a pension, are strongly associated to the specific reality of the country being studied.

Consequently, when McGovern et al. (2004) replicated this model in the United Kingdom, not only did they add an additional dimension (opportunities for career progression), but they also referred to the different weight that access to health insurance or pension has in the British reality where the public provision of these services tends to be widespread.

### *Methods and data*

Finally, the analysis of the selected articles allows us to confirm the importance of the methodological strategy, and more precisely of the data availability, for the operationalization of QoW.

All the authors under analysis adopted a quantitative approach, sometimes complemented with qualitative interviews. Looking only at the quantitative dimension, some authors chose to develop their own data collection instruments, forming a unique database. This option provides more freedom when choosing the relevant variables to define and measure QoW. For instance, Kalleberg and Vaisey (2005) developed their own data collection instruments, which allowed them to combine two methodological approaches (the measurement of the global appreciation of quality of life and the evaluation of several work dimensions) and to define analytical dimensions according to previous literature and research evidence and to their own research needs.

In contrast, a great number of studies are based on already existing resources and databases, which restrict, to some degree, the analytical perspective that is being adopted. Nowadays, the academic community has access to several work-related indicators through the official resources of many international or national institutions, like the national statistics cabinets, the European Commission, the OECD, the ILO, etc. These include data on salaries, social benefits, employment and unemployment and many other indicators.

At a European level, specific surveys designed to allow the comparative analysis of QoW have been developed, namely, The European Working Conditions Survey (Eurofound), the European Company Survey (Eurofound), the European Quality of life Survey (Eurofound), the Enterprise Survey on new and Emerging Risks (OSHA) or the Pan-European Poll on Occupational Safety and Health. Besides these databases, information about working behaviour and values can also be found in the programmes of data collection of values, namely, the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) and the European Social Survey (ESS). Since these data resources allow the comparison of countries, occupations, age groups or sex, also permitting a longitudinal analysis, many authors use them in their research. In these cases, the expected tendency would be for the analytical framework to follow the dimensions included in the data sources.

Clark (2005), for example, supports his work in the special work orientation modules of the ISSP database. Consequently, the analytical dimensions identified as being relevant for QoW are those who are already available in the dataset. Handel (2005), in his turn, used data from the General Social Survey to analyse trends in perceived job quality over the years.

Data resulting from the ESS is also a reference in the studies of QoW, namely, Davoine et al. (2008), and these data have been especially relevant for the identification of the work domains more and less valued by workers.

The use of pre-existent analytical frameworks can encompass some limitations. For instance, the ILO decent work approach and the EC Laeken indicators have been criticized by some scholars for being more oriented towards a specific political agenda than to the accurate knowledge of QoW (Peña-Casas 2009; Green 2006; Davoine et al. 2008). Besides, the development of large-scale questionnaires always bears the risk of not including all the possible relevant variables. Nevertheless, these analytical frameworks developed by official institutions

have the advantage of stimulating further production to a scale that researchers would not be able to reach autonomously and individually.

Since data availability can restrict the final operationalization, some authors choose to combine data from different sources, or add original data to previous existing ones. Davoine et al. (2008), for example, adopted the EC indicators, but chose to add some others they consider to be pertinent. Taking the example of skills, since the EC framework only includes indicators that refer to training actions, the authors added the training hours and costs from other sources.

Authors that prefer to use national-level information, like Kalleberg et al. (2000) in the United States, or McGovern et al. (2004) in the United Kingdom do not have the opportunity to entail a comparative analysis between countries, and in that sense, its operationalization is not always transferable to other national contexts.

Following the argument of Findlay, Kalleberg and Warhurst (2013) on QoW data, our analysis further confirms the idea that practical limitations regarding data access and availability are one more source of variability between authors.

## **6. Discussion**

Following our analysis, it seems evident that there is a great degree of diversity and variability in the theoretical influences of QoW studies and in the analytical perspectives adopted. However, if it is true that in these selected studies there is no evident consensus regarding the analytical dimensions that should be included in the study of QoW, it is also true that employment security, skills and work organization are considered relevant for almost all authors. Salary, well-being, health and safety and interpersonal relations are also considered relevant in the majority of studies. We can, therefore, assume that there is a significant base of analytical convergence. In addition, although under distinct perspectives, the majority of studies try to articulate different analytical levels, combining, for example, employment

structures, task design and work organization with workers' individual resources. The analytical and operational divergences seem to be secondary in face of a group of established and empirically tested working conditions that are central for the QoW.

In present-day research, the increasing interconnection between scholars from different countries leads to the widespread use of large-scale databases that allow comparisons. This means that the analytical dimensions used to measure QoW would likely be harmonized between authors, since they are referring to the same data sources that already have a defined set of operational dimensions.

Recalling the discussion of the relation between definition and measurement, it is generally consensual that the meanings of QoW and favourable working conditions can vary between individuals, countries, occupational groups and other aspects. But it is also clear that the variety of meanings that researchers, in some cases informed by workers, attribute to QoW is somehow limited and expressed as a consequence of analytical and methodological options or conditionings. Perhaps the discussion over these and other limitations could be more relevant than the pursuit of a universal definition and measurement, which would always be difficult to achieve due to the contextual, multi causal and multidimensional nature of QoW.

## **7. Conclusion**

In this article, we have analysed selected articles on the topic of QoW in order to identify significant analytical differences or similarities, and to assess progress regarding the harmonization of concepts and measurement. We have restricted our analysis to the most-cited English articles under the topic of QoW, in the Scopus database, between 2000 and 2015. This clearly leaves behind important contributions that were excluded from extraction due to these necessary, but restricting, criteria. Therefore, the scope of our exercise is limited, and it does not aim to be exhaustive or representative of all the relevant contributions in the field, namely,

the ones published in books, book chapters, in other languages than English or in other years, or the ones that are not present in the database we used.

Considering three axes of analysis (theoretical references, analytical levels and methodological strategies and data), it was possible to denote the variety of approaches in the studies of QoW that lay behind the claim for consensus. In fact, if we want to integrate the different scientific contributions in the field of QoW in order to increase comparability and inform policy, the diversity of definitions and analytical perspectives may bring additional difficulties. But even though analysis vary according to the theoretical references, the analytical level and the data availability, this exercise of analysing different operationalisations of QoW confirms that there is, to a certain extent, some degree of convergence in the main dimensions that are relevant for the study of QoW.

Conceptual and operative discussions are an integral part of conducting research. The variety and complexity of elements that can influence our understandings of QoW easily lead to theoretical and methodological divergences that do not necessarily have to be perceived as an obstacle to scientific development. Allowing for variety is actually a good principle for the scientific discussion of any concept. In QoW studies, this heterogeneity has so far generated a set of interesting contributions that can complement each other in the quest for a higher QoW. By providing a detailed methodological review, this article adds up to the complex debate on the conceptualization of QoW, and aims to contribute to its further research in contemporary societies.

## **8. References**

Berger, S. and Piore, M. J. (1980), *Dualism and Discontinuity in Industrial Societies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braverman, H. (1974), *Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cascio, W. F. (1986), *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Castillo, J. J. and Prieto, C. (1983), *Condiciones de Trabajo, hacia un enfoque renovador de la sociología del trabajo (Working Conditions, Towards a Renewed Focus in Sociology of Work)*, Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Clark, A. (1998), 'Measures of job satisfaction: What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries', *OECD Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers*, vol. 34, Paris, OECD Publishing, <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org>. Accessed 10 February 2018.

\_\_\_\_ (2005), 'Your money or your life: Changing job quality in OECD countries', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43:3, pp. 377–400.

Cooke, G. B., Donaghey, J. and Zeytinoglu, I. (2013), 'The nuanced nature of work quality: Evidence from rural Newfoundland and Ireland', *Human Relations*, 66:4, pp. 503–27.

Dahl, S. A., Neshein, T. and Olsen, K. (2009), 'Quality of work – concept and measurement', RECOPE-Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 5-2009, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1489881>. Accessed 10 February 2018.

Davoine, L., Erhel, C. And Guernoat-Lariviere, M. (2008), 'Monitoring quality in work: European employment strategy indicators and beyond', *International Labour Review*, 147:2&3, pp. 163–98.

Doeringer, P. B. and Piore, M. J. (1985), *Internal Labour Markets and Manpower Analysis*, London: ME Sharp Inc.

Gøsta, E. A. (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Findlay, P., Kalleberg, A. and Warhurst, C. (2013), 'The challenge of job quality', *Human Relations*, 66:4, pp. 441–51.

Friedmann, G. ([1946] 1963), *Problèmes humaines du machinisme industriel*, Paris: Gallimard.

\_\_\_\_ ([1950] 1967), *Où va le travail humain?*, Paris: Gallimard.

Gallie, D. (1996), 'The quality of employment: Perspectives and problems', in A. Offer (ed.), *In Pursuit of the Quality of Life*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 163-197.

\_\_\_\_. (2002), 'The quality of working life in welfare strategy', in E. A. Gøsta, D. Gallie, A. Hemerick and J. Myles (eds), *Why We Need a New Welfare State?*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 96-127.

\_\_\_\_ (2003), 'The quality of working life: Is Scandinavia different?', *European Sociological Review*, 19:1, pp. 61–79.

\_\_\_\_ (2007a), 'Welfare regimes, employment systems and job preference orientations', *European Sociological Review*, 23:3, pp. 279–93.

\_\_\_\_ (2007b), *Employment Regimes and the Quality of Work*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

\_\_\_\_ (2007c), 'Production regimes and the quality of employment in Europe', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, pp. 85–104.

Gallie, D. and Russel, H. (1998), 'Unemployment and life satisfaction: A cross cultural comparison', *European Journal of Sociology*, 39:2, pp. 3–35.

Goos, M. and Manning, A. (2003), 'Lousy and Lovely Jobs: The rising polarization of work in Britain', CEP discussion papers, London: London School of Economics, [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/20002/1/Lousy\\_and\\_Lovely\\_Jobs\\_the\\_Rising\\_Polarization\\_of\\_Work\\_in\\_Britain.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/20002/1/Lousy_and_Lovely_Jobs_the_Rising_Polarization_of_Work_in_Britain.pdf). Accessed 10 February 2018.

Gordon, D. M., Edwards, R., and Reich, M. (1982), *Segmented Work, Divided Workers: The Historical Transformation of Labor in the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, F. (2006), *Demanding Work, the Paradox of Job Quality in the Affluent Economy*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. P. (1980), *Work Redesign*, Madison: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hackman, J. R., and Suttle, J. L. (1977), *Improving life at work: Behavioral science approaches to organizational change*, Santa Monica CA: Goodyear.

Hall, P. and Soskice, D. (2001), *Varieties of Capitalism, the Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Handel, M. (2005), 'Trends in Perceived Job Quality. 1989-1998', *Work and Occupations*, 32:1, pp. 66-94.

Herzberg, F. (1966), *Work and the Nature of Man*, New York: Crowell.

Hill, J., Ferris, M. and Martinson, V. (2003), 'Does it matter where you work? A comparison of how three work venues (traditional office, virtual office, and home office) influence aspects of work and personal/family life', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63:2, pp. 220–24.

Kalleberg, A. and Vaisey, S. (2005), 'Pathways to a good job: Perceived work quality among machinists in North America', *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43:3, pp. 431–54.

Kalleberg, A., Reskin, B. F. and Hudson, K. (2000), 'Bad jobs in America: Standard and nonstandard employment relations and job quality in the United States', *American Sociological Review*, 65:2, pp. 256–78.

Karasek, R. A. (1979), 'Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24:2, pp. 285–308.

Kohl, M. and Schooler, C. (1982), 'Job conditions and personality, a longitudinal assessment of their reciprocal effects', *American Journal of Sociology*, 87:6, pp. 1257–86.

Martel, J. P. and Dupuis, G. (2006), 'Quality of work life: Theoretical and methodological problems, and presentation of a new model and measuring instrument', *Social Indicators Research*, 77:2, pp. 333–68.

Maslow, A. H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality*, New York: Harper.

Mayo, E. \_([1932] 1972), *Problemas humanos de unacivilización industrial*, Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Vision.

\_\_\_\_\_. (1949), *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, London: Routledge.

McClelland, D. C. (1961), *The Achieving Society*, New York: The Free Press.

McGovern, P., Smeaton, D. and Hill, S. (2004), 'Bad jobs in Britain: Nonstandard employment and job quality', *Work and Occupations*, 31:2, pp. 225–48.

Muñoz De Bustillo, R., Fernández-Macías, E., Antón, J. I. And Esteve, F. (2011a), *Measuring More than Money*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

\_\_\_\_ (2011b), 'E pluribus unum? A critical survey of job quality indicators', *Socio-Economic Review*, 9:3, pp. 447–75.

Nadler, D. A. and Lawler, E. (1983), 'Quality of work life: Perspectives and directions', *Organizational Dynamics*, 11:3, pp. 20–30.

Naville, P. (1963), *Vers l'automatisme social*, Paris: Gallimard.

Peña-casas, R. (2009), 'More and better jobs: Conceptual framework and monitoring indicators of quality of work and employment in the EU policy arena', RECOWE Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe 6-2009, [http://www.socialpolicy.ed.ac.uk/recowepudisc/working\\_papers/working\\_paper\\_06\\_09](http://www.socialpolicy.ed.ac.uk/recowepudisc/working_papers/working_paper_06_09).

Accessed 10 February 2018.

Sartori, G. (1970), 'Concept misformation in comparative politics', *The American Political Science Review*, 64:4, pp. 1033–53.

Seashore, S. (1975), 'Defining and measuring the quality of working life', in L. E. Davis and A. Cherns (eds), *The Quality of Working Life*, New York: The Free Press, pp. 105-118.

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. and Lee, D. J. (2001), 'A new measure of quality of working life based on need satisfaction and spillover theories', *Social Indicators Research*, 55:3, pp. 242–302.

Smith, A. ([1776] 1993), *An Enquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Contributor details**

Margarida M. Barroso is a researcher at the Centre for Research and Studies in Sociology, from the University Institute of Lisbon (CIES-IUL). She holds a Ph.D. in sociology, with a dissertation on the quality of working life of high-qualified professionals. Her research focuses social policy, work, organizations, education, gender and work-life integration. She has participated in several national and international research projects regarding the labour market integration of vulnerable groups, namely youngsters, women and working carers and the organizational strategies to promote job quality and general well-being.

Contact:

CIES-ISCTE, Avenida das Forças Armadas, 1649-026, Lisboa, Portugal.

E-mail: [Margarida.barroso@iscte.pt](mailto:Margarida.barroso@iscte.pt)

**Table 1:** Analytical frameworks of quality of work.

Authors	Categories/Thematic dimensions									Theoretical tradition	Analytical level empirical objects	Data
	Health and safety	Employment security	Economic capacity	Skills	Social dialogue	Work organization	Work-life integration	Interpersonal relations	Well-being			
Kallerberg et al. (2000)	Health Insurance	Pensions	Wages	-	-	-	-	-	-	Labour market segmentation	National (USA)	Current Population Survey
Sirgy et al. (2001)	Health and safety needs	-	Economic and family needs	Actualization needs Knowledge needs	-	Need for autonomy	-	Social needs Esteem needs	Aesthetics needs	Subjective well-being Maslow, McClelland	National (USA) University workers	Author's questionnaire

										nd, Herzberg, Spillover theories (satisfacti on as proxy)	Accoun tants	
Gallie (2003)	-	Job security and the welfare safety net	-	Skills and training	Represent ation, participati on and commitm ent	Autonom y, task quality and team work	-	-	-	Quality of employ ment Institutio nalist approach	Internat ional (Austria , Belgiu m, Denmar k, Finland,	Employ ment in Europe (1996)

										Neo- Marxist influence Hackman and Oldham, Karasek	France, German y, United Kingdo m, Greece, Ireland, Italy, The Netherl ands, Portuga l, Spain, Sweden )	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

McGovern et al. (2004)	Sick pay	Pension pay	Wages	Promotion and career ladder	-	-	-	-	-	Labour market segmentation	National (United Kingdom)	Working in Britain (2000)
Clark (2005)	-	Promotions and job security Future prospects	Pay	-	-	Difficulty Content (interest, prestige and independence) Hours	-	Interpersonal relationships	Values and results	Labour market segmentation (satisfaction as proxy)	International and national (United Kingdom)	ISSP (1989) and British Household Panel Survey

Kalleberg and Vaisey (2005)	-	Promotion opportunities Security	Pay and benefits	Opportunities for development	-	Autonomy and control	-	-	Intrinsic rewards	Combination of Neo-Marxist and subjective well-being approaches, but with influence of labour market segments	National (United States) Sample of workers from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace	Author's questionaire
-----------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------	---	----------------------	---	---	-------------------	---	---	-----------------------

										tion theories	ce Workers	
Handel (2005)	Working conditions (Stress, Exhaustion, Hard physical work, etc.)	Material rewards (Security)	Material rewards (Income)	Material rewards (advancement)				Positive interpersonal relations	Non-material rewards Job satisfaction	-	National (United States)	General Social Survey

Martel and Dupuis (2006)	Physical context	-	-	-	Organizational context	Nature of the job	-	-	Psychosocial context	Combination of Neo-Marxist and subjective well-being approaches	-	-
Davoine et al. (2008)	Working conditions	-	Socioeconomic security	Education and training	-	-	Gender and work-life conciliation	-	-	Quality of employment Institutionalists	European	Official statistics ESS, EWCS OECDs

										approach		
										es		

